

R2-12 DATA

A lecture given on
11 December 1962

Thank you.

Okay. This is the what?

Audience: 11 December.

The 10th Dec.?

Audience: 11th.

The 11th? How did you get up into the 11th? The things you've been doing!

First lecture, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, December the 11th, AD 12.

Okay. Well, if it hadn't been for the work done in the V Unit, I wouldn't be able to give you this lecture. There was a little bit of an odd bit. I wanted to know if these oppose lists that have been laying eggs on Routine 2-12 – and you just didn't get anything – if those things, extended, would give you an item. And on case after case, both on the oppose and represent lists, when you think you are skunked, all you have to do is continue the list. Very simple. Very simple.

Now, a lot of you think 2-12 is very complicated. You think it's a very complicated activity. Frankly, you can get experience with great rapidity on 2-12; I'd say within 150 hours of auditing on it. If you're doing it right, you ought to become quite an expert. I said 150 hours of auditing because that's how long it took me. But of course, remember I was piloting it from scratch and didn't know anything about it at the beginning. So I think you ought to make it in a hundred and fifty hours knowing all about it before you start. Isn't that terrible?

That's not a snide professorial comment – that's just fact. Now, your troubles aren't with 2-12. That's what we're learning. You're not having any trouble with 2-12 – you're just having trouble with auditing. I think that's quite interesting.

Mary Sue pulled one tonight at the supper table that really had me laughing. She said offhandedly, she says, "Well, they're still using mid ruds for style." That's marvelous, you know. Gives you this gorgeous picture, you see, of the auditor sitting there busily getting in mid ruds for style, see. And it's little things like: pc's got 1,825 missed withholds, and 16 overts on the auditor, and the list is incomplete, and – there you're getting into 2-12; the list doesn't even have to be incomplete – and the auditor gets in the mid ruds and the needle is still good and dirty.

Oh, we had a remark on a report the other day – actually we’re having a ball with this stuff – we had a remark on a report the other day that is an indicator of using the mid rud for style. The auditor said, “Well, I got in the mid ruds for the session and got in the mid ruds for the list, but I still had a dirty needle, so I determined...” and he went off in some other wild direction. He’s already handed you a complete imponderable: How in the name of God could you get in the mid ruds, see, for the session and get it in for the list and still have a dirty needle? See, it wouldn’t even matter if your list was incomplete. You’re not talking about a list, you’re just talking about mid ruds to this pc, and so there it is.

Might take the random rudiment or something like that on some cases to pull the missed withholds, but you sure couldn’t wind up with anything less than a clean needle.

So what I picked up about the middle of the week – what I picked up about the middle of the week was the fact that people were trying to start nulling lists that had dirty needles, see. There was a dirty needle, and they take the thing, and the needle’s going *zzz-zzz-zzzz-zz-zzzz*, and they start the first one, “Tiger, waterbuck.” I don’t know what they’re doing. I don’t know what they could be doing, because they couldn’t tell if it was reading or not reading.

Now, the only time you have to be able to learn to read through a dirty needle is when the needle is so dirty that you can’t tell what mid rud is out. Now, you can do *that*. That does pose a problem. It’s going *tick, tick, tickety-tick, tickety-tick*, and you say, “Has anything been suppressed?” and it just keeps up the same *tickety-tick*, and you say has it been invalidated and it keeps up the same *tickety-tick*; and then you get to Suggest, and it’s doing the same *tickety-tick*, and you say, well, it’s probably Fail to reveal, and you get Fail to reveal and it’s still the same *tickety-tick*, and actually it was the Suppress and the Invalidate, but he had answers but didn’t...

This is wild, see. Trying to read through one of these needles to get the mid ruds in – that I’ll grant you takes some doing as an auditor. That is sometimes a little bit hard. But I will tell you how to do that. There is nothing much to it. You just put the E-Meter aside and put in the mid ruds. Then come back and see if your needle’s clean. You understand? And very often you will have caught it. The needle still won’t be going *tickety-tick*.

Now, a Variation of this is “Have you thought of anything?” But have you ever realized that this puts an awful lot of responsibility on the pc? If you overuse that or try to make that substitute for the mid ruds, you get this kind of a situation: “Will you please self-audit for a moment to straighten things out so that I can go on auditing you?”

Pc has no guidance or anything like that. You just say, “Well, I’m having a rough time here. Let’s see if you can help me out,” something like that... “Anything been suppressed?” and he tells you something. “Anything being invalidated?” and he tells you something. “Anything been suggested?” and he says no. And you say, “Well, anything you failed to reveal?” and he says, I “Well, yes, as a matter of fact there was...” and so forth. Well, he’s giving you some answers, isn’t he? Well, it certainly is going to change the characteristics of that needle.

Now, you come back and look at the needle, and it’s in – it’s sufficiently clean so that you can read the remainders. Now, you can run a cross-check – something like that.

You say, “Let’s just – now, let me make sure that all the suppressions are off of this.” This is the one most commonly neglected by the pc, because *suppress equals forget*. And you saw me on a demonstration one night, and the pc did wonderfully. I actually cleaned up every question I asked except the Suppress. Remember that TV demonstration? I had a – about a quarter-of-a-dial drop on Suppress and the pc said that’s clean. Now, why is that? That’s because *suppress equals forget*.

You realize, some pc says to you, “I had an item a moment ago, but I sure don’t know what it was.” He’s told you that he’s suppressed something.

Now, that’s no time for you to jump in there with all four feet and try to do this and that. You make awful mistakes when the pc said, “I had an item but now I’ve forgotten it,” and you say, “What was it?” Oh, brother. That’s the time to wish that you hadn’t gotten up that morning because your rudiments are going to go out from there on in, see, because the pc will earnestly try to remember this thing, see. Actually, it’s just an origin – so you just acknowledge it, see. Later on he’ll think of it. You’ve listed a few more items and all of a sudden the pc will probably startle you out of your stance as an auditor, say, “Hey! Hey, wait a minute, wait a minute, wait a minute! That was a pig. Pig!”

What pig? You see, you’ve forgotten about the whole thing. That was fifteen minutes ago, you know. It eventually percolates on up to the surface.

But oddly enough, if – I’ve made a direct test of this for your benefit. The pc says, “I had an item a moment ago, but I’ve forgotten it.”

And you say, “Okay.” It doesn’t now show up as a missed withhold or it doesn’t show up as a withhold, which is very peculiar.

All right, the pc says, “I had an item a moment ago, but now I’ve forgotten it.”

And you say, “Well, what was it? Does anything suppress it? Did you suppress it,” or something?

“Well, I must have suppressed it. Let me see what it was.” And now it Registers as a missed withhold. In other words, you can key it in with your question of “What was it?”

You get too busy. That’s the trouble with you in handling your mid ruds and that sort of thing. You’re using them for style – a wonderful gag. “He looked awfully good using the mid ruds,” you know. Didn’t have any effect on the pc’s needle, but it looked awfully good.

Your most flagrant fault then is just failing to get a clean needle, which is an element of auditing, before you start in. You fail to get a clean needle, that’s all, and you’re trying to take off and null a list with the needle dirtied up with things that have nothing to do with the list. And then you wonder if the list is complete or not and try to use the dirtiness of the needle to test whether or not the list is complete. Well, it all – a great many faults and errors can stem from just this one fact: that you haven’t got a clean needle. What are the mid ruds for? Clean needle. That’s what they’re for. They clean it up.

Now, Goal Finder’s Model Session is actually better than old Model Session providing you always put in big mid ruds.

Now, in R2-12 there is no substitute for an auditor who knows his basic mechanics. And we're talking now about the basic mechanics of auditing. Auditor knows TR 0, 1, 2, 3, 4. Auditor doesn't Q-and-A. Auditor knows an E-Meter. Auditor can smooth out a needle. Used to say "put in the rudiments." Well, actually, don't care whether you put the rudiments in or not – smooth out the needle. And then that makes sense, see. Putting in the rudiments is not something that can be plumbed, measured and weighed. But you can sure take a look at this needle and know that the rudiments have been put in – or not. If that needle has any kind of a pattern of any kind whatsoever, the rudiments are not in on that pc, period. That's all.

Well, that makes it pretty tough, because most of the pcs that show up have got some kind of a tick and a tock and a plish and a plock. Well, that's all caused by missed withholds. So we're back into the basics of auditing – pulling missed withholds and so forth, that sort of thing. These are just fundamentals of auditing – has nothing to do with 2-12.

Now, we utterly neglect the fundamentals of auditing and let some guy fumble all over the place with the fundamentals, and then we add 2-12 on top of it as a complication, and of course, we've got a cow's breakfast, man. It is a mess. Well, your needle is dirty from the fundamentals of auditing, and it's being dirtied up by an incomplete list and the last list you didn't complete. Now, how the hell are you going to make any sense out of this?

Well, you've got to start in at the beginning and get in the fundamentals of auditing, that's all.

Now, posing the problem of how to clean up a needle: How do you clean up a needle? You of course are just posing the problem of fundamental auditing. And don't ever make a mistake about this, see. You're just saying, "This is fundamental auditing." You pull the missed withholds, you straighten out auditing on this person, you do this and you do that. You actually could do it this way: You could take an old-time Prepcheck, take some period, or no period. You just say, "In auditing, has anything been suppressed?" or something like this. You run an eighteen-button Prepcheck; something like this, and you're going to clean up the needle. Of course, that's the long way to do it, but it sure can be done.

It's – you could – you could do it meterless except for the Suppress button which would get you in trouble because it means *forget*, and you'd wind up at the other end of this... Well, if you just did Suppress and Invalidate on this guy, you know, gave him a "Prepcheck assist" – this is getting very popular in New York right now. People turning up after a lot of auditing and the CCHs and that sort of thing, and their needle is just filthy and one of the boys in! New York got the idea of a "Prepcheck assist." He straightened out one or two of these needles, and he noticed that they were straightening out in just, you know, just four or five hours, and he'd had them straight – you know, it was all smooth and fine. So he's got a – they're given a Prepcheck assist, whereby they merely clean up Suppress and Invalidate. And that's quite interesting.

I don't know how far they'd get with that sort of thing because out of the eighteen buttons there's always one of them that's hotter than the remainder, and it's not always Suppress and it's not always Invalidate. But if you were to take an assessment of the eighteen buttons and get the couple that fell the most, or get one that fell the most, and then ran *that* for

a couple of hours, and then assess it again, and get the other one and ran *that* for an hour or two, or whenever the pc said it was flat, why, you'd clean up a needle.

Now, this idea of a needle pattern, then, is not something that you should I be blowing your brains out over. Similarly, a very, very high tone arm is not something to go on worrying about because the exact activity, which I just gave you, will knock a tone arm down. This has nothing to do with 2-12, the data I'm giving you here. It just has to do with basic stuff. I mean, we got a lot of this stuff around. I don't know, maybe you can straighten out a dirty, needle with a Touch Assist. Well, we've had a lot of stuff here for a long time. Now, just add this up and benefit from it and here's riches for you, you see.

So this pc, it goes tick-tock, *bzz, brrr, bzzz*, tick-tock, and he's sitting down there, and you try to put "in this session," see. Oh, man, that isn't going to go anyplace because it was dirty when he came into session, see. And you say, well, let's pull some missed withholds and this sort of straightens it out a little bit and it's still going tick and it's still going tock and that sort of thing. Well, you could sit down and pull missed withholds until it got clean, but you also could run a couple – the first two buttons, just Suppress, and you know, just "In auditing has anything been suppressed?" you know. We don't care if he's been audited for twelve years or one year, see. You're going to get someplace with this thing. And then pull some missed withholds, you see. This is all basic, fundamental stuff. You put it all together and you don't get a dog's breakfast, you get a very nice looking clean needle.

In other words, don't try to run something fancy on a case before the case is ready to run. Well, how many hours should be invested in straightening out a case before you start auditing them on something, and so forth. Well damn few, let me tell you, very, very few. Very few indeed! If you're very good at pulling missed missed withholds – "missed square" withholds – you're very, very good at that, you could probably straighten up the whole needle on that.

But I'll tell you something else, I've straightened out a needle with 2-12. And that's a weird one. Well, how do you assess it? Well, just genius!

You know, you can read down a list of stuff and if you're not stone blind and a rock slammer, you can see that something ticks more than something else. You know, that dead-easy.

So let's just be sensible about the thing, you see. Let's take the old-time rock slam test, and let's hope we've got a rock slammer sitting in front of us. That's the easiest one to straighten out. Anybody can straighten out a rock slammer. That's dead-easy, because you just simply find out whatever slams, and oppose it, see. And crash, crash! The only time a rock slammer gives you any trouble is when some other rock slammer has been trying to give him a clean bill of health and hasn't reported that he slammed on "Scientology," "Ron," "Auditing," and "Sessions," see. He hasn't reported this fact, but he says he's clean.

Well, by this time the guy has got this all suppressed and you don't catch it right off the bat and then the case lays dead horses, and then after a while in desperation you just suddenly pull it out of the hat; decide to give him the old test – tiger drilling the buttons and see if one dirty-needles.

Well, if he's had a lot of dead horses and so forth, do you know you'd practically be justified, even though it laid another egg, just in picking the biggest read on the fundamental items and just opposing it.

Just *supposing* the guy has been a rock slammer. See, he didn't make progress so let's – well, let's just treat him like a rock slammer. See if we make any fun there, see?

I've been working on it – this isn't a rule that I can forecast, but it very well may become one – that if a case makes no progress on 2-12, you treat him like a rock slammer and oppose Scientology – if you can't get the first three, four key buttons, you know. See, “Ron,” “Auditing,” “Scientology,” “Scientology organizations,” something like that – if you can't even pick out a dirty needle, see, a read – a dirty read or something on one of those things, well, hell, just at least oppose Scientology. That looks like it might, one of these days become a rule, because we've wasted quite a bit of time on just this factor of somebody says we'll save this bird's bacon.

Well now, today nobody gives a damn whether anybody was a rock slammer or not. Particularly after you see that after a person's been audited for a little while he starts rock slamming on List One.

I don't know. I'm going to get checked out on me myself So there's no disgrace in this. This is a cute trick some people have been pulling on this. They say – because they don't want to seem socially declassed, they say it turns on pain, and then you list it as though it's a terminal and it's actually an oppterm, and you just get loused up like fire drill.

So I have a little rule that I will do on that sort of thing. After somebody tells me pain or sen on List One... See, if they tell me pain then I'm going to give them a lie test. You know, “Is there anything here that you disagree with now?” “Have you told me anything in session that you thought I'd like to hear?” you know?

We've laid two or three eggs on this lately. Two cases right in this room, opposed wrong way to, see. Opposed as though they were terminals, and actually it just gave the pc hell, see. Because you oppose them – you've opposed an oppterm as though it's a terminal. And of course, you're writing a backwards list. You're putting the pc at effect. And if you don't think that doesn't tear up their ears! You get what I mean?

This thing actually is an oppterm, and the pc says it's a terminal for some reason or other, and then you treat it as a terminal. “Who or what would that terminal oppose?” And it just puts – of course, it's an oppterm, so in actual fact you're putting the pc at effect; you're not putting the pc at cause and it messes them up.

Well, those are just some little things in passing on 2-12.

But this needle is dirty. I can't seem to make any headway out of the thing. I'm not going to spend the next twenty-five hours straightening out a needle, because with one list with 2-12 it'll get all dirty again anyhow. See, it'll go through a cycle of being clean and then getting dirty and then going clean again. So you certainly don't want to waste the rest of your natural life poking around just trying to straighten out this needle. So you need some method of straightening out the needle.

So you pull enough missed withholds off the pc so that you can do some kind of an assessment on List One and get into 2-12 as fast as you can – if you take my advice on the thing – and the first reliable item you find would deliver into your hands one of the cleanest looking needles you’ve seen in many a day. It’s as simple as that, see. I’ve seen a needle, now – I’ve seen a needle that was just *bzz-bzzz-bzz-bzz-bzzz-bzz-bzzzzzzzz*. Everything’s stuck up, couldn’t get old Model Session rudiments in. You know, everything sort of hung up and messed up and so forth and I couldn’t do any assessment and I couldn’t even go over the dynamics, and so forth. One list that rock slammed and at the end of that list I had a clean needle. I hadn’t even nulled the thing out yet. You get what I’m talking about now?

I just listed it out till it was clean. And there it was, clean. Well, what happened to all this pc’s withholds and everything else? Well, I was sitting de ‘ad center in the case, and I actually found an item – took some charge off the bank – and there went a clean needle, see. There went your dirty needle – disappeared.

So, here are two ways of approaching this thing. There’s not knowing any 2-12, not being able to enter the case, not being able to assess, being balked, not having anything that-way to turn, something like that. And not having an auditor around who can pull missed withholds or something – they haven’t got the word yet, you know, something like this.

There’s still something you could tell this auditor to do. Well, just spend a couple of hours on, “In auditing has anything been suppressed?” and “In auditing has anything been invalidated?” when that’s flat. A couple more hours of that and you’ll probably see the needle straighten up. Then coach the auditor in to say, “Is there anything we nearly found out about you?” and “How did you know the person thought that?” or “Why did you think so?” and get the rest of it up and you can straighten up a needle. So this is not a twenty-five-hour proposition or the next seventy-five hours or something like that.

Because listen: There’s a point at which the pc’s anxiety is rekindled on a no-auditing basis that dirties the needle up again. In other words, there’s a point here where your efforts to clean up the needle dirty the needle up.

Now, you can always count on no-auditing to dirty up a needle. Always count on it to do so.

Have you ever noticed this fact? You’re sitting there, getting ready to null a list. You’re sitting there getting ready to null a list. Everything was very fine. When you finished up that list you just had a clean, flowing needle – everything was fine. But you stop at that point to make a note on your auditor’s report to the effect that the tone arm is now at 3.5, and that this is this and that is that and the time is so-and-so, and then you glance up and you look at the needle, and it’s going *tickety-tock, tickety-tick, tickety-tick, tick, tickety-tick tick tick*.

Well, you could sit there then and get in your session mid ruds; and you can clean up the needle – don’t think you can’t. You can clean it up and then you turn back to your auditor’s report, you see, and next time you look at it, it’s going *tickety-tock* again.

That’s anxiety. The button Anxiety is keying in there, and the pc is in a no-auditing bind, and so on. Actually, the way I’ve been handling that particular phenomenon lately, of the clean needle turns into a dirty needle just because there’s – I’m taking a breath to say the

first word, you know, that's too long, you know? And I'm saying – like this and the dirty needle turns on, see. Well, it's just the pc's anxiety that's doing that kind of thing. And I'll just sail into the first one, and then say it two or three times, and say the next one two or three times, and so forth.

Now, by crossing everything out as you go down through a list, you can also sometimes turn on a dirty needle. The pc gets anxious. Nothing is in. You just keep making those Ks, you know, making those Ks, making those Ks, making those Ks, making those Ks. Well, sooner or later, you're going to decide that it has to be tested for Suppress. You test it for Suppress and you promptly have a dirty needle. Where did that dirty needle come from? Well, it comes from the fact that the pc probably did suppress something, but your asking for it keyed it in so it now registers and it wasn't active before, but it is now.

But the main thing is the pc is scared you're going into mid ruds. Scared you're going into mid ruds. So, because they're scared you're going into mid ruds they pull off, and you now have a dirty needle. So this tends to discipline you not to put in the mid ruds so you do the whole list with a heavy suppress on it.

Well now, those are the – those actions actually aren't related to 2-12. They're the actions of auditing. You see, they're the actions of the pc being controlled and handled by the auditor, don't you see? This is the pc's anxieties about auditing, the pc's confidence in the auditor, the pc is in-session or isn't in-session, and so forth.

The only thing I really get very alert for and really go to the mat and slow the whole session down to nothing is the pc, in putting in mid ruds, gives me a "critical." I get a dirty needle and when I pick it up, I find out it was the pc said that I had shuffled the paper loudly. I know I won't have any luck, now. I know I won't be going anyplace now, because that pc has got something I nearly found out. I don't care if it was in the last three days or the last two days or in the session, that pc has a withhold from me because that pc has given me a critical utterance. And critical utterances are *always* underlain by an overt/withhold.

And that's the only thing I go alert for. Why do I go alert for that? Because that one critical utterance or that one attitude on the part of the pc will multiply and multiply and multiply and all of a sudden I'm going to have a screaming ARC break.

That is the same situation that you run into an hour later – with the pc trying to blow the session. You see that? I'm not being sarcastic, but most auditors don't catch the missed withhold; don't catch that ARC break for an hour or an hour and a half It's long after they've happened.

And you've got to become alert for that. These are the fundamentals of auditing I'm talking about, you see. You've got to become very alert for that.

You're putting in your mid ruds, and you say, "Well, in this session has anything been suggested?" See. And you get a tick, you say, "All right, what was that?"

And the pc said, "Well, yes, you actually were saying some word a little louder than the others, and I thought you were suggesting that that was it."

That's enough, man. My next rudiment is nearly found out. I don't – I don't play the motordrome game of riding the motorcycle on the vertical wall just for the cheers of the audience like some of you do, if you will pardon my French. Because that's the one thing you can't monkey with, is a missed withhold. See, that's a critical; that's a direct indicator! Great big black arrows immediately drop up in the sky and point directly to the pc's bank and they have engraved on them in gold letters which flame, you see: "You've nearly found out something about this pc."

Any indication of a missed withhold causes me to go after missed withholds. Pc a little critical; pc upset. I go on the basis: Doesn't matter what I do as an auditor, as long as I'm trying to audit the pc, I don't merit criticism. I'm not trying to punish the pc because the pc's criticizing me and I'm not doing this because I don't like criticism. I'm doing this because the session is going to blow up if I don't. That is your first symptom of a session blowing up. Pc's feeling a little critical.

Now let's move over into 2-12. You do a couple of things wrong and you're going to be in a mess. And one of those things is you find a slamming item and it's slamming like crazy, and you don't know what a rock slam looks like so you don't... I know that sounds incredible, but there are two people here who didn't know what a rock slam looked like.

Now, that sounds incredible, but it's true. And don't you ever make that mistake in a co-audit or teaching a bunch of HPAs, HCAs or something like that, that you know that they know what a rock slam looks like. Because you I say nobody could miss a rock slam. Well, let me tell you, people can miss a rock slam. They can miss them, and just learn by that.

So this item is rock slamming like mad, and for some reason or other the auditor doesn't want to embarrass the pc by pointing it out that he slams on "auditor" or something. I don't know for what reason – or he doesn't know what a rock slam is, or something like that – but he knows the thing was active so he *represents it*.

Now, listen, it isn't always catastrophic. You can get away with it often enough to make a fool out of yourself.

All right, Ill give you the exact example: You're standing in a room, a burglar comes in the door with a drawn gun, and the Telephone rings. Now, you'd feel a little distracted, wouldn't you? And I think that if you picked up the telephone and found out it was unimportant, that you would have a tendency to swear as you slammed it down to take care of the other situation or something there – you'd be in an agitated state. You get the idea? Split attention.

The command value of Mr. Burglar with a gun in his hand is terrific, and somebody's saying, "Look away from this thing." All right, the command value of a rock slamming item is terrific, and the person's attention isn't on the item that is slamming, it's on the reverse item. It's on the hidden item. That's where their attention is mostly absorbed. They're slamming on "gooney birds," and the opposition terminal to "gooney birds" is "hunters." And you ask him "Who or what would a gooney bird represent to you," you've told them to take their attention off this hidden item "hunters." You don't even know what it is, see. And that's like the

Telephone ringing and they have to take their attention off the burglar, see. And it drives them around the bend. They practically go out the bottom.

And when you get a List One item and you don't oppose it; if you're really mad at some rock slammer; if he's really cost the organization thirty-five thousand rand or something like this – I won't mention any areas – and you really want to drive him potty, and just have him so he'll be out in the street waving guns in his hands ready to shoot somebody down or something like that, find "Scientology" rock slamming and then *represent* it. All you've got to do is put a represent list on "Scientology," a rock slamming item, and he'll go right around the bend. He practically goes out through the bottom.

See, there's a hidden item there, he's got his attention on this item, and you tell him to put his attention on Scientology and represent it and he can't do it. It's just nyahh! see. He doesn't know what he's got his attention on, he just knows there's something dangerous there. And you're telling him to take his attention off this dangerous thing and then to do a *represent* on something he's only got his attention from or at, don't you See. You've messed up his attention.

See, here's these two items smashed against each other. His attention is totally fixated on the interrelationship between these two items, this package, these two reliable items against each other, see. That's what his attention is on, and you take one of these and you start representing it, you're telling him to take his attention off the other item and take it... *Ahuuu-zzzzzz-zzz*. And he practically goes gibbering.

We've had two eases here, slamming on List One that have been *represented*, and boy, they both almost went out the bottom. And their antagonism on List One went up by the square. Zooom! Don't you see. They couldn't take this.

Now, if somebody had sat down and opposed the rock slamming item – just like it says in 2-12; did it right, in other words – why, it just would have been as right as rain. Everything would have been fine and sweet and everything. But a case practically goes out the bottom.

Now, you got somebody who's slamming on three or four points of List One and you do nothing but represent lists on them – oh, brother! That's happened here a couple of times. Hardly anybody knew they were slamming on List One, you, see – this hadn't been isolated. Agh! And they didn't know whether they were going or coming. They just started out the bottom.

So it's a good way to get even with somebody. If you find an item slamming nicely, why, *represent it*.

Now, if you really want a case to fold up sooner or later, if you find an item slamming nicely and you oppose it, why, stop listing just at the moment when you can barely null it to nothing and not find an item. Because now the item you took it from, will not slam, all the other slam seems to be gone and you don't see anything there, and the case feels fine – feels much better – but you've got a sleeper now; you've got a hidden pair in present time. That's about the only big mistakes you can make. Of course, you realize I'm just taking up 2-12 *mistakes* with you here.

If you – after you null the thing out, if you continue to list the opposition items against the thing – it's not now slamming, see. You listed it out, everything disappeared, there's hardly even a dirty needle left, everything's gone now. It all looks fine, but you didn't come up with a reliable item. That's the only thing that's spooky about it all. It just – you didn't have an item after you opposed it, see. You start listing again on that opposition list and all of a sudden the nicest, biggest rock slam will turn on the original that you ever saw, and you'll get a rock slamming item, and all of a sudden you'll wind up with – you'll have a very nice big rock slamming item and you'll have a package.

In other words, you can quit just short of getting a package. That, probably, would be the most puzzling mistake that you could make in 2-12. That would puzzle you.

This also happens with a represent list. You've got some dirty needle or something and you're representing it like mad, and it represents into a slamming list and – nice, long list, and it nulls – everything is out, you have a little bit of a hard time keeping your mid ruds in, but you get it, you get it all nulled and you get clear on down to the bottom of it, and you're there – got no item. And there's nothing there now, and it's all gone and everything's gone. And you thought it was “shoe trees,” or – but that was sort of the last one in. You don't know... “Well, it all must have... I know what it was. They were all bonus packages.”

You see, you'll always get an odd number of items; one, three, five – I don't care what it is, it's always an odd number of items. You get an even number of items that exactly match up on a represent list – that's very suspicious, and probably has never happened, and probably never will happen.

You get two items on a represent list that go against each other, and the whole thing folds up. I think that would be almost too rare for you to include in your calculations. The basic thing is, the pc doesn't know about it. In other – if you got a bonus package you can practically count on the fact that there were *three* items slamming and that one of them is not yet on the list.

In other words, if you do one of these washouts that you've been calling skunks; if you think you've been skunked – it rock slammed and it all disappeared and now you haven't got anything to show for it and u cant put anything on the line plot... Well, you can put something on the line plot but it doesn't now slam. You'll be amazed. All you've got to do is continue that list. You've nulled it all, don't you see, and maybe you couldn't have continued it before you nulled it, but the nulling of it helps you to continue it. Even though the pc has a little bit of a loss and so forth, he can continue it much more easily now that it's been nulled. And hell give you a stream of items and you'll come up, and there'll be one going bang, bang, bang, bang, bang, nice R/S, everything's fine. Got a reliable item, you've got something to oppose.

But let's say you were opposing this item on, on, on, on, on, on, on, on, on, on, and it comes to the end of the list, and you can null the list, so on – the danger point in 2-12 is at that point where the list is nullable but the item isn't on it. And oddly enough, that point can exist – so powerful and good are mid ruds. See, your auditing can be good enough, actually, to null a list that isn't complete.

There's a point where you couldn't null it, don't you see – that's just before this point. But then you finally complete it up to a point. It's got enough charge off of it so that it can be nulled, and you have a little hard time keeping the mid ruds in and you get it on out, and then all of a sudden, everything goes flat. Everything goes flat. Everything disappears.

Now, this is contrary to an earlier lecture I gave you. I want to give you a point at this. Because I said if you exactly matched the things up, this would – pardon me, it may sound contrary to an earlier lecture I gave you. I said if you'd match the thing up exactly, it would go *pssww-pssww-pssww-pssww*, and you wouldn't have much left of the package.

But let me tell you something. That can be interpreted as: Just by listing the thing out and nulling it, it all disappears. And you ask the pc what confronted what, and the pc says, "Well, he guesses..." and so forth, and that just isn't good enough. The pc's got to know. He's got to know for sure. "Waterbucks – tigers. Yeah, those two went together." Bang! You get the positiveness of the pc. It's very positive. Pc's never asking himself questions about this. 'Man, that's it!' you know. "Oh yes, all my life I've just been terrified of water..." and so forth, and this sort of thing, "...and of course those things go together, because I used to have a bearing go down every once in a while in my car and it'd sort of make a snarling sound and it would upset me a great deal." On and on and on, see. He knows those two fit together. "Oh, yes. That 'waterbuck,' that goes just up against 'tiger,' nothing else," see. Well, if you don't get that kind of phenomenon you haven't vanished it down at the end.

Now, you just continue that list, whether it was an oppose list or a represent list, and you all of a sudden will see a rock slam. Where the hell did that come from? See, you'll see another rock slam turn on. And now your list will null down to an item and the rock slam will come back on what you were opposing or come back on what you were representing – it won't come back on what you were representing, but it'll come back on and make an RI. And if you're opposing, it will come back on the thing that you're opposing. That is the correct statement.

Now, here's another mistake that is made. People are abandoning lists which rock slam. They had rock slams on them, and so forth and they're just abandoning them. Why?.

Well, you'll get disabused of this and you'll get confused about what the score is – and life in general – if you've taken a rock slamming item and *represented* it rather than oppose it. Now, if you've done that one, you will now get a rock slamming list – this is very baffling – which will go to nothing. Or it'll just dirty-needle forever, and you can't seem to complete it. And then you never go back and check the original item. The item you're taking the represent from is slamming like crazy. Has been all this time. The more you unburden it the more it slams.

In other words, you had the item in the first place. What the hell are you doing representing it? In other words, a rock slamming item does not find another item by representing. The only thing you're going to come up with on a represent list – you may get a bonus package or something – but the only thing you're going to come up with in actual fact is the item you started with. You've got the rock slamming item, why the hell are you doing 2-12, see. Why are you doing 2 – ? You see, what are you trying to find? You've got it!

It's sort of like a bunch of firemen come up, you know, in their firetrucks, and here's this whole apartment building on fire, you know, and the guys run around asking everybody in the neighborhood and phoning city hall and so forth, trying to find out where the fire is, you know – paint's blistering on the truck.

So they start a Fire Prevention Week in the area and start putting up fire prevention posters and that sort of thing, and never take out a single hose or do anything with the fire.

The pc gets very upset when you do things like this, see. How can you find an item that you've already got? That's the question.

Now, here's a sneak that happens, which is not a criticism of the auditor. You've got an item, it's doing just a little bit of a bzz, and you list, and you go dirty needle, and you get messy, and you've got rock slams, and it's quite a list, and you go on, and it doesn't seem to complete or something or other's happening with it, and so forth. And you fail to test the item you got it from. That item has been rock slamming for some little time now. Because you represented it, it rock slams. So although actually it does contain the modifier of "When you get a dirty needle and can't finish the list, you do this," in actual fact, if you're a very clever auditor, you would always check what you're representing, because it might be the item, suppressed, and the representing of the item cleans it up and lets it slam.

You see, representing is very powerful auditing. When you represent something, you as good as prepcheck it and everything else. You could probably take a wrong goal and represent it and have it vanish. See, you get the idea? I mean, you could do a lot of funny tricks with this thing called represent. You do a lot of odd tricks with this thing.

Well, don't then be surprised that you start out with something that is giving a dirty needle, and you do 280 items, and you just don't seem to be getting anyplace, and you go on to 500 items and you just don't seem to be getting anyplace, and you go on to 750 items and you don't seem to be getting anyplace, and so forth. And all the time from about 50 items onward. you have had the item. It's the one you're representing.

Now, sooner or later the pc is going to get kind of bug-eyed as you go down that list; it's going to dirty needle; and it's going to be upsetting to the pc, and so forth, because now you've got his attention in a bind. See, you're asking him to represent a package. It's: the burglar has walked in the door and the Telephone rings and it's his girlfriend telling him that she will be five minutes late because she didn't get a lipstick from the store and could you remember to get some ginger ale as... Burglar says he's going to shoot in the next five minutes, you see, if you don't immediately write him out a Check for eight million quid or something.

Fellow's liable to bark at the girl, under those circumstances, and the pc's liable to bark at the auditor. So you've strained, actually, the pc's attention, because the pc's attention is what causes that rock slam.

Now, the earliest lecture on attention units was given back in Elizabeth, New Jersey, in 1950, in very early June. All about attention units.

Let's say that a pc has a certain number of attention units available, total – you know, theoretical availability – and he's got 90 percent of these tied up in the bank. Therefore, he's got 10 percent of his attention units around in present time or available. Actually, it's not like that at all. It's something on the order of about one one-hundred-millionth of his attention in present time and the remainder in the bank.

But that was the earliest lecture on this particular subject. Of course, that's just an illustration. That's just an illustration, a graphic sort of a picture, of what happens to the pc. In other words, his attention is trapped, residually, in certain portions of the bank, and therefore he hasn't got much attention to spare elsewhere.

A nervous or anxious or frantic individual simply hasn't enough attention units to put on present time, or what's come up. And they're all trapped elsewhere and you're making him take his attention off various places and things are collapsing in on him in these other places in order to handle this, and he gets very frantic. It's simply a symptom of – or he goes into apathy. It's a symptom of not having enough attention in present time, see. And the less attention one has in present time, the more one is likely to go down Tone Scale. This exactly matches the old Tone Scale. The less attention in present time, the less – the lower the tone of the individual is going to be, and his concept of reality, and all this sort of thing.

Actually, you can add up all of Dianetics and early Scientology and so forth, just under the few words I'm just giving you here. Just giving you a picture. Of course, you know you've covered that ground.

But apply this now to the fact that we have found those things which have, without any doubt whatsoever, ensnared the greatest part of the pc's attention. And those are attention traps to end all attention traps. And when you've got a rock slam you have spotted one of these attention traps. And the rock slam is caused by the fury and franticness of his attention and opposed attentions. And that – zzz! That's what causes it.

Now, that amount of attention then is absorbed in the bank. Now, you stir that up, you put his attention on one of these items, and then you go off to find another pair. And you only find one of those, so – you haven't found a pair yet, see, you only find one – and then you go off and you find another item. Get the idea now. You couldn't find a pair that time either for some reason or other. And you finally – you list that out, you see, and you haven't opposed it, you see, you've had to go in with other lines, like “What would you rather not think about?” and “Who or what has been shot lately?” or something like this, you see. And you kept going in, and you'd find a rock slam each time and then you only find one of the items, you see.

How many of these single-sided items or half packages do you think you're going to find before the pc will get no R/S? See, that's the burning question. What can the pc tolerate? Oddly enough, the tolerance is sometimes very good and sometimes very bad. It isn't constant.

If the thing is directly in present time – and the second lecture is about the phantom slam – but strangely enough, if the pc has a thing right in present time that you haven't found the package with, but have ticked it, and it's right in present time, and particularly if the thing he expects to help him, and then you neglect this thing, it's a lead – pipe cinch that his

attention has been all gathered up now. He won't have any attention left to put on anything else. And you just lay dead horses from there on. I'm going to give you more lecture about that.

But right now I'm talking about the auditor who finds an item, then doesn't find an opposition for it; finds another item, doesn't find an opposition for that; finds another item; almost finds another item; gets a list that's rock slamming, abandons that and then all of a sudden says, "I wonder why this pc doesn't rock slam anymore? I wonder why this – pc's getting better, and so forth, says he feels better, and so on." What's happened here? See.

Pinned his attention here, pinned his attention there. You know, these, this, that, *uh, vu, vu*. He's got no place to look now. You know, he's just sort of – there he is.

You say, "Why don't you rock slam, bud?" In other words, you can tie up a case so that it won't rock slam by just making too many bypasses. Now, this isn't really terribly serious.

Now, we now know what – you see, you can take the case's folder – that's why, my God, *always* save all the pieces of paper. And *always* put the date and the pc's name on it, and what you did on that piece of paper, for heaven's sakes. And this is why. In my auditing over the past couple of months I finally have left three things which have got to be completed. There are three, back along the track. There are an awful lot of packages, but I know now that those three packages are not complete.

Now, that isn't enough to catch up with it and stop everything over the number of items that have been found, the amount of attention that has been freed. But brother, I thank my stars that the records were complete. All I've got to do right now is write a few more things on the list and null them and I've got the item, do you understand? I didn't understand it earlier, I was studying this. But they're – I still had three of them.

Now, the number of these that you miss add up to the amount of stuck attention the pc has got on the track near present time. And you can add that up to a point where the pc won't go Clear. But if you've kept all the records, it can very easily be straightened out. That's what's important.

Actually, some auditor comes along and gets all the residual gain – bang! All the poor, first auditor had to do was list five more on the oppose list, you see, and he would have had the rock slamming item and it would have gone together as a package and the pc would have flown, see – 2-12 is a sneaker.

It produces better results done wrong than old techniques done right. So auditors become too easily satisfied with its gains. The pc is very happy about! it. And my God, he's got the – he's got this thing, he just had to list five more and get the item, and really package it up, see, and the pc would have taken off like a Cape Canaveral – not a Cape Canaveral rocket-like a Russian rocket. And everything would have been gorgeous. See, that's all he had to, do, but he didn't do it.

Now we know, now we know what a Class II Auditor is that knows 2i very well and is well trained and classified. We know what he is. He takes the folders and guides through the auditing of cases that have been done by Class I Auditors and straightens them out.

So this tells us at once what a Class III Auditor is, you see. He straightens out the incomplete lines and the failure to package of the Class II, YOU see.

Now we know what a Class IV Auditor is, see. And he takes the cases that have not been completely packaged and straightened out by Class IIIS, you see, and he straightens those out.

And we finally find out what my class is. I straighten out the Class IVs.

In actual fact, it is not dangerous to put this technique in clumsy hands – not at all dangerous to put it in clumsy hands, because it has residual gain. With this one proviso: providing all the records are kept, and providing the guy does say what he did do – so above all else, insist on that. That's the first thing you insist on.

And the next thing you insist on, that common, ordinary, good auditing gets done, you know. That's the next thing. That hasn't anything to do with 2-12, don't you see.

Now, the next thing after that is that 2-12 is done right and effectively, and that's about the order of importance. And if that order of importance is followed, why, anybody will be able to pick up some case and put it back together again. He can see – he's got – looks in there and he sees these – they've got a list of five items, as opposing the rock slamming item, and there's thirty-eight strikes after each one of the five, you see, and right away he has some idea of what happened. All he's got to do is complete that list and he's got it squared up. Those are your orders of importance.

If a case can't do the basics of auditing, then the auditing the case must be permitted to do is the simplest auditing that can be done. In other words, you just omit the mid ruds, you just omit all of these odd balls, and you get 2-10. That's a heavily supervised co-audit sort of a process. You just omit everything that the auditor is goofing with and carry on from there.

But this is the way – this is the way 2-12 stacks up at the present time. It itself is not complicated. But somebody who is still learning to audit while doing 2-12 can find it very harassing and very complicated, particularly when they've missed rock slams. And particularly when... Well, they had all of List One slamming, so they represent a think item. "What would you rather not think about?" Pc goes halfway around the bend. They say, "There, you see, 2-12..." But they actually never can quite say that it doesn't work, because even if they did that, that badly, the pc still Registers some gain.

So 2-12 is actually the first technique that falls into all these categories. And it's quite new. It opens up new doors to auditing. It opens up new doors to results.

Supposing an auditor almost did it right and got lots of lists, and he almost had items and so on – but he never checked anything out. You took the pc's folder, you studied it from the beginning, found exactly where it is, and in the case with four or five hours of auditing you find twenty-four items. You'd suddenly get a gain that'd make the pc just practically

thetan exterior right there, don't you see? Residual gain would all take place in a very short period of time.

But the auditor that did it, if you ask him, would have been very satisfied with his own auditing. Saw the pc gain all the way.

The only thing that gives you trouble sometimes is you cannot quite make up your mind whether the item that you're going to oppose is actually a slamming item or not. And that's the only list you will ever lay an egg on, because it gives you a cyclic rock slam, dirty needle, clean, rock slam, dirty needle, clean, rock slam, dirty needle, clean, and will probably go on doing it for the next fifteen thousand items. That's the only bug there is where it really takes a little bit of judgment, because sometimes you say, "It isn't rock slamming anymore," and you should have opposed it. And sometimes you say, "Well, it was rock slamming so therefore I'm going to oppose it," and you shouldn't. So in that particular case you just learn – one of these cyclic, dirty needle sort of lists that go on and on and on, on an opposition – you learn what one of those things look like, and after that you'll know what you're listing.

Okay. Thank you.