

R2-12 DATA: NEEDLE BEHAVIOR

A lecture given on
13 December 1962

Well, another evening. What – what’s the date?

Audience: Thirteenth.

Thirteen Dec., AD 12. Have you been lucky today?

Audience: Yes. Yeah.

Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, lecture number one.

This is a lecture on 2-12, needle behavior.

Nomenclature: a clean needle. What is meant by a “clean needle”? What is meant by “cleaning a needle”?

Well, not what you think. We want a free, flowing needle. We want a needle which, when it comes up the line, doesn’t go tick-tock. Not when we say anything! Now, let me get this point across, here. I’ll be calm. The auditor is saying nothing. Do you understand? The pc is sitting there. The auditor is not *doing a thing*. You got that? He’s not even reading the meter probably. And under those circumstances there is no faintest trace of irregular or reacting motion on the needle.

I knew I could get this one across. I just saw a couple of cognitions. Now, you’ve been thinking that cleaning a needle had to do with when you said something it went bop, and then when you said something again it didn’t go bop. And that’s not cleaning a needle. I make my point?

Audience: Yes.

That is just taking a read off the needle. You can clean a read off the needle, but that doesn’t give you a clean needle.

If you will watch a needle on a preclear, at some time or another in the source – in the progress of processing – at some time or another in processing, probably during listing – you will have finished a list and will not yet have Q’ed-and-A’ed, see? And at that moment you will see a needle undergoing a slow, pleasant rise and, less usually, a slow fall. It would be flowing. That’s all it will be doing – a flow.

You can see that needle flow. This is particularly true of a Mark V. I – a Mark IV doesn't even begin to express it like a Mark V. But a Mark IV will also express it. And there's that needle, and it's just – you can't even begin to approximate it with your finger on the tone arm because that is too irregular a rise. You understand?

It is a total uniform speed. There is not the faintest tick in it! There is not the famous – faintest speedup! There is nothing. It is just like molasses pouring out of the barrel. And there it is. And *that's* a clean needle! And that's how I want you to get your needles before you start nulling, and you won't have any more trouble.

And I'll bet you right now there's several amongst you who don't think it's possible.

Well, I can tell you that it isn't possible to null with a needle any other way. If you put your big mid ruds in, your needle will look like that unless you clean a clean or miss a read. Absolutely faultless mid rudiments will give you that needle. And if it *doesn't* give you that needle, you've missed one or cleaned a clean! You've goofed!

There isn't a pc that you've been auditing lately that I couldn't have a clean needle on in the course of fifteen or twenty minutes, no matter what they've been up to, with just the weapons you're using – big mid ruds. Just that, nothing else.

Look, please. You're in over your heads on 2-12, trying to figure out what you do on 2-12. And your trouble isn't with 2-12, see. 2-12 actually is very simple.

There's various things about 2-12: You always oppose a rock slamming item. Opposing is senior to representing. If you don't get an item which is unmistakably it, you extend the list. I mean, these things – these things are easy. These things are easy.

The trouble auditors have trouble with is the fundamentals of auditing, the fundamentals of auditing. And let me tell you, you start goofing up with your TRs, you start goofing up with your meter, and you now have a process that somebody looks down your throat and knows you have been.

If there's anything wrong with 2-12, it is so positive in its gain that anybody can tell you've been goofing. In other words, 2-12 starts showing up any fault you have with your TRs, your Model Session and a meter.

Before, these could be submerged into the upsets and vagaries of the pc. You'd say, "Well, he's having a hard time, but he'll come through it."

There's only one period during 2-12 when a needle looks some other way or when a session looks awry. And that's when you're about a third or halfway through a list, you're getting up toward the end. It's hot. The pc doesn't want to confront that next string of rock slamming items. He starts throwing little brakes on, little protests and that sort of thing, and you clean it up and it goes dirty and you clean it up and he goes dirty. Or when you are – as you inevitably will, as any auditor does – try to null an incomplete list, a list which is almost nullable. It hasn't got the item on it, but it's got enough charge off of it so it looks like it can be nulled if you keep your mid ruds in. When you get yourself into that situation, yeah, your needle will look rough, but you smooth it out. And then it looks rough, and then you smooth it

out, and it looks rough, and you smooth it out. You should make up your mind sooner or later that that list is incomplete.

But the point is, yeah, there are periods during 2-12 when somebody is snarling, see, and when the needle is this way. Because after all, the pc is undoubtedly going to get misemotional. Undoubtedly the pc is going to develop some somatics and say no. Undoubtedly some great big crashing rock slam is just over the horizon.

The pc sits there and he says, "Well, that's – that's complete. That was the last – the last item I put on was it. Yeah. 'Fuddy-duddies. 'That's the last one. That's a – that's it. I know it's on the list now." Sell, sell, sell, sell.

You look at the needle – looks all right, nothing wrong with it. Make a few tests one way or the other – looks all fine. You go back and try to null the thing and now it's dirty and it's this and it's that and it's the other thing, and you're in trouble all the way. You decide to extend the list and find out three more items later he had a dial-wide rock slam. That was what he was trying to get complete before he reached.

Oh yes, there are periods during 2-12 when the meter looks awfully, awfully gammy and messy. But when you've got the list complete, and when you put in those mid rudiments to test that list for completeness – which test, by the way, is only a conditional test now. You've got to make a full test the way I gave you in the first place to really find out. "Is it complete? Are there any more items? Have you thought of anything else that should have gone on the list? Could there possibly be anything else on the list?" – Any of those questions produces a reaction, the list is incomplete.

Just stating the question itself, which I gave you to try to help you out was – made it too easy for you, because it doesn't deliver the goods.

We're talking about, now, a clean needle – a clean needle. And a clean needle looks like molasses being poured out of a bucket by a statue. There's just no slightest vestige of anything on it. So there's another E-Meter characteristic. There's another ;meter characteristic that has not been stressed, because one has talked about it, and it has apparently been so obvious, but there's a lack of communication here. And I realized last night that there was a lack of communication.

I'm not blaming you for this lack of communication. I mean, I'm not blaming you for not having – its not having gotten across uniformly and universally. Not blaming you much. Of course, you don't know what the hell's the matter with you. But it's all right. I'm being calm about the whole thing – within reason.

There's this thing called a clean needle. And the definition of a clean needle is something which flows at a uniform rate of speed at a period when the auditor is doing and saying nothing. That's a clean needle. And dat's da way they ought to look.

Now, you should realize that there's a reverse to this. It's something called a needle pattern. Well, a needle pattern isn't exactly a good statement of affairs. Pc comes in and he's always going tick before he goes tock. And the needle's going up and it goes tick and then it

goes tock. And then it goes *pit-pit*. And then it goes tick and it goes tock, and then it goes *pit-pit* and so forth. And he always does this. Well, that's what's meant by a needle pattern. It is a chronic and constant needle behavior on a particular pc, when the auditor is saying and doing nothing. We have to add that. Its not a needle response, it's a needle appearance when the auditor is saying and doing nothing.

Now, a needle with reaction on it is a dirty needle. And that's why we don't need to requalify the definition "needle pattern." A stage four needle is just a big needle pattern, and people will have these chronic patterns. But that's not really what we're talking about. We're talking about a dirty needle.

What is a dirty needle? You think it's a needle that's going *bzz, bzz, bzz*. It's a needle which doesn't look like molasses being poured out of a bucket by a statue – any tick, any roughness, any slight speedups as it goes. It's strictly a Cadillac with an automatic shift moving off on a perfectly billiard-table-flat highway, driven by an old lady.

A dirty needle is any needle which departs from the appearance of a clean needle.

And we've got a dirty read, and it goes *bzzt and bzzt* and it goes – it's a little tiny thing, and so forth. And actually a dirty needle is not just a dirty read magnified.

Now, a dirty needle has nothing to do with the auditor. The auditor is not doing anything. The auditor is not doing a thing. All these needle patterns and responses and behaviors and everything else I'm talking about is with the auditor sitting there totally Japanesed, withholding his foul breath from the pc's face, you understand? Auditor doing absolutely nothing. Of course, you get a dirty needle when the auditor does absolutely nothing. But that's beside the point.

Now, add this into your auditing. Take that meter – pc is on it – take that meter, and just hold your breath for a count of five and watch that meter. You haven't put any question to the pc. All cycles of auditing are complete. All cycles of auditing are complete. And just watch that needle. And if that needle is doing anything but flowing at a perfect uniform rate – or could be still, but the probabilities of that are very, very faint – if it's doing anything that has any irregularity in it of any kind whatsoever, that is a dirty needle and your middle rudiments are out! You got it?

And you want to develop this practice of just sitting there for a count of five and watching the pc's needle. It tells you a libraryful. And that is the state of the needle. You observe the state of the needle. And the state of the needle is not where the tone arm is. It's not how sticky the needle is. It's not how unsticky it is. It is whether or not it has any ticks or tocks on it.

And if it's got any ticks or tocks and halts and *zzppps*, and anything else... And you understand, those are to a microscopic degree! You under – this is a very extreme statement I'm giving you, see. *Anything* beyond perfect, unchanging, uniform action is observable – that is a dirty needle. And that means your mid ruds are out!

Now, if you've audited 1,865 hours on a pc with the rudiments out the whole way, it'll probably take you 25 minutes to put the rudiments in. You understand? It not only can be done, it is what I expect you to do. And if it isn't done, it's what I would consider a goof!

Now, that assigns some very difficult problems to you at various times in auditing. You get this raw-meat pc or somebody who has been audited by, oh, Frank Sullivan. And you get this character, and *whaaaa!* Man, that – you can't even tell which way the needle is going, because it's going both up and down at the same time! It is a mess. Goes *bzzzt* and *tick, tick, zzzp!* *tock, tick-tock pawk*, as you sit there and watch it, see. Daaah. That's going to maybe be a little bit rough now and then, until you get your first reliable item.

On such a needle of extreme filthiness – on such a needle – you actually can't expect too much till you get your first RI. You get a grooved-in list going, and you will see that needle go *bzzrp-zzp* – clean. Just, the list is going. And you've got the list about three-quarters complete, and you'll start to see this needle come clean. Marvelous!

I must remark on that, because that is the easiest way to clean a needle. That is the easiest way. But it offers this slight difficulty: You have to assess – you have to assess before you can list it. And of course the needle is so filthy that the assessment – assessment is almost impossible. See, so it's that period when you're doing that first assessment on this case that is rough, rough, rough, see – that is probably your most critical time in auditing. And that period, on any pc you will do, lasts only the length of time it takes you to get an accurate first assessment. It shouldn't last any longer than that.

In other words, in the total time of auditing the pc, the tendency of the needle to be or become filthy should not last longer than the hour or so necessary for you to find the takeoff point. You know, not per session, not every assessment. Going to have this pc for fifty hours, it's one of those fifty hours, and it's the first hour. And you hit it right on the button, and you don't miss with that assessment – that assessment is dead center – and as you go down listing that list, you'll all of a sudden notice that needle, and it's – be cleaning up. And by the time you've got the item you're going to find eventually on the list, ifs a rock slamming item. And you've got that item on the list, and so forth, that needle – when you go back through for the nulling ifs just nothing.

You say what happened to the dirty needle?

Now, sometimes you'll be unlucky and you'll hit a dead horse, and then you'll hit another dead horse, and you'll hit another dead horse – something like that. Well, every one of those first assessments is ghastly. Because the dead horse is doing minimal to change the needle from filthy to clean, see. It's doing a little, but hardly anything about it.

When you find your first hot item on this pc – just in the process of listing, even before you null it out – you're all of a sudden going to see the needle go *hhaha*; all the tension come out of there.

That doesn't mean the next time you go up the line that it's not going to charge up. But after that you find it's very easy to get the needle clean by putting your middle rudiments in.

And before that time, that's the only case that I would think – I wouldn't make any brag of getting it in, in fifteen minutes, see. During the first hour, I would make no brag about it at all. Nor would I spend any time on it.

I'd decide, if anybody's needle was that dirty, and he'd been around auditors that long, he probably rock slammed on List One. I'd be much more likely just to read off List One, bang, bang, bang, bang, bang, looking for the – looking for the slam. And then it slams, and I might or might not even finish the list. I'd just find the slam, and I'd say it a few more times and I'd pull a suppress or two, and I'd make it slam, and I'd say, "That's good enough for de old redhead. We going right in, right here and right now, and we gonna oppose the living daylight out of this." And I'd have my item, see.

I wouldn't waste any time on this. You start doing picky... And by the way, those two facts go together. The odds are very much in favor of this pc rock slamming on List One if that needle is that filthy and that hard to clean up. So you're kind of saved by the bell on that one, aren't you?

All right. Now, we go into this situation of what is a clean needle, and let me say this: There is nothing which will substitute for pure observation. Needle characteristics have a tendency to become misinterpreted. One of those needle characteristics is this: a rock slam. And you want to ask how in the name of God can anybody misinterpret a rock slam, but it has happened! People have looked at a rock slam and said that isn't a rock slam.

Well, a rock slam is simply a slashing Agitation of the needle, that's all. A dirty read is a buzzing Agitation of the needle. A rock slam's always got a slash in it. And the dirty needle's always got a *i-zz-zzp* in it. But there's no slightest substitute for observation of one.

Now, there's a rocket read. Well, I can describe a rocket read very well. Figured it out. It takes off – it always goes to the right – it takes off with a very fast spurt and does a rapid decay, like a bullet fired into water. It's very fast. It goes *psswww!* It looks like it's got all of its motive power from its first instant of impulse, with no additional motive power being imparted to it by anything. It's kicked off and it has no further kick, so it just rapidly dies out. How wide is it? That's a silly question. I've seen them from a sixty-fourth of an inch to a dial. See, they're any width.

Now, a rock slam can have its first slash mistaken for a rocket read – if the auditor has never seen a rocket read. Because that first slash looks like a very rapid, hectic motion, and they say that must be a rocket read. But actually, it doesn't take off with a spurt. It's of uniform speed, and it has power put to it the whole distance of its slash. In other words, there's a motor driving that one. It doesn't kick off and do a rapid decay. It's uniform speed. And it stops suddenly. It doesn't decay; it just goes *bah* – stops suddenly.

That first slash is more commonly to the left, not to the right. And you'll hear people talking about inverse rocket reads. Well, they're seeing the first stroke of a rock slam. There is no reverse rocket read. If you tiger drilled it up a little bit, you would see the second, third and fourth stroke occur immediately after that first stroke.

I was quite interested. They didn't know whether somebody was a rock slammer or not, because all they could get was the first slash going to the left. That's good enough, man. That's a rock slam. It's not a rocket read.

Now, we're into types of needle characteristics not covered in *E-Meter Essentials*. And these characteristics of the meter have all emerged in the past year. Not the rock slam. We have known it for years and years and years. But the importance of the rock slam – oh, we've known something about that. But that a rock slam could be as small as it can get and be a rock slam – well, I'm afraid we didn't know that. It can be awfully tiny. See, you can forget your “inches of measurement tells us how – whether it's a rock slam or not.” A rock slam is definitely itself. I've been studying them lately, and they're definitely themselves.

The other day I saw one that was a – something on the order of about a sixteenth of an inch was its first stroke. And then it went into a dirty needle – dirty read. Sixteenth-of-an-inch rock slam stroke, and then the remainder of about a fifth of an inch, or something like that was a dirty read. I saw the two crossed right there in the same read. I was quite interested in – when I drilled these things up and did a little something or other to them – to find out that it held good – that that was what that was.

Gives us terribly interesting point: Should we have opposed that item then or represented it?

Well, we're representing it and it's delivering rock slams, but I don't know but what that shouldn't have been opposed. Time would tell.

So there is a point there, which you will strike almost never, where your adjudication can become confused about it. Was it a dirty read or was it a rock slam? And the only thing that's confusing about it is that a dirty read is quite different than a rock slam. It looks like an electric buzzer going and it doesn't look like anything slashing. And a rock slam always slashes. It's the difference between tickling somebody on the sole of his foot with a feather and chopping his head off with a saber. I mean, the two things are quite different.

And there's this business of – this business of the rocket read that should never be confused with even a one-stroke rock slam because of its fast decay. Now, this – we add to these data, here, the data of a clean needle. And that takes – that takes something – is something new that has been defined. It was one of these “everybody knew” things up until this time – and it's not one of these. I mean, nobody evidently understood this thing, because otherwise some people keep saying, “Clean up that needle.” The Instructors around here have been saying, “Clean up the needle, clean up the needle.” And the auditor, in many cases I am sure, has been saying, “Well, yeah, anything been suppressed? Yeah, there was a suppress on that.” And pull the suppress and get the needle – gets a few things from the pc, and say, “Well, I've cleaned off several reads. So therefore it must now be a clean needle.”

He didn't realize that the shirt on the line was not being worn or used at the time it was clean. See? I mean, there it was. It was either plastered with mud or it was snowy – Daz, Tide-water white, see? See, it was – it was the needle when nobody was doing anything that we

were talking about. Nobody's doing a thing. Just sitting there looking at the needle. And that's what determines whether it is clean or not.

No, all those little ticks and tocks and so forth come under the heading of your big mid ruds, plus – which also includes missed withhold – plus perhaps a very, very heavy shakedown of... Well, a case might be so anxious, the case might be so this and might be so that, you couldn't get these things in, but nevertheless those are the buttons which make it dirty – they're the buttons contained in the big mid ruds. That's why they are those buttons.

Now, there are a couple – three other buttons that have influence on this. But actually, if you clean up the main buttons you get the others too. There's the matter of shifted attention. This is not a button that you would use. I'm giving you an example. You could have 135 buttons and all that big mid ruds, don't you see? And it'd all be very complex. But the truth of the matter is there are none necessary. This is one of them. This is a very – a very nice one. This is a very nice one. This'll lead you astray any day of the week. "In this session, has your attention been shifted?" See?

Well, that – that's almost valid. It's almost good enough to be part of the big mid ruds, because you've got somebody whose attention was yanked off his list or yanked off the auditor, or the auditor did something unexpected; you get all the points of surprise out of a session, see.

Surprise is simply shift of attention. I've known that for a long time. And you can clean a couple of little ticks, and a couple of little reads off the thing, and that sort of thing. But in actual fact, it isn't good enough, over a broad usage, to be employed as a big mid rud. It isn't good enough. There are a lot of others this way.

Now, every pc has a favorite button. They have a favorite. You learn this faster prepchecking than otherwise. You do an eighteen-button Prepcheck and you'll find out that every pc you – every pc you do an eighteen-button Prepcheck on has a different favorite out of those eighteen buttons, see. This guy runs hotter than a pistol on Decided. And that bird runs hotter than the devil on Suggested. And they tend to have favorites.

Now, you're getting up toward doing a Prehav assessment just to get your mid ruds in, when you expand beyond a very small number of rudiments. You go beyond eight or nine buttons to get in mid ruds in a session and you are being ridiculous. Because if you're going to go any further than that to get Big Tiger or big mid ruds, you see, well, why don't you do Prehav assessment?

Why don't you get the Prehav Scale out, and do a full roll-your-own-and that'll deliver the case right into your lap. Actually the needle will straighten right out, because you've got the exact button now that is causing the needle to be anything. Only the difference is, is you're – you're no longer doing 2-12. You're doing Routine 2. That was the earliest ancestor of 2-12, see.

Oh yeah, you can do Routine 2. You do a Prehav assessment and run this thing repetitively on the pc, in a fi – or, in a five-way bracket. Marvelous! A lot of cases gone right

straight up the graph and everything. It's a nice – it's a nice process. It's pointless. But it's a nice process.

You can change somebody's graph all over the place. If you just wanted to be an HGC D of P and be able to shake paper in front of the pc's face... The pc'll be very excited about it too. And you just want to shake paper in front of his face and, "You want to know what gains you've got? Well, good, good. See, you went from the bottom to the top, see?" Pc feels good and everything is fine. Probably be back at the bottom again next week, but that's all right.

Point I'm making is you really didn't do very much in the way of shifting mass or anything else for the pc that had any lastingness. It was lack of lastingness that sealed the fate of Routine 2. It didn't last. You have to actually find items. You have to find items, and those have to have some mass to them for a case to get any kind of a shift.

In the first place, this ease has got item one bucked into item two. And the reason item one is held in suspense in time is because it is exactly balanced against item two, which is held in suspense in time. And actually, even do Routine 2-12 badly, you have still upset that balance. You're not going to murder anybody with this, and the case could get an enormously better gain, but sooner or later that balance is going to – going to shift. It'll stay out, in other words.

It's like – it's like the fellow's leaning on the wall. And he could lean on the wall, and the wall lean on him, you see, for quite a while. But you take the fellow away from the wall or the wall away from the fellow and you haven't got the status quo anymore. This situation is no longer this kind of a status quo.

Well, in view of the fact that it isn't quite the fellow leaning against the wall, but a wall leaning against a wall, you take either wall away, the other wall will fall down. That's more the architectural pattern of the two dumbbells of a package.

So you can unsettle that status quo, and you can unsettle it in a variety of ways and it's never the same again. It doesn't recharge. But if you wanted to get the full benefit and never have anything hanging in your way at all, you'd, of course, neatly pick up the package. And the benefit there is ten, fifty times more than just softening up one side of it.

You soften up one side of the package and the other one tends to be unbalanced and not be as effective and hang around and aberrating the pc, but it's still there. And you leave too many of those things, and the pc starts getting confused. He doesn't know what he's leaning against now. And he doesn't feel he's had much of a gain. And if you want to know – if the pc wants to know he's got a gain, you actually got to find both of them.

You'll run into 2-12 some guy that you list the whole thing out, you think, and then you don't find an item. And then you – you found an item, and then you oppose it, and list the whole thing out, but don't find an item. You don't find anything to lean against the first item. And you'll find the case – the case tends to feel funny. Well, the case will say, "Oh, yeah! Lots of gains, lots of gains." And two days later he'll say, "What gain?" See, he's not in the know that he's had much of a gain.

He might have gained, you see. The two noses that he ordinarily wears – one of them might have disappeared, you see. There might have been quite a change in the guy, but he won't know it. In other words, this doesn't affect the knowingness to the degree that finding both sides of the package does. Now, you've got to go ahead and find both sides of the package in order to do that.

If you kept on doing that, finding just one side, and finding one side, and never finding the other one, and one side... You go up the line about six – this – six unfound, bypassed items in 2-12 – you think you've found them but you haven't; you know, they didn't – nothing rock slammed on the other side, you see – you'll find your pc starting to be nattery, starting to look kind of seedy.

You go back, then, and complete those lists and find the rock slamming item in each case, and this pc takes off, and you wonder how the hell you ever considered that you'd ever seen a pc gain before. Because the gain, now" that he – that he gets out of just extending that list a bit and finding that real item there is phenomenal. He now knows he's gained, and the gain is terrific.

In other words, you could make a little old gain that compares to processing of years past. Everybody's satisfied with this gain; they're happy with this gain and so forth, but it's not a skyrocket gain. There'll be a lot of people around as time goes on... They'll be – they'll be further out on the fringes of Scientology, you see. You'll hear this receding as a statement: "Well – well, 2-12 is all right. It's as good as... Oh, it's probably better than a lot of processes we've had in the past." You'll hear that kind of a statement, see.

Actually, that statement will get more and more further out away from where people know how to do it, you see. Because if you do it right, and you get both sides of each package, and so forth, there isn't any doubt left in your mind whatsoever about the power of 2-12 compared to old processes, you see. It's tremendous.

But you know, when you are looking at somebody making that remark, you're looking at somebody who never completes a list. He just – he just confessed. He just signed, sealed and delivered a confession that he stops lists when the pc tells him to, and that he never finds the final item, and that he's perfectly willing to say, "Well, they both dirty-neededled, so it must have been a package."

"I told the pc it was a package – didn't have much to say. I told him, though. I was very satisfied with the intensive myself, but he was having wife trouble at the time at home, I suppose, and therefore he didn't think he got much gains out of it. But I could tell that he got gain."

Any remark made like 2-12-you know, about 2-12 like that – that's simply saying auditor didn't complete the list, or always made a habit of representing that which rock slammed. It – oh, no-no-no, I beg your pardon. I beg your pardon. That's another breed of cat.

If an auditor goes on representing what rock slams, he'll have this idea of 2-12 – get a little better reality here: "Oh, that process. I don't see what you people see in it, you know? I don't know what you see. I was running it on a pc. I was running it on a pc, and as a matter of

fact, she didn't look too bad. She just had sciatica. And when I finally finished up, she looked about ninety and had lumbosis. So I don't see what you see in that process."

Well, that's the direct result of doing one of two things: of representing rock slamming items – thing rock slams like crazy so you represent it (you do that very often, and particularly on List One items, and your pc just about goes around the bend) or you didn't finish the cycle of action. You See, before you got an item on action A, you got tired and started in on action B. And before you got an item on action B, why, you started action C, hoping somehow or another it would all come out all right. Now somebody'll have to come along sooner or later and complete action A. And it will all come out all right, long as action A is completed.

That's failure to complete a cycle of action, will produce an adverse result, particularly if the pc is very interested in the cycle of action and you didn't even vaguely complete it. That's the best. If you really want to cave somebody in with 2-12, that's my strongest recommendation. They're going there, *pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa*, and you – you're sitting there, and you're watching the needle, and you don't know what a rock slam is. That'd be a good one. You think it's pc body motion or something and say, "Well, it's a dead horse."

The pc's saying, "Waterbuck, tiger..."

And you' say, "Wait a minute, wait a minute. This whole thing's a dead horse. We're going to do a reassessment on some other list."

Pc – he's just left in a sort of a stunned state from there on. Actually, he will remain in that state until somebody comes back and says, "Well, who or what would oppose an ink pot?" whatever it was, see. And at that moment he'll take right off again. "Oh. You want them? Waterbuck, tiger..." clang, clang, clang, clang, clang.

Now, this idea of requiring a clean needle before you null – I've got to get it across to you. Because the beauty of a Mark V is that it expresses a clean needle much better than a Mark IV. And when you've really got the thing cleaned up, you can see a needle characteristic. That is to say, it's a type of needle on the Mark V. It is visibly a type of needle. And you'll get spoiled by a Mark V.

You'll see this thing, and it's just like turning on the light and turning it off, you know. And you'll see this needle, and it's just beautiful. It's just flowing. It's lovely. There isn't a ripple in the thing of any kind whatsoever. And this meter expresses that gorgeously.

And, boy, you know those rudiments are in. It'll spoil you the next time you'll take a look at the needle on the pc and you'll – it hasn't got that characteristic. And although the needle isn't reacting in any way, you'll start chewing on the pc trying to put it that way. You'll be absolutely right. There will be something – something that the pc has there that is making it some other way.

In other words, the Mark V, oddly enough, expresses a rudiments-in pc. It is a way it looks. And that description is just the ne plus exclamation point ultra of the definition of a clean needle. It really looks – it looks quite different. You'll see that needle – you'll see that

needle one day on a Mark V and say, “What do you know.” Actually, the pc is sitting there without a thought in his skull. He’s just perfectly happy for you to go on, and not go on. It’s quite interesting that the Mark V expresses a clean needle.

Now, if there’s just the slightest suppress or just the slightest withhold or the slightest anything on the case – it isn’t in a needle pattern; it doesn’t go so far as to make a tickety-tock and a slickity-slock on the thing – it just doesn’t look clean. It is still flowing, but it doesn’t look clean.

It is a very interesting thing. I’m calling your attention to that on a Mark V because sooner or later you will – if I call your attention to it, you’ll watch for it. And you’ll suddenly say, “Hey, what do you know! This thing does. It tells you one more thing. One more thing than the Mark IV tells you. It tells you how clean the rudiments are, just by the fact that the needle is moving, and there it is.” You want to look for that one.

Now, you can harass a pc in trying to clean up a needle until it looks like a game of battledore and shuttlecock. “Well,” you say... You see a little tick on it, you see. And it’s going tick and a tock, and so on. “Well, what are you thinking about?” This is one of those broad, wide-open-door questions that doesn’t focus the pc’s attention in any direction. He doesn’t know what he’s thinking about. If he knew what he was thinking about, it wouldn’t tick.

“What are you thinking about?” you say. “Yes, well you must be thinking about something.” And he’ll try to – he’ll think madly to find out what he is thinking about, you know? And he gets completely lost. He doesn’t know whether he’s coming or going.

So you’ll see the needle now, instead of going tick and tock, is going tick-u-tock, tick-u-hc-tock. And you’ll say, “Well, I don’t know; I really can’t get on with this list, and I’ve just made up my mind that we will just sit right here until you tell me what you are thinking about.”

And hell say, “Oh, my God, what am I thinking about? I must be thinking about something. Must be pretty powerful if he notices it on the needle, this particular way.” By this – this needle now is going tick-hic, tick-hic, tick-hic.

And eventually, break down and ask him just the mid rudiment questions, one right after the other, and hell find out *what* he was thinking about. It’s much better to put in the mid ruds than it is to give them supergeneralized questions.

Now, there’s one exception to this. When you’re going down a list, you’re nulling away down a list, and all of a sudden the rudiments go *bzzzt!* out from under – you know, more the heavily charged the list is, you know, the more a pc’s think reacts on the meter. See, the pc’s think associated with a charged list reacts more heavily than a pc’s think on a no-charged list. And as a matter of fact, on a no-charged anything a pc’s think wouldn’t register at all. So on a heavily charged list – you’re going down this list, and ifs going to have a dial-wide rock slam when you finally find the item and you hope it’s complete, you’re not sure, you’re going on down the line – you’ll notice the needle is getting less and less flowing.

Nothing has happened to the needle yet. It's not doing anything peculiar. It just is less flowing. You see what I mean? It's just less. It hasn't done anything yet, but it's less right than it was. All of a sudden it goes all wrong, and starts hiccupping. Well, you can't do anything at this point.

Now, if you put in the mid ruds every time you did that, you would rapidly get into a great deal of trouble with the pc, because the pc just starts screaming. It's no-auditing, don't you see. Well now, the pc can't see that that needle's so dirty you can't null with it. Pc is unaware of this fact. So a very good stunt is not throw at the pc, and not push rapidly at the pc – never push anything rapidly at a pc – but just twist your paper around, and ask the pc which of these he has had any thoughts on. And let him go down the list.

Now, show him as much of the list as the needle has been getting worse on. And hell say, "Oh, well, no, I didn't" – usual response – "No, I didn't have any thoughts. I didn't have any thoughts on that one or that one... Oh, wait a minute. 'Gladiator.' I thought isn't that a hell of a silly thing to have on this list – 'Who or – who would cook well?' see? 'Who or what would cook well? 'Gladiator.' I thought that was a silly thing on the list. I don't know what's the matter with me, putting that on the list. That couldn't have been it. So that's all."

And you start to lean back – "Oh, yes! Oh, yes! Heh! Yes, this – this other item – this other item – I thought, by golly, you know, that – that's it. That's it, you see. 'Cook.' I said that-that-that is it. And then I thought, 'Oh, no, that couldn't be it.' Yeah, and that's all I've done... Except this last one that you just asked me on. This-this last one down here. This last one down here – uh – I didn't understand what you said."

And you say, "All right, thank you very much," pull the thing back, and just continue nulling from where you were. You'll find out that is a very interesting little trick.

Now, a pc develops another allergy to that, by the way. The pc knows you're going to do that when he – you – he sees an in, an in, an in, an in. He knows that paper's going to turn around and come his way. But actually that does far less harm than knowing he's going to spend the next half-hour battling with the auditor about mid ruds. It's all in the speed of auditing.

The rudiment that goes out on checking – and particularly goals checking – the rudiment that goes out is this "Anxious about." And that's really why it's in there. You're going to see a rebalancing of these rudiments very shortly into a very proper, better order. But it doesn't change your small rudiments, and it doesn't change your Small Tiger Drill. Those things are – compare one with the other.

But getting a needle clean – getting a needle clean is an operation which takes all needle pattern, all jerks and all ticks off, when the auditor is doing nothing, see. The – it has these things without the auditor doing anything, and it doesn't have these things with the auditor doing nothing. And then you see these character – this characteristic of a clean needle. And that's what a needle ought to look like before you start nulling anything.

That's what gives you in, in, in, in, in, in, in, in, in, in, in. And you say the list is incomplete. No, the list *isn't* complete. Incomplete! You're trying to null with a dirty needle,

see? Maybe the list is incomplete too, but even if you had a complete list, if your rudiments are out and your needle is dirty you say, “waterbuck,” and it’s – just the auditor speaking makes the needle tick. See?

The pc, in essence, has a withhold from the auditor, and thus is peculiarly vuler – vulnerable to the auditor’s actions. He’s just – even though he’s just invalidated something, you see, the auditor doesn’t know that he has. It isn’t enough to make the pc critical of the auditor, but it is enough to make the pc think extra thoughts all the time. See, it individuates the pc. So he’s not so well under auditor’s control. And you’ve got an individuated pc, and the pc thinks there, *pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa*, think-think-think-think-think. Every one of these things will have to be picked up.

And the more they’re out, the more the pc individuates, the more the pc thinks. So it just is a dwindling spiral. Now, you start to do a list that is complete with a pc with a missed withhold, the pc is individuated, the pc’s going to think some crashing thought every five – every five items you say, and so of course these things are now going to react and stay in, and so on.

Now, the Mark V will be cursed by pcs who believe that the thing at 128 is unfair. In actual fact, the Mark V is not one bit more sensitive than a Mark IV. In spite of the guts of the thing. The guts are much more complicated in a Mark V than a Mark IV. But in spite of this, it actually doesn’t register any more than a Mark IV does – if you’ve got fly’s eyes. All it does is take what the Mark IV is registering and amplifies it.

And whereas it’s almost undetectably tiny on a Mark IV – you don’t know whether it twitched or not, on a Mark – you see it did register on the Mark IV – on the Mark V, when you turn it up to 128, why, that confounded tick was one to two divisions wide. See, that’s what it does. All it does is amplify the read. The Mark IV always read it, providing you had fly’s eyes. See, this is nothing more sensiti – one meter is not more sensitive than the other. But the tiny manifestations that would be microscopically small on a Mark IV are visible on a Mark V, and that’s all. The Mark V is a more visible meter, not a more sensitive meter.

That’s very important to an auditor. By the time you put a magnifying glass up on top of a Mark V, man, have you got it made. You can read anything.

Now, at that level, you pick up all the analytical thoughts of the pc. You pick them all up. And the pc who has been audited on a Mark IV and has been getting away with blue murder because the auditor didn’t have fly’s eyes, gets into a Mark V and he feels like he’s going into a buzz saw, and he’s liable to start cussing the Mark V. “Yeah,” he thinks, “well, I hope that doesn’t read.” And the auditor says, “What was that?”

But let me tell you, if you never clean a clean, and you pick up every read and you clean those – in other words, you always clean up the needle, and don’t erroneously clean it up – a pc’s protest against mid ruds starts going out on the subject of the Mark V. It starts getting less, because the pc, of course, has less missed withholds from the auditor. And eventually they die out and stop yapping about it.

But at first, when you shift a pc over from being audited on a Mark IV to a Mark V, you can expect a little bit of trouble, because the pc's days of liberty are at end. The day when he could think all those nasty thoughts about the auditor and get away with it are over, because the auditor can see them.

But the Mark V *does* give you this flowing manifestation. The Mark IV does too. But the Mark V, it becomes very, very visible. And you know that thing. "Boy," you say, "that's the cleanest set of rudiments I've seen in many a day." There's only one other way to get the same manifestation, and that's just ARC break the *living daylights* out of a pc! And you'll get the same manifestation. It has to be a very severe thing. You say, "You know that withhold that I – that you told me last week about Betsy Jo Ann – well, I – today I was on the phone to her parents, and they said..." see, something like this, you know. Multiply that by five or ten more, and you will get a very nice, flowing needle. I don't recommend that you do that. I recommend instead that you audit the pc.

Thank you very much.