

ROUTINE 2-12, PART II

A lecture given on
27 November 1962

Okay, here we are, second lecture November 27th, AD 12, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. And this is a talk about R2-12.

There have been an awful lot of queries about R2-12. I have actually audited this procedure and audited it and audited it and audited it and reviewed it and given out pieces of it to be audited, actually for about eighteen months. A long time to audit a procedure. And I've made every mistake that you're going to make. I made them all and followed them over the hills and far away and finally found out why they're mistakes. And the only thing that I have mapped here is an invariable procedure. I have mapped an invariable procedure. I have not mapped all the mistakes. There isn't enough paper in Christendom; there just isn't enough to map all the mistakes that you could make with this.

People can always dream up more mistakes than you can circumvent. And the only thing you can do is to try to get it down to a terrifically invariable action.

Now, as training becomes advanced you of course expect people to be able to exercise judgment. You give them more judgment factors to handle and so on. Remember that this one is designed for the HPA/HCA level of action and it is very, very close to a totally muzzled, totally invariable procedure. And if you just stay on it as a line, why, you will arrive at the other end. Now, that it is an invariable procedure does not mean that it occasionally won't lay an egg. You're going to get an occasional egg laid with it even though it's done perfectly.

Now, why is this? Well, put it this way: You've picked up an item on your first list by some sort of an assessment which was not part of the GPM. You could almost classify it as a mistake, but a mistake that you would make. You tiger drilled it, and it had some withholds on it, and it stayed in. See, it wasn't well cleaned up.

Now, it actually – it isn't worthwhile to well clean up these items. You don't have to sit there and polish up one of these items with a Tiger Drill for three hours and a half, you understand? You're mainly interested in the session withholds and suppressions, you understand?

Now, in view of the fact that you're not going to tiger drill these things forever with Big Tiger and run a Prepcheck on the first list assessment item, you're occasionally going to get one that is simply held down by a couple of withholds or a misdemeanor that's not

connected to the GPM, at which time you will lay an egg. That's all right, if you know that you can lay an egg with it, why, fine. And that is the phenomenon which we have been calling in 3GA Criss Cross "currying a dead horse."

You can go on and curry this dead horse, and polish up and gild his hoofs and polish his harness and do all sorts of things with him and buy him wreathes and so forth. But it doesn't make him any less dead. And you're not – also – you're not going anyplace while you are currying the dead horse.

So you have to learn to recognize a dead horse. Now, the source of the dead horse is just what I have just given you. There was something in on the list because it wasn't well cleaned up on the Tiger Drill and therefore the thing continued to read as the only thing in. So you started busily and methodically to list this thing, and so on. It'll happen sometimes that somebody will miss a read or something like that on it or imagine he saw a read or something or the meter will need new batteries or something goofy will occur, you see, that doesn't have anything to do with the technology. And it gets something like this.

So you have to know this one. It doesn't matter how come you've got a dead horse, you have to recognize what is a dead horse. And it's an integral part of 2-12 – dead horses. It is a list, whether a represent or an oppose list, which contains no wide slams. And that is a dead horse.

You've gotten this thing – you see, you don't have a slam on your List One. It's rare that you would have a slam on your List One, but three cheers, you do have a slam on One and you just omit 4, 5 and 6. But that's the only thing that happens. So you have a big slam going along on List One. All right, well, you just omit 4, 5 and 6 and directly oppose what you had on List One. But that slam, of course, only occurs after assessment. Because that slam can shift around, as you will rapidly learn.

What I mean by a dead horse is a represent or oppose list that does not slam after you've given it a chance in listing. If no slam occurs anywhere on a listing list, with the mid ruds in for the session, that's a dead horse.

Well, how far do you have to go on a list to find out if something is going to slam? Well frankly, you can go as far as fifty. If you haven't got any – if nothing has slammed by the time you get to fifty items, (that's by the way about twice as long as I go) but if you haven't slammed – if you haven't read a slam on this thing by the time that you get up to fifty items or something like that, there's just little dirty needles, dirty needles, dirty needle and dirty read, dirty read, dirty read, I should be saying, you're going to lay an egg. That list is going exactly no place. And the best thing to do with it is carry it to fifty; if there's no rock slam has appeared and the meter is hooked in, abandon it.

Now, how do you read – if that's the case – then, how do you read a slam while you're listing? Well, it's very simple. On a Mark IV meter you turn it back to sensitivity 8 and carry

your tone arm so that it is somewhere around the middle of the dial. So you've got a sensitivity 8 is your best action on a Mark IV meter. That doesn't mean then that the needle is going to wander so far off that while you're listing you're in a continuous and continual nervous prostration about catching up with this meter.

Now, what can throw you off? A pc who does calisthenics in the auditing chair can throw this off. The best way to handle the pc is to say, "Put the cans in your lap and sit still." These pcs that scratch their head with cans and scratch their knees with cans and do this with cans and that with cans are actually in a kind of a rock slam all the time. But you can cope with this and there's no particular reason why you should permit this to be loused up. Just – you can put it in your R-factor and it won't surprise the pc, you see. "You start throwing these cans around while I'm listing on a list and I won't be able to see whether or not it's a valid list or not, so I'm going to have to tell you to sit still, put the cans in your lap." And it won't break your pc's heart. But don't go along with a super-permissiveness that permits this all the time so that you never get a rock slam visible.

Now, on a Mark V, you set it at sensitivity 8 with the knob furthest to the left. In other words, you set that knob furthest to the left and sensitivity 8. Actually the sensitivity could be a little bit lower than 8. It could actually be down to about 6 and you would still be all right. You would still see your rock slam.

That keeps your – that's to keep your needle from drifting around so madly and so wildly that you can't keep it on the dial and you're always having to adjust it and so forth. Well, you can very visibly see a rock slam if your sensitivities are as I have mentioned.

It's necessary that you list with the eye on the meter. Otherwise you will never notice this. And the meter should be turned on. There are lots of – lots of ways that you can get a dead horse list. You can get them a lot of ways and the most popular of these ways is not the way I mentioned, but to get a wrong assessment. You get yourself a wrong assessment and you're liable to get all manner of dead horse lists.

A fellow can't go down and just sit there comfortably and read these things off, *bark-bark-bark-bark*, and mark those that are in and winds up – misses a read, misses two reads, misses three reads, as he's going down the list. Doesn't repeat, find out if they did read or not, just made up his mind that they didn't read. And of course the item that he missed is the item which would have stayed in and he gets down to the end of the line and he becomes very wroth with the pc because he can't quite get anything to tiger drill in. So he ARC breaks the pc enough to get one of them to read. Now, that is a successful action in getting an item to read but it's not going to be successful in listing that item. And you're liable to have some item that shouldn't be reading anyway.

An E-Meter has the peculiar characteristic of spotting for you what a pc can have reality on. It's actually a reality indicator, and if the thing reads well on an E-Meter or reads at

all on an E-Meter, you can get somewhere into the pc's zone of reality. But supposing you have an ARC broke item, which is simply because the pc's never heard of it. Let's say MEST. We're auditing a raw meat pc and "MEST" were on List One. And he's never heard of MEST. And he doesn't know what it is.

Well, it's been a long time since we've stressed clearing the auditing command and somebody was writing me as an emergency from an Academy that all around him he saw pcs trying to answer questions in the Academy that they didn't understand. Well, I don't know anything about that. I do know that somebody had neglected this old factor of clear the auditing command. If the pc can't answer it, why, you have to word it up so that the pc can answer it. And you're going to get something like this sooner or later. You're going to get something like MEST. Let's say that was on the list – it isn't. And the pc doesn't know what it is. So every time you say it he wonders what it is. And then he withholds asking you and of course at the end of the assessment it stays in.

Now you say, "Who or what represents MIEST to you?" And this is going to be a wonderful mishmash, believe me. That will breed more dead horses that can be easily buried. That is going to be a tough one, is the misassessment, the misassessment. Now, a misassessment will be caused because the pc didn't understand something. It can also be caused because when the pc gave the word, the auditor mistook the word and wrote down something else and of course when the auditor's nulling the list he calls down the something else. The pc doesn't recognize that as being in proper sequence and so tends to protest it, which will therefore make it read.

There's another way of getting a dead horse. If you don't understand what the pc says, even though the pc ARC breaks *every* time you ask the pc what he said – you understand – if the pc ARC breaks *every* time, the way to really ruin his case is to put down something he said that you didn't understand. That really ruins the lot, you understand? It's much better to ARC break him every word that he says than to write a bad one on the list. You'll at least get a list of sorts that has some possibility of having an item on it.

But you get one of them with an improper item on it, the pc said "cats" and you wrote down "scratch." You're in a mess. I don't care if he says "*rrrh*" and that was supposed to be "cats." Now, the way you ask a pc to repeat something is of interest to any auditor. The way you ask him to repeat something is, don't say, "You didn't say that clearly. Say it again," see? The pc's in-session; is very susceptible to comments of this particular kind. You always say, "I didn't understand that, what was it?"

Now, a pc very often believes that you have challenged him on the properness of the item on that list. See, he said, "*bwwrr*" and that was supposed to be "cats." Then you say, "I didn't understand that, what did you say?" He very often thinks that you are telling him that cats don't belong on the list and that he shouldn't put it on the list. So if a pc is getting of this frame of mind, you say, "I didn't understand – I didn't understand that. Would you please

spell it for me?" You're going to be a lot better off. Got it? Then you do want it on the list, we want him to spell it. If he can't spell, you've had it!

Now, you mustn't say, "You didn't say it clearly," and put the burden of responsibility for its incorrectness on the pc. That is very improper. And another thing that you mustn't do is repeat the item after the pc. You just mustn't repeat the item after the pc. He says, "Cats," you say, "Cats, thank you." He says, "Game warden," you say, "Game warden, thank you." He says, "Tiger," you say, "Tiger, thank you." Man, it'll drive him round the bend.

The highest point of psychology, the tremendous zenith that they reached in all of their researches was a machine that drove people crazy. You said a word into it and it said the word back. And after that they had achieved the zenith and they stopped their researches. But they did achieve something. It's wicked of you to continue to insist that the psychologist never, never accomplished anything. He did do this. There's a monument I think, somewhere in the Middle West – been covered up during these last centuries – but it says, "On this spot they invented the machine that drove people mad." We put it there back in 2052 – anyhow, space opera.

No, I just – all jokes aside, the idea of repeating something back – particularly a little bit out of phase with the pc – can make him feel like he's spinning, particularly in a susceptible condition in-session. So you mustn't repeat items to the pc. It's all right to null them, but repeating them back to the pc every time he says them has a tendency to shut him up.

I know you can play this game with little kids and they get a big gag out of it. Remember you're playing it in the spirit of a big gag. It's a quite different proposition when you're just in there and you're writing down solemnly: he says "Cats," you say "Cats," so forth, see?

Now, the wrong way, really, to get an item straightened out is to say, "Did you say 'interim'?" He says "anteroom," see, and you say, "Did you say 'interim'?" Now he immediately has to protest that, doesn't he? And it will leave a mark on the list that will show up during its nulling. He'll sometimes forget that he did it and it'll still register. You'll get it off eventually, but it takes a lot of time.

So the saying words back to him which you didn't underst – saying words back to him always carries the liability of your not having understood them and saying them differently – aside from its factor of making him feel spinny – why, it looks like you're correcting him. And hell take vast unction to it.

Now, that goes so far as never point to an item on a list. Not: "Did you mean this one?" Just never do that. In the first place you should never make motions toward the pc anyway. His anchor points are peculiarly liable to being driven in by you, the auditor, to

whom he has granted a great deal of responsibility and power. And you start pointing up the list in his direction he gets feeling – his whole theta beams will be pressed down against the end of your finger trying to bring your finger down to the point on the list where your finger should have stopped. And you get the effort of that will read on the item you're discussing.

That's a marvelous way to get a wrong goal. I myself have had a wrong goal found on me that way one day. The auditor pointed to the wrong goal and said, "You mean that one?" I made a remark – I made a remark and the remark was misinterpreted as to applying to another goal and the auditor pointed to the other goal and it stayed in by protest. And it took the devil's own time to find that protest when it was finally cleaned up. It was just dug in but deep. And you'll find a lot of items can be pushed in on a list by the auditor pointing to items.

Now, the pc can put anything he likes on a list but he must never take anything off of a list. He can put anything he likes on one; he must never be able to take anything off of one. He wants a word changed. You write the whole thing down with the changed word in it as a brand-new item. That's an invariable action.

He says, "To dance the hornpipe." And then he says, "To be able to dance the hornpipe is what I meant." And you're nulling "To dance the hornpipe."

You say, "Thank you very much," and you write, "To be able to dance the hornpipe" down underneath the one you're clearing, and go on and finish clearing "To dance the hornpipe." And then take up the next one. If it's completely disrelated you put it at the end of the list. He's got a new one, so you put it at the end of the list.

Now, that's – he wants a "the" changed to an "a." Well now, if you're sitting from the high pinnacle of always having put it down right first, then this is a change of the list. And you won't run into any ARC breaks to amount to anything if the pc tells you, "Well, that's 'to be able to dance the hornpipe'."

And you say, "All right, you want that on the list? Thank you very much." And you put it on the list, see.

Pc says he doesn't want it on the list, don't put it on the list. "No," he says, "Just change that one."

And you say, "I'm awfully sorry, the rules of the game, I can't do that. I've got to put it on the list down below here, and I will, I'll write it down 'To be able to dance the hornpipe.' We'll see if that isn't it, or not, okay?" It's usually okay with the pc.

These are the little – the little points of listing that get overlooked that hang pcs with wrong items and that give you dead horses and other things like that. So you just do the thing, do a good clean job on listing it and then do a good clean job on nulling it and with right assessments it just runs like a ball.

We haven't made allowances for all of the ways that you can go reverse – wise. See, we

haven't – we haven't said, “Now, these. . . “ It so happens that if you null a list which has given you a consistently dirty needle and you take a dirty needle final angle on the thing and then you oppose that, that you won't wind up with very much and so forth and all of that has more or less been cut out of this thing. We say, “You get a clean assessment, you take what stays in, and you represent it, you get a rock slamming item and you oppose it.” In other words, you've got an invariable action there.

If you can't carry out that invariable action don't try to carry out something else. Scrub your dead horse, in other words. You've been listing on this thing, and man, it's just going no place. There's no slam on it. Get your mid ruds in. Get your mid ruds in. “On this list has anything been suppressed?” and so forth. Get your mid ruds in, make sure they're nice and clean, everything is fine. And by the way, never put mid ruds in when the pc originates. That is absolutely against the law. Pc originates, say, “You know, I had an interesting thought then, I thought that I must have suppressed that item. I thought that – I thought that cats never got that big, actually.”

And the auditor, “All right, on this list has anything been suppressed?”

Man, if you want to drive a pc out of session, just try that. He's keeping his own ruds in, so what? So what? He'll eventually get so he won't. It's not you – up to you to use mid ruds for punishment. But at the same time don't shy off getting mid ruds in. You know, the reverse can happen. “Every time I open my mouth. . . “ If you operate from the armor-plated turret of always doing a good helpful job and doing everything you can do for the pc and doing everything you're supposed to be doing right and using very reliable processes, believe me, you don't have any qualms about heading the pc's attention this way or that or straightening out something or other or going on and doing something.

If you're auditing with a guilty conscience of not knowing quite whether you're doing right or not, you are very vulnerable as an auditor, because you think you might be committing overts. And therefore you tend to withdraw from them. And even an auditor who's auditing almost letter – perfectly can sometimes be shaken up by a pc who says, “Oh, there goes those damn mid ruds again! All I'm doing is sitting here getting in mid ruds and *mo-raooww!*” See, mid ruds.

Well, all right, so you had to get in your mid ruds too often. Tell your pc, “I'm awful sorry. I'm sorry.” Treat it as an origin, don't ask him – don't punish him now with the random missed withhold question. See, that's the other – that's the other mark of a tyro. Say, “I'm awfully sorry. But just exactly what are you doing there?”

“Well, I just. . . and so on and so on.”

“All right. What haven't I found out about that?” see?

“Well, so-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so – and that's what I'm trying to tell you.”

You say, “All right. I'm trying to get these in so I can get this needle straightened out, and we can go on, you know? And I've got to put them in. I'm sorry.” And go right on in and put them in.

Well, that's good auditing, see? But I've actually had pcs try to scold me out of getting my rudiments in and yap at it. And I don't care whether it was one reason or another, I found out the way to handle the pc was to go ahead and put them in. And the way to mess it all up was to try not to, you know, try to Q-and-A with the pc's objection.

Nope, if you're operating from the certainty of being right – you're doing your best for the pc, and so forth, and your pc starts to ream you out

and you know very well you haven't been using mid ruds to punish his withholds, you see. You know, to punish him every time he originated – excuse me. And you know you haven't been misusing this and you've been handling him all right and the pc's going straight through the roof. Well, don't Q-and-A by going straight through the roof yourself. Go on and do what you're supposed to do. He'll simmer down. Sometimes has a legitimate beef; most of the time not. Get in your mid ruds.

Now, the next big source of dead horses is this incomplete list. And I don't know how to tell you emphatically enough what an incomplete list is, because actually I've been bleating and nattering and beating my gums and splintering bits of enamel out here for a long time on the subject of incomplete lists and really nobody hears me. But I finally caught up with one thing that *I mean* to be very *emphatic* about. I have caught out the auditor who says: “The pc said he put it on the list and therefore I stopped the list.” I've caught up with it. If the pc says the last one he put on the list was it, I will guarantee you that the list is not complete. It's that reversed. Pc says the list is complete, just volunteers it, I will absolutely *guarantee you* that the list is not complete.

I will guarantee you also that this has happened, that coming right over the horizon is a nice big rock slamming item and the pc has just chickened. The pc hits the silk, Man. He unloads right there. And part of the sensation is, is that he has put it on the list. He's fooled himself. What he really has said is he's put the last safe item on the list. And I've tested this out some times now, and I finally got the number. Because I've heard this for a long time. And I finally got this thing straight, and made some tests on it. And it's ARC broken the pc I made the test on, “Well, it does no good for me to tell you the list is complete, because then I put that on the list, because you just keep on going on,” and that sort of thing. Yeah, but here's the test of the pudding: are we getting the package? And that's always the test of the auditing. Have we got the package that made the pc well?

This pc could have screamed, bawled, howled, shouted through the entire session, and if at the end of the session you have got an item to show for it, I guarantee you that if it was the good item, that everything is fine – the pc will just – it'll all evaporate. All the bad,

everything evaporates. The one thing you can do wrong is not to get a package. Not to get items, reliable items

that's what you can do wrong. You knock off doing that and the pc will never forgive you.

“What do you mean,” he's liable to say to you. “You mean just because I yelled and screamed and so forth, you knocked off and didn't get the item? What are you trying to do, get even with me?”

Unreasonable beast, see? You're handling a very unreasonable breed of cat. The pc is not forgiving you for getting the item and will never forgive you for not having gotten one. So you take your choice.

Now, this is particularly true on a Scientology list where somebody is slamming a bit on the list. Maybe they're not slamming enough to make it really interesting or have a rock slamming item, but there's just quivers, you know, and “zzz” and quarter-inch “zzz” and you go down, bang-bang, dirty reads, big dirty reads, you know, that sort of thing, and you're going on down the line.

Man, when you start representing that, you're liable to run yourself into more tears and protests and upsets than you've seen in a long time. Pc just digs their heels into the auditing room floor and just isn't going to go forward from there. Won't list, and so forth.

Well, anything short of mayhem, make them list. That's the answer to it. The answer to it is to get the list because that's the only road out, unless the pc has a legitimate beef. Pc might have a legitimate beef, say, “Well, I-you-you just keep doing that, you-you just keep reading that particular item, and I tell you that's in because I'm just protesting it. I don't believe that is it.”

Get the protest off the item and then test it again. Pc may be right, see. Don't throw it down his throat. But you're listing something and it seems to be quite a legitimate list, the pc all of a sudden sets his heels, he isn't going to go on. Well, I don't know what you have to do to make some pcs go on. But let me tell you that whatever you have to do to make them go on, the only thing you'll never be forgiven for is not having made them 90 on. That's what you'll never be forgiven for. That will really shock them and upset them.

I don't care. So a pc cries. So the pc emotes. So the pc gets mad. So the pc does this. So pcs are pcs. Get the list. Pc says, “I'm not going to list any more and that's it, that's it. That's the last item. That's the last item you're going to get out of me.”

You say, “All right, I understand how you feel. Let's see, what are we listing from, now? Turnip seeds. All right, listing from turnip seeds. Okay. What do you think about them?”

“Well, I think it's silly! The whole thing is preposterous.”

“All right. All right.”

Don't turn their cases around, just keep them talking, see, keep them talking. And more times you'll be startled out of your wits. They'll suddenly say, “Well, there's field hands, there's feed stores, there's this, and. . .” You're back there listing again, see. Don't try to take words out of what they are saying to you and list them. They consider that a terrible betrayal, because they didn't give you the item. Therefore you have robbed them.

But you get yourself a good – a good list, that list is going to look in a certain way. As you are listing a list – now here's the way a list looks – as you're listing a list, and you go down the line, you're liable to run into a dwindling rock slam. Or you're liable to run into a sporadic, occasional rock slam. We don't care which you run into. But if you don't get an item that slams when the list is being written down by you, you've got no list. There's got to be some on it that slam, man.

Now, how many is some? Well, three or four in a row, one or two occasionally on the thing that aren't attributable to the pc's moving his hands, and you'll find out that very often you run into the textbook dwindling rock slam. Every one rock slams a little bit less. Every item he gives you, you get a little smaller rock slam on. Starts from a dial wide or something like that, goes to three-quarters of a dial and goes to half a dial, goes to a quarter of a dial, goes to dirty reads. Dirty reads dwindle on down and go absolutely clean and slick as a whistle. And you say, “Boy, we've really done it now.” And you close your book and you start nulling and you are horrified to behold that you get a dirty needle. Not dirty reads, but you get a dirty needle. What the hell's this dirty needle all about?

Well, it's the list isn't complete, that's what it's all about. Lists go in through phases of looking flat. Now, there are various tests. You can get the mid ruds in and ask the question that you're listing from to see if it produces a read. That is really not an absolute guarantee that that list is listed out. That is a good indicator. That's a good indicator. The absolute guarantee that it is an incomplete list occurs on this test: When you go down the list nulling items you can clean up a dirty needle – not a dirty read, but a dirty needle – by simply asking the pc if he thought of something.

You say to the pc, “Did you think of something?” Pc fishes around, finally digs it up and says yes and your needle goes clean again. If you have to use more mid rud than that, that list is incomplete. You see, it's not even mid ruds. It's just the off-hand two-way comm question. You just say, “Well, did you think of something?”

Pc said, “Yes, so-and-so and so-and-so,” and your needle cleans again.

Now, even that one, if you have to pull it two or three times for ten items or twelve items, no, man, that list is not complete. So you want to go at it this way, is “Did you think of something?” This is also – this is an invitation, you see, it's a two-edged sword. It's an invitation to give you his withhold or what he just thought or what he invalidated or

something like that. It's an invitation to do that. Also an invitation to give you more items. See? "Did you think of something?" And then you can write this new item down at the end of the list.

But let me tell you that a pc's ARC breaks about not completing the list do not stem from the auditing or auditing flubs. They come entirely from the pc's unwillingness to confront, because when a list is complete the pc will list forever. So when he ends listing is not a test of complete list. If a list were complete he would go on listing. But when a list isn't complete, he blows his stack. He balks.

So any balk by the pc is an indication of an incomplete list. Simple. Just over the hill – you watch it. You'll see this manifestation from time to time. You'll be going down the line, *pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa*, and all of a sudden the pc will say, "Well, that's strawberries. That's it."

You say, "Huh?" You know, your pencil screams to a rubbery stop.

He says, "Yeah, that's the item. That – that – that's – that is the one. That – that is the one."

Well, just for fun sometimes, null the list you've just done. You want to get skunked? Just null what you've just done. You aren't going to get anything. It's going to be one of these horrible things. I'm going to put this in some bulletins so it can be spread more broadly. I'm going to put some actual patterns of incomplete list nullings and some actual patterns of some actual complete list nullings. Boy, they sure look different.

I did a list the other night that was a real complete list, man. I think on the whole list there were five items in and some fifteen pages on the first pass. And boy, the one that showed up at the end of that was the nicest juiciest matched-up item you ever saw. Yum-yum, you know. Was just out, out, out, out, out, out, out, out, out, out. "Did you think of something?" you know.

"Oh, no, no. So and so on. Suppressed something, I thought that was funny."

"All right." – Out, out, out, out, out, out – "All right, did you think of something?"

"Yeah, it was this *brrrt* ...

"Good. All right." Third, fourth page, all of a sudden one's in. That's all right, mark it in. Next one, in. Uh-uh, uh-uh-uh.

"Well, what have you been up to here? What do you think about it?" and so on. "Here's the list. Have you invalidated any of these things or anything like that?"

"I don't know. Oh, that one! That one. Ha-ha-ha! Yeah, ha-ha! Thought that one was awful funny. Ha-ha-ha!"

An auditor gets an awful lot of "you clowns" and that sort of thing, suppressed in

doing this sort of thing.

Anyway, they just go right on down the line, *pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa*. One read out, one read out, one read out, one read out, one read out, one read out, see? Just nothing, nothing, nothing. Two in consecutively, mid ruds went out.

Imagine my embarrassment on one sector of it, though, I had two in consecutively. Two were actually in, one after the other. I'd gotten so cocky by that time I was pestering the pc because the second one was in, of course. You know. Then you say, "Pardon me!" you see, and really – really apologize, and keep on going. But that's – that is a very ideal situation to get into.

And Mary Sue dragged out, the other day, some of the old 3D Criss Cross lists, and I really am going to have to post them for you because you'll scream, man! Twelve items long, this list is, up to the point where the pc said didactically, "Well that is it. I have now put it on the list." And then we have as many as twenty-four to twenty-eight slant marks after each item.

Oh, you thought I was going to say, "The one that was in." Oh, no, no, it went around to the back of the page. And no items resulted. And we could never understand why the case wasn't getting anywhere. That was why the case wasn't getting anywhere. Every time the pc'd say, "Well it's on the list," the auditor would stop and that was it. And then start this arduous nulling, you see. Three sessions later still trying to null twelve. Wild business, man!

So anyway, the pc – the pc actually slows down, sees that just over the horizon there is the smell of danger. One shouldn't go over that rise and so instantly gets up the one that's it, presents it to the auditor and says they aren't going to go any further than that. They'll say it in various ways. When you try to persuade the pc to go further than that they say it in various ways. They just don't want to go any further.

Now, you shove them – well, this is the other test you should make – you shove them just a few inches further and they start listing again – slam! You won't go four or five items beyond where they put it on the list, before you are looking at the first rock slam you saw in the session, in many cases. That's quite amazing, see? Marvelous. And now here's another one for you. You can have as many as about three groups of slams and a slam will dwindle two or three times on a list. That's not common but it can be expected. So that you have had a dwindling slam is no test at all, except that's a valid thing to list from. You just keep going.

Well, how far do you keep going? Well, until you don't have to get the mid ruds in to null it. Well, how far is that? Well, that's as far as it is. How long is a piece of string? Some pcs seem specialized in terribly long lists. They just love these 589 lists, you know? Let me tell you, no pc has short lists.

There aren't no such things as lists of ten, twelve, fifteen or twenty, twenty-five.

There are no such lists. You don't get short lists like that. The person would be almost to OT before they'd give you lists like that. You understand? And then their confront would be up so high that you wouldn't have anything to know. They would have blown them all anyhow.

So you just don't get short lists. You get these longer lists. And a pc that works somewhere in the neighborhood of eighty to a hundred and fifty on a list is just dandy. You can have a list complete as short as sixty or seventy, but not very often. It's eighty up.

Some of these pcs go five hundred – I think there are some who have gone as long as a thousand – are actually habitual. They're habitual. I mean, you ask for their next list and they give you five hundred, you know? Well, I'm sorry for it and I'm sorry that they do this. They happen to be rare. It's much commoner to have a pc that will run around a hundred, see. But you've had it, I'd up their auditing rates at once.

But anything that restrains a pc or tries to keep the pc from doing a proper length list will wreck your R2-12, just as it will wreck 3D-3GA Criss Cross. You say, "Well, your lists are too long. I don't want to audit you." They'll give you short lists with no items on them. Then you're really wasting your auditing time, see. You find out they'll suppress items, and put them out of sight. Then you never can get the needle cleaned up.

And you finally say, "Well how come you suppressed all those items? I mean, you know, they seem perfectly good items and we've now got them on the list. But how come you suppressed them?" If you asked them something like that, that's too jabbery and talky to for an auditing session. But if you were to say something like that they'd say, "Well, we'd get through so much faster if the list weren't so long."

See, if they'd given you their normal list you would have gotten through it and nulled it and found their item in two hours and a half, you see. Everything would have been dandy, you see, so on. This is the second session which you've still been battling with this. You've now burned up five auditing hours. And the pc is trying to save you time!

I'm afraid as an auditor I never have quite measured up to the ideal auditor. The ideal auditor would never say anything about it. He would never say anything about it. And I'm afraid, after a pc has done this to me a few times, and so forth, I'm liable to say to the pc, "Thank you so much for your help." I'm afraid I'm not completely – not completely proof against doing that.

That's the one that really gets me, though. The pc is trying to help you out so that you can't even vaguely do your job. Oh! What can you say, you know? And you sit there and you sweat it out and that's as far as I'd go there, is just to thank them a little too loudly. They sometimes get the point. And they say, "Oh well, you didn't want me to do that. You mean it would have got done faster if I'd just – just gone ahead and let you do it?"

"Yeah, that's what I mean."

“Ah, well. I'll help you out next time.”

“No thank you. Just – just sit there and answer the auditing question, will you please?”

But actually, the more you beat up a pc, the less you're going to get done. The more you harass a pc, the more you worry a pc, the more you yap at a pc about a dirty needle, and so forth, the less you're going to get done. You should never yap at a pc about a dirty needle. Now, you'll rapidly come off of that and it won't be one of your sins. As soon as you learn to complete a list, you'll stop chopping up pcs for having a dirty needle.

Now, although the ideal auditor, the perfect auditor, would never cause any ARC break at all, a good auditor inevitably causes a little bit – inevitably. It's just part of the business. You're going down the line and there you sit there and you're going down the line and you're checking this and that and you're saying, “Catfish, tigers, waterbucks,” so forth. And you're going down the line, and all of a sudden this thing is going *bzzz, bzzz, bzzz, bzzz, bzzz, bzzzzz*. Your list is already 320, see.

Now, the ideal auditor would have completed the list in the first place.

But an actual auditor very often finds it out in mid-flight. In other words, there's a difference between perfect ideal form and the form that you can achieve. You can come awful close to perfect form but this one will always throw you. The thing was clean, everything was clean, there was no indicator, no clouds on the horizon, everything was beautiful, the sun was shining, you're going down the list like mad and all of a sudden, *clank!* You got a dirty needle.

Now, if you say to the pc, “All right, let's list some more items,” you're not going to get too much cooperation. But frankly, the more monkeying around you do, why, the less cooperation you're going to get. So it's almost that abrupt. You say, “All right, now I see here you've probably got some more items that you thought of in progress and we're going to turn it over to the next page and now, all right, just give me some more items.”

And the pc says, “But we've done that twice!”

And you say, “Yeah, I'm awful sorry, but we have...” and so forth. We'll just go back and, you know, kind of pick up one item there that you – that you thought of when I was going along.”

“Well, 'gophers'.”

And you say, “'Gophers,' yeah, give me some more.”

And the pc's all of a sudden going a-a-a-a-a, you know, straight down the line. Marvelous to behold. Sometimes they overlist. Five would have cleaned it up, see, and they give you twenty. But never stop a pc from listing. You'll – because it's too hard to get them started in the first place. You never stop a pc from listing. Never. They go on and on and on

and on and on, well, just sit there and take the items down.

Now, you can have as many as three dwindling rock slams from the same item. That is a little discovery that is quite interesting. You thought there it was and it disappeared and it went to a perfectly clean needle and you say, "I've got it made in the shade." Don't be too smug. You keep on listing as long as the pc wants to list. And you get your mid ruds in, make a test of the thing and so forth, and watch that carefully because any slightest disturbance of that needle on that test means more items on that list.

The test simply consists of getting your mid ruds in and asking the question from which you were getting the items. And you just ask that question, and man, watch that meter. Because if there's any rough-up . . . That needle was flowing and you asked the question and it stopped flowing, and just sort of souped. Didn't read. There's more items on the list.

And you say, "Well, all right." Try to sound happy about it. Say, "All right, good. Well, all right. All right. Well, I see you've got some more here. And here we go." And let's just write them up, see. Get your mid ruds in and test the thing again. It's always an invariable action. You get your mid ruds in and you test.

Now, on List One there is an accidental that you must know about. On 3GA Criss Cross, on all other steps of Routine 2-12, you probably won't notice that before you start to null you have put in your mid ruds. You see, because you wrote the list and then you put in your mid ruds and tested the list, so your mid ruds are in, aren't they? And on List One, the Scientology List, before you do it, you haven't completed any list so you haven't put in the mid ruds. So it becomes absolutely vital to get your mid ruds in on the Scientology List.

Now, one of the reasons why you can't add anything to the Scientology List turns up that if you ask the pc to add as much as one, two or three items, you have started the pc listing and will have to continue the pc listing it to get rid of your dirty needle. But if it never occurred to the pc to list, you won't have a dirty needle. But you get your mid ruds in, not on the list, you just get your mid ruds in for the session, so forth. But that becomes a little extra piece of stuff that has to go on ahead of it, just because in all other lists it occurs inevitably that you accidentally have gotten your mid ruds in at the beginning of the list, see, before you started nulling.

Now, if you add nothing to the Scientology List you won't have a dirty needle to worry about unless it's just the dirty needle of missed withholds or the dirty needle of out mid ruds. Otherwise than that, there's nothing different on h the first list than h any subsequent or successive lists.

Now, the thing to do in doing Routine 2-12 is just keep your eye on what you're trying to do. You're trying to find a trace first in Scientology because areas, because that's closest to the session and then in the present time environment of the pc. You're trying to find a trace of the GPM and where it might be keyed in because the individual will then have a chronic and

consistent present time problem. Now, having found this trace in present time, you recognize that the other side of the package – the second sphere, the second valence – that is opposing that thing in present time is keyed in all the time.

But also recognize, please, as an auditor, that it is a complete lie that it is in present time. It is only keyed into present time. So the moment you start listing a represent list, your pc is going to fly out of present time. But of course the thing isn't in present time; where else could he go but out of present time.

He only thinks it's in present time. It only appears to be into present time to him, and as soon as you represent, why, you'll carry him out of present time. But don't get too disturbed if for all his understanding of present time somebody starts to list backtrack like crazy. Well, what else is there to list?

You don't think this life had enough duress in it, even with the Democrats in power, you see, and the Republicans about to succeed them. You see, I mean even with combinations like that, you still don't get masses of the GPM in this lifetime. Let me assure you of that. There couldn't be anyplace but the backtrack.

Probably the thing he thinks is keyed-in in present time actually was a million years old, at the very youngest. So, of course, you're going to go backtrack. That you're going backtrack doesn't invalidate it as wiping out the present time problem.

Now, one other thing you should realize is in 1938 there was this matter of identities, similarities and differences. And you saw it first in *Dianetics: Modern Science of Mental Health: A = A = A*. See, *A = A = A*. In other words, everything is identical to everything, see. Everything is identified with everything. Well, of course, this is the reason the present time problem is in present time. He has got the GPM mass identified with the present time item. Nothing is wilder than this one that occurs in Scientology organizations. You're trying to help this guy out, you see, and he keeps shoving a dirk in your back.

Why? Well, because you're the king of the “Glu-Klocks” or something. Of course, he's been dead several million years, but somehow or another you restimulated him, minds being minds.

Now, the $A=A=A$ factor is terribly interesting to you from the viewpoint of the represent step of 2-12. You can represent anything and you will peel identifications off of it. So the representing alone is auditing. Listing is auditing. And by taking anything somebody is worried about and just representing items – you see, oppose, no, no, no. See? You can't say, “What would oppose it?”

This fellow says, “I'm awfully worried about ice cream cones.” I'm showing you now a little shortcut, goofball assist use of this, just to teach you the principle, see?

You can't say, “What would oppose ice cream cones?” and wind up anyplace. Because

there is no such package as something versus ice cream cones. It doesn't exist. He'd have to invent it. But you can say, "What would represent ice cream cones to you," and he'll give you the scale of substitutes for ice cream cones. This helps him to differentiate so he sees they're only similarities, not identities.

Now, you can always use represent as an assist. The fellow's got a bellyache. You say, "All right, now, what's a bellyache represent to you?" See, you haven't got him on the meter, you haven't done anything with him, so "What's a bellyache represent to you?"

"Well, it represents this and that and the fact that I am dying, and – ha-ha! That's real funny, I'm not dying," and he feels better. You understand?

But you're handling now one of the most fundamental fundamentals there are with that represent list and any time you say, "Who or what would (do something)," you're still writing a list and it's still got some represent in it. And you're actually using items to separate them out and get the pc to differentiate. And therefore he can see what is what and what is true and what is false. So you're handling all of these factors while you're handling R2-12. And the factors are in there and hidden, but they're quite startling. When you get a full parade of how many factors you're handling in R2-12, it's dizzying. So the best answer to it is just do it and you'll see those things peel off.

But it's very funny. Somebody will be absolutely sure his wife is an ogre. You've heard of this, you see. Well, actually he's just got an $A = A = A$. And you say, "Well, what does your wife represent to you?"

He'd say, "A *thuh* and a *thuh* and a *thuh* and a *thuh* and a *thuh*," well, he'd feel better just from doing that. And, of course, that's very short of what R2-12 could do and the wrong way to do it, actually. But you could use it that way and he'd differentiate.

So remember now, while you – while you're cursing there at the length of a list, remember the more identification on an item, the more items are going to come off on the list. The more identified the person is with something, the more items you're going to get coming off of it. And all the time you're listing those items you're auditing him like crazy – whether it's represent or oppose – because the oppose, too, is stripping down a certain idea or concept.

And don't lose sight of the fact that all the time you're listing you're auditing him like mad. And now we'll take nulling and every time you go down this list he thinks there and he reintegrates this stuff and you're auditing him like mad. So it's all auditing, solid auditing, and about the soundest and most condensed auditing that you could do – gain per unit of time.

Now, done right, and arriving with items, this is absolutely wonderful. I mean, you get someplace with this – it's fabulous. Now where – how many, how fast should something like this go? Well, I'd say, in an HGC, an auditor who was accustomed to it or something like that

should be able to get two packages very easily in a twenty-five-hour intensive. Two packages. That's four items. You know, A versus B and C versus D, in a twenty-five-hour intensive. He would really be loafing, see. He would have run into a lot of hard luck. He would have had to have done this. He would have had to have done that. It was a tough pc. You understand, all these things.

But I notice, I notice that to get a complete package that I'm – with long items and 2-12 and that sort of thing and with not being too careful or meticulous or trying to make time, actually loafing a bit on the job, and so forth – I notice it's going about 7 1/2 item-hours per pair for me. That would be for you 2 1/2 sessions of 3-hour sessions for a pair. That's really loafing. You understand? And so I say, then, for 2 pairs, for a twenty-five-hour intensive, that is – should be pretty close to a minimal expectancy. Of course you can always go up from there.

Of course you can gear in, and of course you can really get flying. I can do a list and get an item, if I want to really sit down and sweat at it, in one hour and ten minutes. But this is, of course, putting on the pressure of this, really, really knocking it out, man. Your voice is such a blur you can hardly hear it yourself, you know – but just to give you some kind of a level of expectancy.

And when you get two items you've got to make a package out of them, so when you say two packages you mean two pair. So you get two packages in a twenty-five-hour intensive, that would be very slow going indeed. Actually, you'll find your better leading auditors will get up to about six in twenty-five-hour intensive.

But, actually, in terms of case gain, two packages of R2-12 well listed, perfect, they are the items that should have been gotten, and that sort of thing, do more for the pc than a thousand hours of anything we've ever had before. Because you've removed the present time problem out of his road and now he can get gains from auditing. Those are the reasons for fast results.

Now do you understand this technique a little better?

Audience: Yes.

Well, I wish you lots of luck with it.

Thank you very much.