PREHAV SCALES AND LISTS

A lecture given on
30 October 1962

Well, this is the what of what?

Audience: 30th October AD 12.

Not even Halloween yet! Thirty Oct. AD 12 and first lecture, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

Now, it's a very fortunate thing that you are here tonight. Very glad to see you tonight, you knuckleheads! I'm glad to see you in such a happy frame of mind.

Well, what this is about, actually, is we're turning the Z Unit loose on itself. And you've seen the policy letter by which the Z Unit is being turned loose on itself. And I just want to make an announcement; that is more than meets the eye. The auditing style, skill, boo-boos and that sort of thing of the Z Unit will be very, very closely supervised – very, very closely supervised.

And when you get out of here, Z Unit, you won't have Phil or Herbie or Fred or Reg and Mary Sue and myself to say, "Well, have you been sitting down across the table from the pc?" You know? You'll be on your own. And you'll have to make decisions regarding eases and what to do with those cases, across a lot of miles. And the time for you to fall on your heads is here, not in lower north South Amboy. See? That's a mythical place. That's where we sent the chosen few from Johannesburg – they'll never be heard from again.

Now, that opens up a new chapter in training. Your training, you should realize, is quite different than any training done on Earth to date. There are some parallels of one kind or another and here and there it's the same. Sometimes they'd let an engineer see a transit before they graduated him as a skilled engineer. That's about as far as practical application of engineering ever went. Sometimes in polytechnic schools, they let somebody build a small stool or something.

But were doing different than that. We've divided education into theory, practical and actual application of what is learned in theory and practical. And I'd like to bring it very severely to your attention that practical is not extended into the Auditing Section. You can't perform in the Auditing Section – well, you've had it. That's it.

Auditing is something that is performed. It is performed on a pc and it is performed

with benefit to the pc. Now, these are very severe restrictions. It is something that is done, it's done on a pc and it's done to the benefit of the pc. The Auditing Session is not someplace where one practices what one learned in Theory and Practical.

Now, the faster we upgrade that, the better off we're going to be. This isn't a lecture on training. This is just a prior announcement here.

We've just found out something that's very, very, very, very interesting. There could be other reasons for this that you could explore, but the only booboos of magnitude being made in the Z Unit were being made by people who had been put in it without their checksheets complete. That's a sweeping statement. It's more sweeping than it looks because it tells you that any staff training program that you conduct in any organization or District Office has got to be as tough as this course or the boo-boos are going to show up in the HGC! They're going to show up there right upfront on the public. You understand?

There's apparently a direct coordination between the completeness of a checksheet, the thoroughness of its examination and the skill of the auditor. These things are direct in their relationship.

You see, there's a lot of feeling that somehow or another you get around a course and it sort of leaks in the pores. You hear a lot here and you hear a lot there and – you know, and you can kind of pick it up and you get it off on the fly. You know, there's a feeling that this can go on. And that is true, some of that does go on. You can get the inter – correct interpretation of this and that more easily on a course than anyplace else, that's for sure.

But if that were the only method of education, we would be turning out Oxfordians. Did you know people in Oxford get educated just to pick up the atmosphere? So they can look like an Oxford man? And they never have to pass an examination, they never attend any lectures, they just spend four years there and it sort of leaks in and they become an Oxford man. As an old Cambridge graduate I'm licensed to make libelous remarks about Oxford.

But the point that I'm trying to make here is although that takes place, it is not any substitute of any kind for thorough and severe theory and practical study and examination. If you want to know why some HGC is doing very badly, you can go round and round and round. You can try to audit all the Pcs in the place yourself and you're going to get noplace. Where it was, was right there, originally in the Academy, somebody wasn't tough enough. And then later on, on the staff training course, they weren't tough enough and then that culminates in no results in the HGC. And I just wanted to tell you this because I fitted it together and sniffed it out and I knew darn well you could benefit from it.

So sometime in the future, when you're tearing your hair out – and you will be! – over the total no results, you say, "Well, all I did was tell Joe to sit down there and run 'Since January the 3rd, 1938, has anything been suppressed?' and that's what I told him to run and here's his pc all spun in. There must be something wrong with Problems Intensives." No, there

was something wrong with the staff training program. See? That's where it was wrong. You got to correct it before it gets to the session.

Now, those are just preludes. I have an actual lecture to give you this evening. But I just thought you would be interested in that fact. That goes contrary to some of your – some of your feelings on the thing. It goes contrary to maybe some of your instincts on the thing and it certainly would go contrary to mine!

Why, the other day I sat down and took a tape examination and flunked it! I missed the last question. Why'd I miss the last question? Because on that particular tape of October the 2nd, I think, or something like that, I had since put out new gen and suppressed the older. So, if I can flunk them, so can you.

Now, don't ever go feeling sorry for anybody on the subject of harsh, rigorous, positive training. Don't ever feel sorry for anybody. Just feel sorry for the pcs who have to experience auditing that wasn't so trained. If you're willing to take examination and you're willing to pass them, you'll make it, of course. But are you also willing to make somebody else take examinations and pass them? Make somebody else take drills and pass them? Are you willing to do that? Because you have to be pretty willing, otherwise you've got to take responsibility for every flub that auditor is going to make from here on out and for every pc that auditor is going to mess up. So that's something to think about. And that's something I very, very definitely do take responsibility for and I try to take the responsibility right here.

This course is getting better and better and better. And I'm very proud

of this course. I'm very happy with the way it's going. So therefore, I'm making it tougher and tougher and tougher. I know now what all the people who have left here – I know what all these people have flubbed on. I know how they flub and I've known why they flub – not so much in the field of technology, but other little things, just like the theory, the practical that weren't passed.

Too soft on their TR 0. Fellow sat there tipped halfway out of his chair,

you know? Nobody was quite tough enough. And when they came into actual auditing, why, they softened up quick and their TR 0 really went to pieces. You always an – see an auditor, he'll always look a bit worse off the course than he looks on it. Count on that, because there's just not quite that much discipline. See?

So that's where it's going and that's why it is and I'm very proud of what

we're doing. I'm very proud of what we're doing with auditors and I think we're being very successful and I'm very proud of you. And therefore, I'm not going to let down one single tiny bit of it. Okay? All right.

Now were going to have a lecture. The subject of this lecture: Prehav

Scales and Lists – how to do them.

There may or may not have been lectures in the past on this, but any former

data that exists on the subject of doing scales and assessing scales was prior to a tremendous amount of experience on the subject of nulling goals.

Tiger Drill has been born since that day – a lot of data as to why things

stay in and why things go out. All this data now tells us that things can mysteriously disappear off a list without being out and things can mysteriously appear on a list without being in and all of that data now must be

integrated into every type of nulling that is done. And out of this we will get a very set procedure.

And that procedure is more or less as follows.

We have a scale – list, call it – scale or list. Now, it doesn't matter how we got it – if it was put in our hands from a bulletin or was taken from the pc or any other way that we get this – and we have a whole lot of terms or words or terminals or actions or verbs or something, and they're all in a column of some kind or another, they're lined up in this column.

Now, the Assessment by Elimination which we used to do is being superseded, here and now. You'll have a bulletin on this in a few days, but it won't be to the extent that I'm giving it to you in this lecture.

Now, Assessment by Elimination is infinitely faster than tiger drilling every level. You can do this much quicker – Assessment by Elimination – and that consists of taking this list or scale or whatever it is and reading it against the meter, with one or another wording. We don't care if we just read it, each one once, or "Consider committing overts against it," or "Would you – (whatever the level is)" or whatever it is we're saying, whatever that wording is, it's all actually the same action. And that is to read it one item at a time and those that produce a disturbance of the needle – get that; that's used advisedly: *disturbance of* the needle. I'm not talking about instant reads. Because some of your rock slammers, the rock slam has already begun as part of the rise and you don't notice that it has begun to rock slam, so you get apparency of a latent read. You leave that out and you've had it, because you've got your rock slamming item.

So anyhow, it's any disturbance *of* the needle in the vicinity of mentioning the word. You got that? That's about as broad as I can make» it. Now, disturbances *of* the needle that become before you mention the word are suspect. You don't think that's funny, but I do! The funny part of it is, a pc can go over a list two or three times and he knows what's in or he can go over a scale two or three times and he knows what's the next level.

Something very remarkable happened on this on goals. You know, I checked out a goal

in Washington that wasn't it. After it was unburdened, it was it. Pc had to be checked – prepchecked like mad before this goal stayed in. I may not have the story entirely straight, because nobody gave me a blow-by-blow account of it. It just occurred in another list. And I saw that the old goal that I had checked out in Washington as not it, was now it.

Well, how'd that happen? Well, a goal has to instant read. That goal wasn't instant reading. I was that person's oppterm. Me, personally, see? So every time I would draw in my breath to say the goal, I would – you know, the PC would already get it running through her head and the goal was about a five-word goal, see? And I would say, "To be a rocket read! "To be a quee – rocket read! Got the idea? And the goal was "to be the queen of the universe." And it should have rocket read after "universe." But because the PC was very disturbed and very out of session and I was the Pcs oppterm and a lot of other reasons, that read was occurring anyplace. Any time the pc thought of it, the read occurred. So my starting to say it caused the pc to think of it, which caused the read to occur. Do you understand?

Now, that is terribly unusual, particularly in a goal, for a goal to be this far out. Goals almost always do an instant read. Of all things that instant read, you can count on a goal. You see? But in this particular case, you couldn't even count on a goal. You see how far out this thing is?

So when you're doing a scale, the time to adjudicate whether or not it is a fair read or a proper read or an instant read or whether it is one twenty-seventh of a second after breath has ceased in the auditor – see, the time to discover that is when you've got it still in at the end of the list. See, that – I mean, after you've eliminated everything and it's one of the few remaining, now is the time to eliminate those factors. Now you start getting nice. See, now get nice about whether or not it's reading on the button, and so on. Now get critical. But up to that time it's just slop, man! It's just sloppy.

Now, what do you do? This term, list or scale, is any series of words. You go over that once: line by line, level by level and you take those that are in and you mark them in. You mean "in" – "in" means they disturbed the needle. I don't care whether they gave you a rocket read, a rock slam, a dirty needle, an instant tick, any – any valid disturbance of the needle. The needle was playing "Dixie" and it all of a sudden started playing "rally round the flag, boys," you see? All right, there it is. It did something else, so therefore it's in. You got the idea?

There's no adjudication necessary, except the ability of the auditor to see that the needle is disturbed. And of course, you disturb me the number of times you miss disturbances of needle – it's too often missed.

All right. So here's our criteria: That means read, and "in" means disturbance of the needle and "read" means disturbance of the needle. Got it? Needle disturbed – in. Now, when you're dealing with the rock slam and the channel of the slam, down toward the goal, man, that pc is like a bear on ice skates, you know? Just all over the darn pond. You get anywhere

around a rocket read, why, the *PC will* read pretty consistently. But you get anywhere around a rock slam, it's anyplace. It can be early, late, not. It can be all kinds of wild things because he doesn't read well – this pc doesn't read well on the auditor. Why? Because the item that is going to slam has far more authority than the auditor has.

You watch these items just tear this pc right out of session, you know.

They – *whooo!* Man, they introvert. And that's fine, but remember they can get so introverted they're out of your control. They might not be leaving the auditing room by the door, but they've left it by going in. Now, I've seen a pc not bother to tell me anything for minutes. See, pc cogniting, silently. Totally forgotten me. "Oh, that's a so-and-so *mmm, hmmmm, hmmm* so-and-so *hmm, mmm, hmm* – off they go *mmm, mmm.*" Of course, you're used to a pc cogniting verbally. That's only some pc who's still aware of you. You're almost hit him over the head with a Chinese gong and they wouldn't come out of it.

You understand, in the vicinity of one of these items, the power of the item then, has more command authority, very often, than the auditor sitting in front of the pc. So you say the item and anything happens. Got that? That's that – that much prediction. You say the item, anything happens or nothing happens. You get what you're dealing with, now?

Now, if all of this were reducible to a very, very neat situation – if we were just auditing robots and you could set the robot's chest, you see, and it says, "rocket read," you see. And then you'd say, "To be a robot" and you'd get a rocket read, you see. And then you turn another dial over here and it says, "rock slam." "Who or what would want to be a robot?" and it gives you a wi – large slam. And then you have another button over here which you push on the robot's chest and that says, "dwindling," you see. You sit there . . .

But, I assure you there is some reason why nobody ever found the trail to clearing. Well, you need all the tools of auditing to do it. Well, what you should realize, first and foremost (although I was going to talk to you about this in a second lecture), is you're not doing anything ordinary. And that we can provide – and I can fix up and guide you in ordinary procedures to do this extraordinary, fantastic thing that hasn't existed on the track for two hundred trillion. It's utterly fabulous! Yeah, that's a shocker – except you're used to it, you don't look at it and so forth. Well, think of the command value of one of these levels that is *the pc's* item – has terrific command value over the pc. And it's guided his life and kicked him around for many an eon now. It's dictated his every action. It's made it so he couldn't eat cereal in the morning. It's fixed him up so if he went to sleep, he had to have a hyacinth on the bedstead or – so that only girls who wore Chanel No. 5 were acceptable. See, it's guided his life, man. And you're sitting in a session and you say offhandedly, you see, "Cat whiskers," see, and the pc says, *"Llwaaagh-ch-gggg!" you* know. Next time you say, "Cat whisker," where's the pc? Well, he might be up in that corner of the room, you see, he might be totally introverted now. He might be way down in the bowels of the Earth! We have no guarantee where he would be at this particular moment, because he gets a sort of a – of a funny look in

his eye, if you've ever noticed, when you hit these things and he starts cogniting.

You do a list of dynamics, for instance. Well, you're foolish, on a good – on an easy-working pc with a good dynamic list, to go down the list at a terrific rush and not pay any attention to the somatics the poor pc is getting. Because on one of those levels he's liable to feel like he's just been slammed into a brick wall at about 225 miles an hour. See? And you're going to read the next level? *Huuuh!* What next level?

See, pc's going to stop right there with that, you know? You'll very often find the full valence sitting right there when you're doing this kind of stuff. He's just sitting in it! And it's never appeared to him before and you read the item and he's all of a sudden – you know, there's the – cased in concrete.

"Huh? What's that!" He's liable to try to tell you, "What – wait a minute, what the hell? I mean, I – I'm missing my head. I mean, wh – what happened to my, you know, my arms? Uh – *khmm." Y*ou're going on down to the next level. And you get the next level and the next level and let's get him tangled up, protesting the next level and protesting the next level and trying to communicate to you that he can't talk. And you're just sweeping grandly on down the avenue.

Well, it's little things like this that give you wrong assessments. So, theoretically – theoretically, you just read each level off or each item off or anything on the thing – list that you're reading off, one after the other. Theoretically, theoretically, it goes like this. This is theoretical perfection. You've got a list and it goes off. Item one, item two, item three, item four, item five, item six, item seven. And needle's nice and clean and it's going *ping!* and it's going ping! And then it doesn't go *ping* and it doesn't go *ping,* and it doesn't do anything. And then it goes into a little dirty needle, *bing!* And a little one there, and that one's in and that one's in, dang, bang, bang, bang, down to the end of the list. And you go back and you take *each level that is now in.*

And you go over each level that is now – that was in the first time, you see – there's a little mark there, said it was in – and you go down that, and you take only those that are in now, and you read those. And theoretically you go down there, pang, pang, pang, pang, the remaining levels that are in, pong, pong, pong, pong. Now, those levels are in twice, some of those dropped out. You go over it the next time and you take the levels that are now in and you go over those, pong, pong, pong, pong, pong, pong, pong. And you go down to the end and you finally have one. You go – repeat that each time – you probably wind up with two. You go to the item and then the other item. And then one of them drops out and that thing remaining that produces an action on the meter is the found item or the found level or something.

Now, that's theoretical Assessment by Elimination – theoretical. That is the exact theoretical way it is done and that is the way previously it has been taught. But it won't work.

If your pc is perfectly in-session, the chances of your getting correct levels on this pc are very good if you're a very good auditor. But remember very good auditing required to stay in two-way communication with the pc, without Q'ing-and-A'ing and so forth. So a good auditor always got good assessments and a bad auditor got bad assessments.

And the bad auditor would say something to the pc and it wasn't two-way comm, it was an evaluation. "What do you mean, this level 'Failed to withhold' is in?" you know?

Pc says, "I-I-I didn't put it in. I-is it in?"

"Yeah, well, it's in, and – heh-heh! – we know that isn't alive. Why is it in? Why – why do you have this level 'Failed to withhold' in?"

Pc doesn't even know it's in, see. This kind of corniness going on, of course, would louse up anything, because it'll make "Failed to withhold" now read or something like this, don't you see?

So any rough auditing throws this thing out. Any roughness, any failure of two-way comm with the pc; any out-rudiments; any of these things would have thrown that assessment out. So it was almost accidental. A very good auditor, in good two-way comm with his pc, always got a reliable level.

But factors change the moment that you start dealing with items on the rock slam chains. See, it wasn't as important before, if you sometimes got an offbeat level or an item; it wasn't very important. It's important now. It's very important.

Therefore, although theoretically that is the way you do Assessment by Elimination, your pc can be sufficiently disturbed by the types of lists you're doing or the targets of the Prehav levels or other things of this character – he can go so blasted out of session – that you're liable to find yourself winding up with a wrong assessment unless this procedure is revised.

Now, this is all of the revision. It becomes very simple. It is very easy to do. It first requires that you notice when the needle of the meter does something else. That is necessary. I wish to call that to some auditors' attention – that the motions of the needle have something to do with the auditing session. I know this will come as a surprise. But some of those reads, if not noticed, will cost the pc the level. Some of those reads not noticed will cost the pc his item. Some of those reads not noticed will end up the whole goals-finding operation in the well known cul-de-sac.

Miss one; you've – maybe, maybe that's all right. Maybe you're lucky; maybe it wasn't *the* one. Because after all, there are hundreds of reads. Miss two, miss three, miss four – no, I'm afraid we're way out! We're way out. We go down that list and we miss four reads on the Prehav Scale. Well, that's pretty sour. So it does require very accurate, very precise meter reading. That's the first thing that this requires.

The next thing it requires, of course, is your R-factor and your H-factor. Pc has to know what's going on, has to know what you're looking for, has to know what you're doing. Otherwise the whole list is a protest, so everything will read. Get your R-factor in, tell him what you're trying to do, what you're trying to find. R-factor and H-factor, if not put in, can cause the whole list to go hot or go cold or do something, because the pc doesn't know what you're trying to do.

The next thing is make sure that you can *read* the list that you are trying to assess. You get some other auditor's lists some time. Man, this'll throw it out like crazy, because if he couldn't write very well and you can't read it, why, you'll stammer every now and then – you'll say – you'll say – you're going down the line, and you say, "Waterbuck. Tiger. C-ca-uhm-cuh-ca-catchup? Catchup." Pc gets a strange look in their eye.

Actually it's all on record, it's supposed to be "catfish" see? Pc knows it's supposed to be "catfish." And you hang him up right there. See, a mistake.

He'll say, "What was that supposed to be? What was that supposed to be? What was that supposed to be?"

You go on down the list, see. You're going *pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa*, "Polar bears. Wolverines," you know, we're going down the list, down the list, down the list.

The pc's saying, "Catchup? Catfish? Catfish? Must have been catfish. Catfish – catchup. Couldn't have been catchup. Must have been catfish."

Hour later, you're still charging on, you know. The mails must get through! You know?

"Couldn't have been catchup."

You get back to it again. You get back to it again. Maybe you have the bad luck to have a sleeper – a rock slammer who hasn't been detected as a real slammer on the subject of an auditor or a session or Scientology, but can develop a rock slam. And you go past this point and you say – next time through, you say, "Catchup," and, why the thing rock slams like crazy! Beautiful rock slam! "Catchup! Ha! Boy, you know? I'm – " the auditor that ought to be shot will sit there and he'll say, "Oh! Oh! Look at that! A rock slam! Well, we finally found an item on you! It's 'catchup!

Pc says, "Catchup?"

Finally found an item – pc had never even put it on his list! Wasn't – wasn't even anything the pc ever had in the bank! See, you get a false slam on it. It will – it'll look just like a slam. Somebody else comes through, doesn't clean it up, for a little while it will slam. So, that sort of thing – that can happen!

Now, let's take it on a much minor scale. Going down the list, *pocketa* this happened to me the other night – *pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa*, down the list, you know,

down the list, *whaaaa*. Everything's going fine. Getting the mid ruds in about every three levels, you know. Everything going smoothly, you know – dirty needle and, you know and tone arm keeps going up to 6.0 and 7.0. You know, smooth session and so forth. I'm going along the line, *pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa*. Pc, of course – we were doing it against an oppterm that was very restimulative. So of course this was going mad. And the pc already pretty introverted, you know?

All of a sudden I hit this level on the Prehav Scale, Pull. It had absolutely nothing to do with the pc, had nothing to do with the case. And the pc's first reaction was that it had nothing to do with the case. I saw that it could have nothing to do with the case, so I just left it in to find out what the hell's going to happen.

It stayed with us, man! I even let the pc get off of it a little bit. You know, get off a little bit about it. Still with us! We'd of – would have wound up a Prehav assessment with the level Pull, which had nothing to do with anything!

You see why? Because as I went back, the pc says, "You know, that hasn't got," to self, see, says, "that hasn't got anything to do with anything! Nothing to do with anything in the session. This one is totally extraneous." Makes a big comment on it, protests it. Auditor, by reading it the next time, asserts it. Pc protests it – we get a lovely read. Do you see that? And that, amongst other things, was why the tone arm now really started to go up to 6.0 and 7.0 and get dirty needles and everything else. See that? So it became very difficult. Everything became very difficult.

All right. That's just one phenomena. That's the wrong item in. There's another phenomenon – much more gruesome. You're going down this list and it's "Tiger. Waterbuck. Catfish." See? And you get "Tiger" and it's in; "Waterbuck," it's in; "Catfish," it's in; "Wolverine," it's in; "Polar bear," it's in; "Deer," it's in; "Stag," it's in; "Mouse," it's in. You say, "Dog," it's in; "Cat" it's in. Everything's in.

Or we're – go down the list – we go down the list – we know very well this pc is allergic to – cats. Every time a cat walks in the room, pc gets a black eye. We happen to know this out of the case history, see.

That, by the way, is old L. Sprague de Camp – one of my archenemies as a writer. I always thought that was very amusing, always offering to give him kittens. Even occasionally take one to a party and give it to him. He'd get two black eyes, just like that – bang! – the second he saw a cat. Most satisfactory result, you know, I've seen. And the only reason I got any satisfaction out of it is he used to criticize my stories to my editors – mostly because they wouldn't buy his. Yeah, he had a couple of weak points. That was one of them. Anyhow ...

So, go down this list and you say, "Tiger," out. "Waterbuck," out. "Cat," out. "Polar bear," out. "Wolverine," out. "Dog," out. What's happened? Those are the two problems of

the auditor. They're both mid ruds problems. Mid ruds of the session: too many staying in, too many going out. Either way, mid ruds of the *session* are out, not mid ruds of that list – mid ruds of the session.

So this becomes very amusing. You, then, are asked to decide how many is the right number in? And I now look at you platitudinously and I say, "Well, my child, experience will bring you answers to these things." How long is a piece of string? How many should be in? Well, the proper number.

I don't know what the ratio is, but I know a page looks right – I know a page looks right for a pc. The reason you can't say is, it varies on pcs. But it looks right. There's one in every now and then. And there's little runs of one or two in at a time. It looks right. There aren't columns of Xs and columns of reads and all that kind of thing, see.

Now, that's a problem in mid ruds. So, you have in doing a list – listing this isn't true – until a pc stops listing you don't have to get mid ruds in, if you're getting the list. But that isn't the subject of this lecture. We're talking about assessment of the list. So you get in the mid ruds and the pc runs out and then test it.

No, we're talking about something else. We've got this list. Now, we're going down the list – *bang, bang, bang, bang, bang*, level by level by level by level. And if the mid ruds of the session go out, then the pc is hauling an invalidation, a suggestion, a failed to reveal or a mistake on down the column. And everything, as we go down the line, reads because it stays in. You see, because we're still dragging this error. For some reason or other, because he's got an error – see, one of these items I mentioned; he's got – one of these items is out – then the auditor's voice and the item creates a greater impression on the pc. Like in bridge, the pc is now vulnerable. He's got a withhold, so he's vulnerable. Don't you see? And this reflects on the meter.

See, if he – if he's got this invalidation that's floating along in the session – it's a session invalidation. He's invalidated some item or he's invalidated the auditor – he's invalidated something. We don't care what. Something's been suggested, he's suggested something, he withheld it, you get the kind of combinations of things – and then the auditor's voice, reading anything to the pc produces a reaction in the pc so that everything reads.

It is very disturbing to the pc if you suddenly start to say ... You're reading a perfectly valid list and you suddenly start to say, "Hot dogs. Cat fur. Horns. Automobiles. Austins," just to see whether or not the thing is reading on your voice. That's quite disturbing because you throw the mid rudiments out further by being unpredictable to the pc. So this is not any kind of advice.

But if you were to just – if you were to – I'm just giving you the experimental action, see – if you were to just move over and just read a totally false list (you know, pick up some other pc's list and put it down there and start reading that against this pc who has this heavy

invalidation, so forth), you get instant reads on everything. It's not even the pc's list. You get everything reading. That's the vulnerability of the pc because the pc has really got a missed withhold, you see? So the auditor's voice registers.

Now, if we increase that just a little bit further, we wipe out all reads. Let's say he's really got a missed withhold and it amounts to an ARC break and we cease to get meter reading at all. So we get nothing reading. Or if the pc suppressed something heavily or was very careful of something heavily, we also get a wipe out. See? So we get a whole column, a dozen at a time, go out; nothing's reading. You see those as liabilities?

Now, there's the liability of the session in one of these assessments. That's a session liability – that columns of them will read and columns of them will go blank, and the ones that reading are not it and the blank ones are not blank. You see? So that's going to throw your assessment out.

Now, there's one other factor you should know about this: You can get the mid ruds in for the session too often and drive the pc out of session. So you have some delicate balance here of getting them in when they have to be gotten in.

Now, actually, if you've gone down a whole long column without noticing that your rudiments were out and everything is in or everything is out ' the only real danger – if it's all out and you don't recover it. So they're all in. The next time you're going to go over them all, why you're going to select those out. The danger – see, you'll select the ones that are really in. The danger is going down a whole long column of X's and not redoing them. See, you run into danger there.

You should actually just block out the Ks as though those things have never been done and continue your assessment and catch them the next time around. Just draw an oblong square around them – rudiments were out during this period. Because it's very disturbing to the pc to go back over the same levels you just went over. You get the idea? So just sketch a square around it and the next time through catch those levels. That invalidates all of your own X's.

That's harder to do in doing some kind of a Prehav assessment where you're using the same scale over and over and over and where you're not marking them all out and that sort of thing. It's much harder to catch in that particular way, but IM talk about that a little bit more later.

Your system then, consists of, basically, preventing reads from being wiped out by out mid ruds – that's the most dangerous action that can occur. See, you're not so disturbed about all these staying in because the mid ruds were out, because you're going to get a second crack at it with the mid ruds in – and then your selection of the right datum or the right level or the right item off of that list and that selection is done by Tiger Drilling.

Now, what you should actually do on an Assessment by Elimination is – let's say this pc – you're not in really good ARC with this pc or something like that and you're afraid of something happening and you feel nervy about it or something like that, then you'd tend to leave more in – you'd tend to leave more in at the end of the elimination than some pc you were quite confident of

And I don't think in any case I'd leave more than eight in. And in no ease would I leave fewer than three in. Now, I can give you an arbitrary figure, just so that we would agree on this and everybody does it the same. But we're being a bit arduous, because sometimes the auditor doesn't quite catch the moment when only three are in. He thinks there are a couple on the reverse page. And he happily turns the page over and by George, those went out the last time through and he's sitting there having nulled all of his items down to nothing. See? He can make a mistake this particular way.

So it is better to err on the numerous side and if you try to leave five in, you will catch it more often and more regularly than trying to leave only three in. See, you can tell when there are five in more easily than you can tell there are only three in, oddly enough.

Now, during your last pass – through, you normally have four or five in, whereas you'd have to null half of the list or something to catch three in. You understand?

Audience: Yes.

The introduction of the exact number to be left in could be done only for the benefit of agreement that this is what we're going to do. Don't you see? Actually it serves no other purpose than that.

But to cut the whole list down on a freaky pc – PE's freaky, you know, got a false slam and a got a this and got a that and *huh-huh,* mid ruds go out and doesn't like to do the rudiments, and all this kind of thing. To cut that down to three, that's risky. That's risky. Because there are more items than that are likely to have been in because of invalidations.

Now, even though you got the mid ruds of the session in, you are left with the proposition that on that exact level it may still be out. In other words, the mid ruds are not out sufficient to now mess up the session. They're only out enough to mess up that particular level or item that they occurred on. Do you see that?

So, what do we – what's the best procedure? And that's to do Assessment by Elimination, keeping your mid ruds in, down to the point where you have a few left in – never less than three. And I'd be darned if I'd leave more in than eight, in any list. And somewhere in that zone start tiger drilling. And all you does, is you just takes it and you treats each level as a goal and that is all there is to it. You just tiger drill it.

Now, what Tiger Drill? Big Tiger? Little Tiger? Well, it's just the ordinary six on the left – three on the left and three on the right. In other words, the six button Tiger Drill. That's

perfectly adequate for this activity – unless you've got a protesty pc, at which time you'd better add the Protest button, which gives you a seven-button drill. But you can swing these off awful fast.

Now, you just do all of those. Do all the buttons you have left – whether it was three or four or five or six, however many you had there and you just do those, each one Tiger Drill. And one is still reading – well, don't – don't be goofy enough to say that is it if you're looking for a slam and it's only got a little dirty needle on it. Draw a circle after it or something like that to indicate that it is still firing and go on to the next one and tiger drill that one up and polish that one up. See?

You're not trying to polish these up like a goal. See, you're just polishing these things up so you know darn well they aren't reading *because* of. And you come out with your biggest strongest read and you don't knock this thing out. Actually, tiger drilling a proper level or item gives you an increased read and tiger drilling an improper item – this doesn't apply to goals – gives you a decreased read on items. It just – eventually just fades. Now it's just sticking the needle, so forth.

Well, you're – it's not with this precision that you're doing items or levels; that's the same precision as addressed to goals. You're getting right down there to that last point and you're fixing it up so that you can tell which one it is. That's what YOU 9 re trying to do, see. You're not trying to polish everything up. See, on a goal you'd have to polish them all up, because you leave somebody stuck in a goal that's half out – that shouldn't happen. It shouldn't happen at all.

1 heard one time an old-time Dianeticist of about 1950 vintage had become a psychiatrist. It shouldn't even happen to him. God, I never thought he'd stoop so low. Moment of silent prayer.

Anyway, the – the situation which you face then, in taking the item out, is you tiger drill them enough to prove it up which one it is. That's which one it is. You're not trying to wipe each one totally out. You're just making sure that none of them are reading falsely. And you'll find when you get the right one that it'll fade – the rest of them will fade, usually. Do you understand that?

Audience: Yeah, Mm-hm.

You don't have the same thorough, half an hour per item. And, man, if I catch you taking more than three minutes, I'll – I'll swear! See, it's just a ... "On the item catfish, has anything been suppressed?" You know? "What was that? What's that? That, that, that. Oh, all right. Thank you. On the item catfish. Catfish. Catfish. On the item catfish, has anything been invalidated? Yeah, that. That. That. That. Anything been suggested?" Nothing. "Anything you failed to reveal?" Nothing. "Any mistake been made?" Nothing. "All right, anything been suppressed? Anything you've been careful of? Good. Good. Catfish. Catfish. Catfish. Catfish.

Yeah, that reads a little bit. All right, that's fine. What do you think about this? Got any pain? Got any sensation?"

"Oh, I've got this terrible sensation that's come on. I've been meaning to tell you about the catfish all the way along the line! Ooooh! Terrible!"

"Oh yeah? Is that so?"

Well, go on to the next three, because they might have even more than that! In other words, you just dust these things off, see. You dust them up very nicely and then you're sure that they're not in because the pc got stuck on them while you were going through and didn't say for the remainder of the assessment, "Catchup? Couldn't have been catchup." See? You get this method of Assessment by Elimination?

Audience: Mm-hm. Yes.

Too many going out, too many staying in – you know, the pc is dragging a suppress or dragging a ... Too many going out, he's dragging some sort of a suppress or an ARC break on through the list, item to item. Too many staying in, he's dragging an invalidation on down the line or a suggestion or something of this sort. So that's a mid rud situation – mid ruds on the session.

Get on down to the last few in, give yourself a good dust-over with a Tiger Drill. Give each one of those things a dust-over. Then you can't make up your mind which of the last two it is. Well, just tiger drill both of them harder, then suddenly, all will emerge and you'll have the right level. You'll have the right item.

Now, that's very sound auditing to do Assessment by Elimination. It could – can be rather rapid.

There's another condition for any such elimination list and this is a very difficult condition. It should be done on a clean needle. That's a very difficult condition, since you're saying something on the order of this: Let's say you've already found an oppterm and you're doing a Prehav level against the oppterm, so you say, "Would you Prehav level) fail to withhold from an airplane?" You've got the oppterm and you're trying to find the terminal level. "Would you fail to withhold from an airplane?"

"You" sometimes clicks on pcs – quite often, as a matter of fact. "Airplane" was found because it rock slammed. Every time you say, "airplane" it upsets the whole needle characteristic of the pc. And you say, "Why am I ever – why'd I ever hear of this airplane?" Pc is very happy about this airplane, you understand. But it just keeps upsetting your meter and then your meter goes out and your needle gets rough and you have to get in your middle rudiments and that upsets the pc even further because they go into protest. Don't you see?

In other words, you got your work cut out for you and it's not an easy job and there's no reason for you to believe it's an easy job. And there's no reason for you to dust it off

lightly to some poor suffering HPA and say, "Well, take this pc and find me the Prehav level and so forth. For this other, I haven't got much time here. And find me the Prehav level for this item oppterm 'airplane' that we found yesterday. I'm going to be busy," so forth. Don't be surprised if you come back at 2:00 A.M. and he's still at it. He's trying to read around the needle and he's trying to do this and he's trying to do that.

Now, the more you harass a pc about his dirty needle, the more dirty his needle is going to get. You start blaming the pc for his dirty needle and you're going to get a dirtier needle.

There's no sense in you sitting there saying, "What's the matter with you? Why are you doing this?" Because the pc isn't. You are! The pc does not have these items under control. You do! They're his items, but they're under the auditor's control and you're agitating them. So he or she isn't giving you the dirty needle. You are! So there's no sense in adding the untruth into the situation of "Why are you doing this? Why do you have such a dirty needle?"

Oh, jump a pc all over the place. He – you say – you're trying to run a Prepcheck on the pc for the last twenty-five years. Sheena was doing this the other day. I should have brought that dispatch along. I laughed, man! Some character that's been giving them all kinds of trouble over in the Washington area got onto their staff – their clearing co-audit. And she assigned some co-auditor, I think it was, to do a Prepcheck level and to flatten "done" on him and the period was the last twenty years. And the co-audit person, see, sits there – never audited before in his life, apparently – and flattens it in five minutes.

Well, this was Mr. Natter from Yakville, see. And he's – the co-auditor said, "Well, the needle's clean." And Sheena put him on the needle and by George, it was clean. Everything was clean. "Done" was clean. "Done" was clean. First time he'd ever been run on "Done," but he's been yapping all over the place, but it's clean. So she knows more about the mind than this, so she rolls up her thetan sleeves and she let's him have it. Almost on the colloquial basis of "Just what the hell . . ." you know, "You're going to tell me that in the last twenty years you've only done five minutes worth? Well now, what have you done? Now, give! I'm tired of this, see." Off the meter and everything else.

He hadn't done very much – he'd spun a few pcs in. But he had been going around with a clearing process which he didn't dare let Ron find out about because Ron's reactive bank would stop it. And he'd been secretly auditing pcs all over the place and spinning them in with this thing and that cracked the case – bong! It all went very nicely after that.

That was a missed withhold of such magnitude, you see. I thought that was very amusing. This Sheena is a very determined character. Said the pc was happy after this happened but she was a rag.

But anyway, the point I'm trying to make is, is you've got to be able to keep the pc well enough under control and in-session and unblamed and hopeful enough and calm enough

about it all to get an assessment done in the face of the fact that you're assessing the most disturbing, upsetting items which he has in his reactive mind and which have controlled him utterly for eons. Do you see the problem in assessment?

So don't you start worrying because you particularly, find assessment a little bit rough now and then. Assessment is very often rough – very often. But you must not do inaccurate assessments. You must not do inaccurate ones.

The primary difficulties of assessment actually occur in listing. You do an incomplete list or you list on the wrong level or you list something you shouldn't ever have heard of and the pc wishes he hadn't, and you'll wind up with a dirty needle messed-up thing or something. Your list isn't complete enough and it's dirty needle the whole distance. Or you haven't asked the pc the right question to get the first slamming item and the needle is all mucked up – and it will be mucked up until you get that first reliable item on him.

All these various conditions exist to upset this business of listing. So that makes it incumbent upon you to be a very smooth auditor in whom the pc has a great deal of confidence. And that will get you over the hump in listing better than any trick I could ever teach you.

Assessment by Elimination, old style, is quietly buried. And this one I've just given you is very much in. Make sure that you have a proper number in for the pc and make sure that after you've eliminated them all, you take the remaining few and tiger drill them to make sure they're not in on the 44 catchup" principle.

And you11 always wind up with your right levels and your right items and it's very easily done. It isn't necessarily slowly done. The slower you assess by elimination the more trouble you're going to have with it.

It doesn't much matter whether you read them once or twice or three times or read one once – one level once and the next level twice and the next level three times. It doesn't much matter what your sequence is – just make sure that you have read what you have read and that what you have read is reading. You understand?

There are various tricks about it, these – I mean, as far as that's concerned, the types of question you ask ... What I mean to say – various tricks, the types of questions that you ask to assess a list, the types of lists, the types of scales, all of these sort of things – they have absolutely nothing to do with the principles I have told you.

The principles I have told you apply to: Prehav Scales, listing and assessing to find the rock slam on the pc (that's Dynamic Assessment by Rock Slam), unburdening the goal, doing any type of finding something – any type of finding something. You could even do it with goals with some success, although I don't particularly advocate it. You know, null the goals list except for the last twenty – tiger drill those.

All kinds of things can be done with this system of Assessment by Elimination which I've just given you. And those principles I'm sure you will remain – you'll find remain very sound now and quite reliable, because I've been working on it very, very hard for the last week or two.

And as far as I'm concerned, that's what you have to know to do an accurate Assessment by Elimination. You got it?

Audience: Yes.

Thank you.