

REPAIR OF R2-12

A lecture given on
13 December 1962

Okay, this is Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, lecture number two, 13 December AD 12.

Well, there's nothing much to talk to you about now, you know everything. And I noticed at the end of the last lecture you looked a little bit disheartened.

And there is a direct law concerning your disheartenment. There's a law that embraces this. It's the more you goof the more disheartened you will get! That's a law. We're now not dealing with a – an area of – we hope the process can be tailor-made for the pc; we hope the process works on the pc. We're not dealing with that type of material right at the present moment. We're dealing with open and shut material.

And it's always very dismaying for an auditor to fool around with something like that, because there's only one person that shows up, and that's the auditor.

Now, for a little while, an auditor who's being shown up has a tendency to try to kick back against the material. He's – not producing a result, he thinks, or he's goofed up, so he doesn't know that the material will produce a result. So on a technique such as 2-12, it is necessary that somebody be shoved hard through to a win. Actually, it requires a subjective and an objective win on the part of the auditor.

If he wins on a pc, and he gets a win on it himself he consistently gets some more wins, showing that it wasn't a fluke, now, he knows very definitely that it is the matter of his auditing, and it is not the technique.

Now, this is a hard thing to confront. It's something like somebody saying to you suddenly, "Be responsible!" And *heh-heh-heh-heh!* That's kind of a nerve-wracking situation. You could always lay it off on something else.

Now, R2-12 has the characteristic however, of producing results if it is done right. Now, oddly enough, it'll produce results when it's not done absolutely right. And therefore is fairly hard material. You will at first regard it as very critical material, and you will hear – have people around in organizations and so forth, telling everybody that it is very, very difficult, and that they have to study very, very hard, and they have to this and they have to that. And after they've passed 115 checksheets, and run around the block on their hands and so forth, then they will be permitted to sit in and watch a session in which an item is being found, you see. You'll get this kind of stuff.

Actually that is not the approach which I advocate at all. The approach I advocate is: take the guy by the scruff of the neck, throw him into the session, say, "Produce a result." Make sure he's getting audited on it at the same time. So he gets a subjective and objective reality. Then his interest is piqued. He sees something is happening around here. And then he wants to know why it's happening around here, and therefore he studies it not just as a grind or a rote, but he studies it as something that will do something.

And that's a lot different than the attitude of, "Well, if I study this very hard I will get a Class IV," see, or, "If I study this very hard I'll get a Class II," or something like that. No, it's "If I – there is something here. And if I study this, why, I will be successful with pcs."

Therefore the pc – the auditor wants to know all about it. He will – "How does this thing work?" You know, and obviously it just has an unlimited number of variables. It's just obviously, when you first look at it, you'll say, "Oh, my! *Heh-heh-heh! Oh-oh-oh!* This thing must have hundreds of laws, you know, and there's all kinds of special cases, and special conditions, and there's all kinds of this and there's all kinds of that and how devastating, you know!" And nevertheless, he still stays fairly willing. And just like I did on you in the last lecture, I throw something brand-new in your lap and say, "Get a clean needle before you start nulling."

That's pretty grim! And it'll be grim right up to the moment when in your next session you get a clean needle. Then you take a look at the thing, and you say, "Hey, what do you know! *Wha-ha-ha-ha!* Here's one of the damn things!" And you say to the pc, "Look! Look! I cleaned your needle!" Goes tick, tock, thud!

But the process, the routine, R2-12, is specially designed in training, and its training is based on that. Walk before you read a book about walking. And then you want to know how to walk, read a book. In other words, get the auditing done. Get auditing done.

Now this only has one liability. You've got to have somebody around who has to know how to untangle a case. And that's the subject of this lecture. If you're going to let all these people sit there in a co-audit and audit, why they've got to have somebody there who's backing it up. And who can untangle all these wild goofs that are being made. Because these goofs are going to be made, man. And this, of course, is all part of it.

This person is sitting there, and it's kind of a rock slammy kind of auditor anyhow, and he's sitting there and he says, "Now look! *Ha-ha! Heh-heh!* Look, look! I-I opposed it just like you said! Ha! No item! Pc looks like hell! Ha-ha!" You got to know the right answer. You say, "You do so-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so." And then hover over him like a dark, vulture shadow, make sure that he does just those things. And he finds himself sitting there looking at a result.

This kind of surprises him. And when this happens to him and so forth, fine. But supposing several of these goofs got by, as in any large group doing a co-audit, supposing several of these goofs got by. And you've got a case that's hanging its head. Well, now, the basis of the training of 2-12 is: use it; see that it produces a result; and let that auditor get a subjective reality on it. That modus operandi is totally defeated by one mucked-up case.

Well, R2-12 won't muck up one case and be beneficial to fifteen more, providing somebody knows how to untangle them. Well, as many of you, right at the present moment, are in the stage of getting a good solid reality on R2-12, you're not yet up to the stage of untangling a case. And I threw you an awful bomb, in the last lecture saying you've got to clean up a needle and that's what a clean needle looks like. And in fact it laid you out cold. I might as well do the same thing in this lecture, and say, "Well you think you're going to know all about R2-12, well, there's a special technology on top of R2-12 of how do you straighten out a case that's been goofed by R2-12." See, so it isn't enough to know how to do R2-12, you got to know how to straighten out a case that has been goofed on R2-12.

So you'd be very interested that this whole technology consists of simply then doing R2-12 right. And the only crime that is irreparable – there is one irreparable crime – is to lose the guy's papers and reports. You can't do very much about it – if you do that. So that becomes the one thing you have to safeguard.

And one of the ways of losing reports is careless labeling. You don't have the pc's initials and the date and the page number and the question being asked on a separate sheet of paper, see. This piece of paper then can drift. Here's a long sheet of paper and it's got all kinds of names on it and items on it and it goes down to the bottom, but it joins up with nothing else and you don't know where it came from. One fine day somebody drops the folder. *Heh-heh-heh-heh-heh-heh-heh!* That's all that can wash up a case in R2-12. Take my word for it, that's all that can wash it up.

So it doesn't become just a weird idea to label each separate sheet, see. It's not the top of every page. It's just let's make sure that every sheet, see, every separate piece of paper, has the pc's name, the date, and the question, even in shorthand. Let's suppose he's opposing roses. It's at least – says, "W/W Op Roses." See. And maybe that's a four-way sheet. One of these big folds. Well, actually, it only has to be on that sheet once, because nobody's going to tear that sheet in half That's – makes it an identifiable sheet. And you can get the folder back into some kind of shape.

Now, it's very interesting that in the last two or three days – oh, not the last two or three days, in the last week – I've sorted out several cases, two of them very noteworthy. Mary Sue was sorting out one last night, or night before last, rather. And let me tell you. If it hadn't have been for those labeled sheets, why, we just would have been from nowhere, see. But because those labeled sheets existed, and the thing could be assembled back into sequence, which it had fallen out of, we could find out what the devil had gone on from the lists.

And in one of them there was a demonstration – had actually picked up a slamming item. The item had never slammed since and that was what the case was hung on. *Heh-heh-heh-heh-heh!* See? Just a fluke that was right there in that demonstration. There it was, R/S slant, R/S slant, R/S and then out. All right, so it went out in a demonstration, that doesn't mean very much, because the case had several dead horses, one right after the other. So looking for a List One item, which was R/Sing.

So, in patching them up you want the papers. And when – you let anybody do R2-12, as long as they'll keep the papers. But they've got to keep the papers. That you got to impress people with. Because you can really goof a case, irreparably, if you haven't got the papers.

This compares to goals. One case has gone on and on and on and on and on and on and on. Went on and on and on, I don't know, the case must have written two-three thousand goals. I finally got very, very curious about it, and sent cables everywhere, and I finally picked up the terminal that gave the pc's goal. And that was the pc's goal. See? Finally managed to run down, in other words, the piece of data in folders, that delivered the pc's goal into our hands. It was on another list, see.

You will run into that too. You'll be looking for the pc's goal, and the pc's goal, and it isn't on any other list, you start going back and nulling lists. Looking and looking and looking and looking. Then you remember there was a goals list in a *Handbook for Preclears*. Pc's goal appears as number one on it. See?

You get kind of nervy when you realize that most of those *Handbook for Preclears* that people have been filling out over the years have been thrown away, and they're not any longer available. There was a little goals list.

But with R2-12 it is even more important. We now have the techniques that if you did them long enough on the pc and followed down along the track long enough, the goal would finally dump out in your lap. He isn't totally stopped. But supposing somebody has stopped R2-12. R2-12 then becomes, in its papers and administration, becomes more important than a goals list.

Now, I was down digging through folders – some of your folders – in the last few days. I was very, very, very impressed, with the near possibility of not putting the ease back together again and in one of these cases the *key list* was only two pages long. *Heh!* The auditor had called it a complete list, see. We didn't know what it was or what question had been asked; it didn't appear on the auditor's report. And that list had been picked out of the pc's folder by the auditor and had been put in his own papers.

We were tearing the place apart trying to find that one sheet of paper. Now, when you figure out the number of sheets of paper that go through your hands on R2-12 – any one of them, you see, might contain that one piece of data. And we found out what we had to know: that that list was only two pages long and that *two* items had been found on it, neither one of which R/Sed. The list was not complete and we had found where the bypassed item was. Very, very interesting. Case had hung up there. That wasn't what we immediately started to work over the case with. We started earlier than that on another bypassed item, which we got record of, which I myself had remembered. I remembered it. It was not part of the pc's record.

That's how touchy this sort of thing can be. Mark down what happens. Mark down what R/Ses. I don't care how many notes and scribbles that you add to sheets of paper and lists – how much data there is there. The key data that you want is: Did it R/S? Were things R/Sing when they were written down? In other words, was it a rock slamming list? Was there one rock slam on it, at least? Pain and sen isn't as important in listing or nulling, it isn't as

important to note pain or sen because you can make a special test for that. But it's sure important to note down when, what, which R/Ses.

DR is not as important as an R/S. But a DR tends to become important on a list that you're going to represent. But what this list came from, what was being listed, how many pages does it consist of, you know, numbering those pages as you go down the line. And what did you do with it? What did you do with that item? That becomes very important. The tiger-drilled items, and this in almost every case, auditors don't make enough notations on. When they tiger drill it what happened? Did it R/S during cleaning buttons of the Tiger Drill? And then not R/S when they said it?

You know, little – little pieces of data. The observation of what happened while they were tiger drilling this thing can be of considerable benefit. The auditor's report is not as important as the list. Because you always confirm the auditor's report by finding the list to which it relates. My auditor's reports on 2-12 are rather sketchy. I'm usually going very fast and too – too much on the fly to get very much down on the auditor's reports. So i tend to put it down on the lists. But I sure try to put lots of data down on lists. And then I'll go back and summate the session as to what the results of everything was, and put any piece of data that I had on the auditor's report. In other words the auditor's report doesn't become a long column of TA reads.

Matter of fact, TA reads are relatively unnecessary. We don't much care what happened during the – during the listing or during the nulling. We really don't care whether the TA moved or didn't move. It's relatively insignificant. But what is significant – the needle behavior. That's very important. And go back at the end of the session, I've got the TA at the beginning of the session, I've got the range of the TA during the nulling, and I just make a note of that, kept it on the list, see. Just say, well, it was high and low and it was moving fast, or something like this, any kind of notation. And then very detailed results of the session. *Results.*

The auditor's report, then, does not become an action report which is blow by blow during the session. It becomes a summation report, which is just what it is. It says "report." Meaning, "This is what I did during the session." And he writes it up with great rapidity. And he said, "We tiger drilled wedding bells and it all came to nothing. I guess the list is incomplete. We had four items in: cat whiskers, catfishes, and wedding bells and tarts. Pc couldn't add any of them up." I don't care what he says in the auditor's report. This is the final conclusion of the session.

And then some hint as to where it should go from there in the auditor's opinion. Future. "Tomorrow I ought to..." See. "Case needs wedding bells tiger drilled, or the list completed." "Case has got to have Scientology organizations opposed." And even if he isn't going to do it tomorrow, this has become obvious that this has to be done. In other words what should be done with a case should appear on the auditor's report.

And the results of what the person did should appear on the auditor's reports. In other words, that auditor's session either added up to nothing, or it added up to maybe, or it added up to a win. And it doesn't matter what it added up to – the auditor shouldn't be sitting there

trying to give anybody a sales talk. All you want to know is, did you get anything done? And the pc says... Of course you've got your goals, you got your LOL, Life and Livingness, you got your gains, you got these things noted on the report. You've got a couple of cognitions the pc had, something like that. Generally they give you some horrendous cognition or another, generally enough to give the cognition that they recall in their gains. That – if it's that big it'll last over to gains, you see. Not interested in the little tiny cognitions. But basically what did we get done in this session? See.

“We nulled three quarters of the list and had a hell of a time keeping in the mid ruds. List looks like it's incomplete.” Now that isn't anything more than a guess, he'll find out tomorrow the list was complete or he won't find it out. In other words, it doesn't have to be a proven fact what his guesses were on the thing. In other words he doesn't have to be right in these reports. But the report consists of basically what was accomplished and what should be done. And if you get those into the reports you'll save a lot of pcs' bacon.

Also, an Instructor looking it over can say, “Hey, don't – you know that – that's a bum one. You say this ought to be represented. It's slamming, man, it's slamming. You never represent a slamming RI. You just never do that.” And he can catch this up, don't you see, on marking reports.

Those are the important things. The list itself stays as an integral part of the session, of course, and usually when I'm through with a list I'll pin the report to it. You know, give it a staple or something. I know you don't have many staplers available. But that's when I'm all through with a list. I'll keep a list I'm using floating on forward in the folder. It's perfectly safe for that to happen, don't you see.

But the point I'm trying to make, here, is the first point of repairing a case is having the data with which to repair the case. And you look back, an auditor's report, if you say what should be done with the case by end of session you've made up your mind what you should do with a case. The auditor's reports of that period say... I don't care if somebody's D of Ping it, see. The director – somebody is – somebody is saying, “Now, now the thing for you to do is, you've got to represent these three additional items which you found on List One,” and that sort of thing.

If the auditor thinks something else should be done, well, put it down. It doesn't come as a source of argument. Nobody will be insulted about it. It's on the basis of, “We'll go ahead and represent the remaining items on List One, but I think personally that 'cat whiskers' should be opposed.” At least somebody trying to put the case back together again goes back through that thing, and he says, “Hey! That auditor there thought 'cat whiskers' ought to be opposed at that time, it must have been quite a slamming item at that time.” So he goes on in and investigates “eat whiskers,” don't you see. And he says “Aha!” See? You could pick up a point there, with which to put the ease back together again.

But now, lay aside the idea, as of now, that there are endless rules in R2-12 – there are not. If you got the idea that there are tremendous numbers of special cases and awful variables, and all kinds of things like that, and there are special things that you do here and there, and so on, you'll – you'll be in a state Of defeat about putting a case back together

again. Because you say, “*Look* at all the tremendous variables which could be done with this case.”

First thing you start out with is there are only... Well, the chief thing that will louse up a case, really louse a case up, is to take a rock slamming item and represent it. Now, I can tell you from experience that that will louse a case up. It won't louse all cases up. It won't louse them up every time. You understand? But every – every few cases the thing that should have been opposed was actually represented and you get the roof coming off. Particularly if it's a List One item. And that's peculiarly true of List One items.

You want to make your pc look like he's eighty, and the roof has fallen in, why you just take something that's slamming like mad, and say we'll make the pc look good and we'll represent it. *Yaoww!* You just done him in! See, that's the tension – the attention factor, see. The pc should be watching at this fist coming toward his nose, and somebody's saying, “Dear, do you want your coffee?” Splits his attention up. He has kind of a feeling like he's going nuts all the time he's doing this represent list.

He knows he shouldn't be representing it; he knows he should be staying in there with the fixed bayonets, you know? And he'll go along with it and do it, the idiot! He'll be – tell you he's feeling fine, you know, and he'll look older and older and rougher and rougher. So then naturally if that's one of the things you mustn't do at the highest level, then that's the thing you should look for as having been done, in patching them up.

Did we represent something we should have opposed? That's your first question. Opposing things is senior to representing them. And that will account for a great deal. You find that somewhere along the line, it'll stand out like a sore thumb. You look on the auditing of the second of the month, and the auditing says, “Checked out List One, HGC R/Sing.” Or you find that old assessment and it says, “HGC R/S.” And on the auditing of the third of the month we get the piece of paper and it says, “Who or what does HGC represent to you?” You see?

Wrong wording, messed up, what's this? Oh my God! See. Should have been opposed, man! See? So you say, “That's it.”

Now in repairing a case, always take the first List One mistake as your first repair action. List One. That has priority. Not because we're trying to safeguard Scientology, but just because it does – has more bearing on an auditing session than any other single list. So it has priority. You patch up the List One goofs before you patch up some other goof And you'll find out that someday this guy – oh, you'll find a folder that will look something like this. It's almost impossible to even estimate the number of goofs numerically, the combinations of goofs, you see. Combinations can just be infinite.

Auditor plunged, found something R/Sing, see. Found something going R/S, so just took this, and represented it. Well, you don't quite know what it is. And it was his mother's aunt. Mother's aunt. Well, you say, that's a hell of a mistake, see. It R/Sed. If he found it. He didn't find it on any list. Where'd he get it? Well, he probably got it in the rudiments. Oh, well, so that's a highly suspect item already and actually will have very little goof-up for the case as a result. We don't know whether it was right, so on.

But we find out that the following Monday somebody got on the auditor's neck, and said, "List One! List One, assess out List One." And we find out that we had a DR on "Scientology books." And we look over the next folder, you know, the next list, and it says, "Who or what would Scientology books oppose?" That? DR? Scientology books – oppose? Pwt! Nuts!

It may say, "Scientology books, sen." And then "Who or what would Scientology books oppose?" See. Now, that's a nice basket, see, of errors. DR – well, you don't oppose DRs. The thing had sen on it, so it would, "Who or what would oppose Scientology books?" would be right. You see how you can patch it up again. But you've still got "My mother's aunt" back here, rock slamming. Well, just brush her off. Return her to the poorhouse or wherever she came from. Because it's your List One, your List One goof takes priority. That's the first one you put together.

The first goof you correct is a List One goof. And the biggest goof on List One is to represent when you should have opposed. Now oddly enough, you can oppose anything with less damage than reverse way to. In other words you could oppose a DR with less damage than representing an R/S. Quite interesting. But you don't even have to know a refinement of that particular character. You know that R/Ses should be opposed. That's just a rule. The thing R/Sed, so you opposed it.

Now, there's your – there's your first rule of patch-up, is take the first goof you can find on a Scientology list. Now, how many of these goofs can there be? There could probably be an infinite number of goofs, but there are fortunately just a few things to do right. Rule – head light rule is: If it R/Sed you oppose it.

Now, which way you oppose it has some bearing on it. And if you can't make up your mind which way – if it was opposed right, just tell the auditor to oppose it both ways, till one is going well, and then just keep on opposing it that way. Pcs often tell you fibs or they can't tell the difference between pain and sen or something like this.

Now, the closer things are to present time, the more possibly they will be coterm. See? Now a coterm is opposed both ways. "Who or what would it oppose? Who or what would oppose it?" And you'll find one of them after a little while will run smoother than the other one. So you use the one that runs smoother and seems to be producing more interest and action. Opposing a coterm is quite tricky. And therefore R2-12 has more of this trouble than 3GA Criss Cross because you get more coterm.

The guy's knees are in sen, and his skull is in pain. And it's rock slamming. All right, which way do you go about it? This is the commonest goof I'm giving you right now: didn't complete the list. That is the commonest goof and will probably be the commonest goof to the end of R2-12's days. And tried to figure out some way to make it oppose without completing the list – actually spend more time on trying to match it all up than in completing the list.

Now, one of the reasons the list doesn't complete is this coterm thing. Opposition lists must be completed because there's the perfect way to leave a bypassed item. You could actually keep on dumping represent lists without much liability. Don't worry about how many represent lists got dumped. No, just don't worry too much about it because the pc's attention

is not very thoroughly fixated on them. There's lots of R/Ses to be found in the bank, there's lots of items to come up, and that item will probably come up again on some other list. But the opposition, when you start to oppose something, you key it in. And the commonest goof on that on R2-12 is the auditor didn't hit it both ways to – I'm talking about the commonest goof is incomplete list – but the auditor didn't hit it both ways to.

See, he didn't say, "oppose it" and "it oppose" and sort out which one was slamming best. But just went at the thing in reverse because the pc said he had a pain in his back and neglected to mention all this sen on his skull for the excellent reason that he always has that!

So your patch-up action so far – let me trace this for you again – is to find the earliest goof you can find on List One. That's your – that takes priority. And get your opposition list – takes priority over represent – get your opposition list completed, and one of the reasons it didn't get completed is that it was a coterm and it was being opposed wrong way to. And the remedy for that, of course, is just to continue the list, swapping it around the other way. And you can actually swap it back and forth.

You can do half a page on "oppose-it" and another half a page on "it-oppose. You all of a sudden find that thing is just running like hot butter on "it-oppose" so just don't bother to turn it around the other way again, just let it run.

That's not infallible – that is not infallible, because the item may be – by this time has deaded down, so you can't tell whether it's R/Sing or not, or if it ever R/Sed. And it might be wrong source, don't you see? But if it's wrong source it never becomes nullable. That's your infallible test for wrong source. Never becomes nullable. Nullable is different than find an item on it.

Actually, a list which is from wrong source, if it's a goofed-up list, you can't get – you can't get ten items down it. You just can't. Just a dirty needle comes on, and it just all starts going to hell in a balloon. You're lucky if you can get three. That's a non-nullable list.

So, extend that list. That's high priority. And you must remember that there's a trick in extending an opposed list, and that is you reverse it the other way to. And if the thing has gone for a thousand items of opposition, and was nullable – if it was nullable on opposition it was not wrong source, don't you see? You can null anything that is an opposition list, if it was going up against a rock slamming item. And you get on down the line, it's gone a thousand items into this auditor's hands, and it hasn't produced any RI, well, you can just bet your bottom dollar it's been opposed reverse way to.

In other words, you were saying, "Who or what would oppose Scientology books?" And the pc *is* a Scientology book. It should have been, "Who or what should Scientology books oppose?" Now, what do you do with that list? Do you tell somebody to null it all over again? No. Here's a rule: *Never re-null*. I see on your papers you occasionally do. Why? If the commonest error is an incomplete list, why don't you just extend it and null what you've now got? Don't say that well, the guy just missed the item.

Now, let's get over into another department, now, I'd finish up what the – extend that oppose list. Represent lists, don't pay much attention to them. Remember we're patching this case up. So we're going to specialize in Scientology list first, we're going to specialize in

opposition lists and the commonest thing wrong with the opposition list is somebody's got it going backwards.

So that's not very much we have to patch up here, is it? Well, look it over. Can – you got those little points I just sketched over? That's actually not very much to look for, and not very much to patch up. That's what you're going to look for.

Next thing you're going to look at is another type of case. No, I'd better tell you the rest of the patch-up on this other case. You just keep doing just what I said. You take the next List One goof-up and the next opposition goof-up from it. See the guy had a long represent list, he had a rock – he had a reliable item on that and nobody opposed it! See?

So there's goof-ups. And you just keep doing this, see. Finding the List One items that had been neglected or List One phenomena that have not been properly reported or cited or something of this sort and then patch up the opposition lists that go along with it. See? All those opposition lists, get those all patched up. That's actually the basic fundamental of patching up a case. Just doing those things. No more than that. It's not very complicated.

Let's take, now, a different type of case. You take any new group on R2-12, you'll have a – several members of that group who will be – come charging in to you telling you that it doesn't work, in one phraseology or another. And this is another type of case to be patched up. You understand this is another type of auditor; that it's not going right. This is the not-going-right.

Now, in actual fact, you don't have to do too much to trace this one back. The ease that isn't going right is simply not going right because one of two things have happened: An R/S has been missed on List One and has not been opposed or somebody shifted the cycle of action. It's just those two things that can be wrong with it. Just those two things. R/S has been missed. And the other one is, of course, that somebody has knocked off a cycle of action.

Now, opposition cycles of action are always more important than represent cycles of action, so if you want to put the case back together again in a hurry, you specialize in opposition cycles of action. Which opposition cycle of action was not completed first? And you simply go back and complete that cycle of action, then take the next one consecutively and complete that cycle of action, take the next one consecutively – you get the idea.

In other words somebody wrote up an opposition list of twenty and it should have been two thousand. Something wild like that, see? And you get those cycles of action completed consecutively' The only thing that falls out of sequence, of course, is your List One. Maybe the guy didn't get onto List One until the fifth list was done. Some reason or other. Yeah, well, you're going to find all kinds of things. Didn't do List One, said that, "Well, we're only doing raw meat and they've never heard of Scientology, so therefore we'll omit List One," see. Something like that. And then finally decided to get onto List One, just to make a clean job of it, and then you see a great big goof, you see. You see "Scientology R/S" and then you see a represent list. Well, you push that one back to the first action which you undertake. And then from that one come forward with all the other incomplete cycles of action.

See, it's just List One that spoils this rule of take the cycles of action which haven't been completed from the first cycle of action to the – that was incomplete, till now. See, it's

just List One that pushes this out of order. If you ever get one like that you'll be scratching your head, saying, "I wonder which one I take up first." Well, you answer it with List One. And if you've got it answered on List One, which goof on List One was first? And you do that one.

See, it's List One first, or the first goof on List One first, and that's the way you put it together.

Now, you're going to see the dead-horse case. See, this case has been – this is dead horses, dead horses, dead horses. Nobody can see an R/S. Nobody can find an R/S on this case. And this just about drives everybody daffy. Well, this already is an incomplete-cycle-of-action case possibly. You're getting a lot of dead horses, look for that failure to oppose, particularly on List One. That is the big, exclamation point blunder.

Not because I say so and not because the gods say so and not because of any other authority, it just so happens, actually in this very room, there were about four cases that were laying lots of dead horses – highway was just getting stacked up with them. It was getting so the sanitary commission was going to complain – until the R/Sing item on List One was found and opposed. And at that moment the dead-horse phenomenon ceased.

See, that was – there's at least four cases that I know of right in this room that did just that. So that shows you that's fairly important. So important that on one case we simply just picked it out of the hat and said, all right. So the list at some time or another must have R/Sed. We're just going to write an opposition Scientology list. And we did and it R/Sed and it's the first R/Ses ever seen on that pc. Hah, this was done very indelicately, by the way. If I myself had been doing it as an auditor, I would have gotten ahold of the pc and I would have sort of tiger drilled some of the key things on List One, see, and so forth. But decided we'd just do this one blundersomely. And I said, "Well just oppose Scientology," and they did and it's now rock slamming like mad. Interesting huh?

Now, so it isn't because anybody has said so that this is true. If you can actually get these dead-horse cases. Now, oddly enough, the only dead-horse cases which we have are all under that category: R/Sing item on List One which wasn't opposed. That's every one we have. But then remember we're kind of a special group. You've had lots of auditing and lots of this and been around Scientology and orgs, lots.

So this is not – this is not a pure proof. So we can extend it over to saying that a case that is now laying dead horses has an R/Sing item which hasn't been opposed. This is a raw-meat case, he was a member of the 137th infantry, and he was just sent in by his commanding officer to be processed, and he's never heard of you or anything else, you see. And you're trying to patch up this case, after he's been run in a co-audit or something like that, all you're going to do is look for the R/Sing item that was goofed. It must be in restimulation. Must be in restimulation. Remember this is a patch-up lecture, it's not what you do with this guy. Whatever was done with him, there must have been an R/Sing item that wasn't opposed, and the case has hung up ever since. This case is just laying dead horses now.

So, if a case is doing nothing but dead horses, one of two things is true. First and foremost is: an R/Sing item has not been opposed or if opposed was not completed. And the

other one is: the auditor needed a white cane. This actually happened right here, that an auditor who was reporting no R/Ses was getting them. And wasn't seeing them. Didn't know what the R/Ses were. It's happened twice here. That sounds pretty impossible, but it has happened. So it's something that in case patch-up has to have some allowance made for, particularly in a co-audit where you don't have highly trained people. You'd have to watch for that one. And the question you ask, "Is the case laying dead horses?"

Now, what you do, you have to do an observation of this one. You let him extend one of the dead lists and see if it R/Ses. If you're auditing the case to get it patched up, why, nothing is easier.

Let's take one of these so-called dead-horse lists; let's sort it out this way: We find no evidence of any kind that the case has R/Sed on List One, we can't pick up anything with regard to that. We've even opposed something on List One, and told them to. Nothing seemed to happen, and we're just getting R/Ses, then we assume that the auditor can't see an R/S. That's sort of simple, isn't it?

Now, how you catch up with that one to patch it up, that's something else, because it takes observational time, and it takes this, but this nevertheless can exist. Now, you mustn't overlook that as a point. Needle is falling off the pin, you can hear it hitting both sides of the – of the meter clear across the room. "No, the case hasn't R/Sed," see?

You also will get complaints about cases R/Sing too much. R/S so much you can't get the rudiments in. Now, I just answered a question on this sort. Would a case continue to R/S while you represented something they weren't R/Sing on? And the answer is no. Fastest way in the world to turn off an R/S is just start representing on something that would become a dead horse. By the time you've asked the pc for three items you'll have no R/S.

In other words, the rule is that a case will only continue to R/S when the subject from which the R/S is coming continues to be addressed by the auditor. In other words, you have to stay on that subject to keep up with the R/S. A phantom slam doesn't do this. You have to be listing the right list to have the R/S on it. I'll give you that security. In other words, there aren't a whole bunch of cases whereby somebody just continues to R/S forever, even though you're listing peanuts. The case actually is R/Sing simply because they're protesting listing on peanuts. No. By the time you'd gotten the third item on peanuts the R/S would be off. You see what I mean?

In other words, your rudiments won't continue to R/S just because they are out while you're listing on something else. In other words if there is an R/S on the list, as you're coming down the line, you haven't got an R/S from something else which is lousing up your list if it's a nice continuous R/S, do you understand? There isn't too much R/S, in other words. People don't talk about peanuts and R/S on chimneys.

Now, even the phantom slam tends to behave. This is what's peculiar also. You don't ever get a phantom slam on an uncharged list, which should be very heartening to you. The list has to be hotter than a pistol to turn the slam on. And the phantom slam may turn on, however, and louse you up here and there on the list, as to which item is rock slamming while you are trying to straighten them out. But a phantom slam always comes on and goes off, and

comes on and goes off. And a phantom slam has this characteristic: that it never obeys the auditor. The phantom slam never obeys the auditor.

Your basic impatience with this type of case is they'll never do what you tell them, also. That's completely aside from the phantom slam. You say, "Has anything been suppressed?" and they don't think about suppressing something. They think about something else, and so forth. But right along with this, a phantom slam never obeys the auditor.

You've got a rock slamming item, catfish. And you say, "catfish." A phantom slam does not turn on when you say "catfish." But "catfish" turns on when you say "catfish." See, you say, "catfish" – catfish" is a slamming item, it slams. It start – it keeps on slamming until the pc's mind shifts, attention shifts, and the pc does a suppress. And you pull the Suppress and the Careful of off, and it slams again.

But because you're working with present time items, you can over-tiger drill your items. You can tiger drill an item to death. Tiger Drilling must be brief on 2-12. That's – that's a good one to remember. You can kill an item with Tiger Drill.

I've given you most of the data now, on case patch-up. Not very painful, was it?

Audience: No.

Now, you want to get fancy, you're going to get fancy now. And you're going to go back, and you're going to try to patch up this ease, case isn't doing too badly, you're going to look for List One oppositions, failures to complete cycle of action, incompletes. And the case that has dead horses, you're going to assume something must have slammed at some time or another on List One has been missed – that's your primary source of dead horses – or to some slight degree, that the auditor needs a white cane. Now, that's patch-up. That's not very tough.

Now, you in running a case are a different situation entirely. That's how you patch one up. How can you misrun a case? Well, I won't, give a lecture on the subject! We haven't got enough time! And we haven't got enough tape. Tape costs money! Time you've bought forty, fifty reels of tape, you feel it. We just would have scratched the top of the subject. So it's very lucky that case patch-up is so simple. Because the number of things that you can do wrong in 2-12 I'm sure have not been estimated. I'm sure that nobody could possibly do it. Because there'll be variations, variations, variations, variations. And I've long since ceased to try to outguess the number of variations there could be of a simple procedure. They're almost infinite.

I have had loses on this, man, my you – my self-confidence in my imagination has been staggered by this! I think I've dreamed up all the reasons why, all the variations that can be done. And my God, I'm always outcreated! I don't say that sarcastically, but it's just a little game that I sort of play. Well, I keep my eye open. Somebody's going to dream up a new one. And they always do.

But it'll be something is real in crosswise. You know? Like opposition lists actually should dirty read. Shouldn't they? Now if opposition lists consistently dirty read, why, then, shouldn't you represent what dirty reads, on the biggest dirty read that you get, in order to establish whether or not it had any rock slam on... You could – you could get these things

without count. You'll have all of these things pulled on you. So you better not get an idea that there are infinite numbers of special cases to 2-12. Otherwise you will feel like you're drowning. Because there are infinite numbers of things that can be done wrong.

This is one of them. And this is, by the way, the commonest. Somebody goes on representing and representing and representing – and this is also mentioned because this is part of case patch-up – representing and representing and representing and representing, and they get some slams, doesn't null, they go on representing, and they never check what they are representing. And they will leave a List One, particularly, item slamming like crazy! It didn't slam when they did the assessment. It just got a little tiny scrub. And they never, never, never go back to find out if the item that they're representing is now slamming. Because it will, being unburdened. Of course doing that – a listing, a represent list from an item, if the item's ever going to slam, *that* will make it slam better than Tiger Drilling.

If you wanted to make something – if you wanted to make something fire better, it was firing yesterday, it isn't firing today – it wouldn't louse up the pc if you got ten or fifteen items off of it on a represent. I don't advocate that. I'm just saying it would do that. Instead of tiger drilling it, get ten or fifteen items off You'll find out it produced the same effect. This thing is now slamming again.

So – but that's just ignoring a slamming item. They never check it. Nothing is ever checked out. Another thing that happens sometimes, and this is something that you should do with 2-12. Well, let's see, it's part of the rules, is when you're doing a represent list on something, well, check the item to find out if it is now slamming. You very often will find that the item that you're representing is now slamming. Quite often find this!

You've got – you've got situations where the auditor has just gone totally knuckleheaded about anything and everything in the book. But normally false reports will give you the least difficulty. False reports. They – you very seldom get a false report. There's only one thing the pc says that has been found out to be not too accurate. Pcs will tell you the truth in all cases but pain or sen. And they'll do a big sell on pain or sen. They can have that dull pressure against their forehead and say it's a pain and knowingly lie about it. See, they don't even make a mistake. I mean there's been too many of that. And pcs will tell the auditor lies. And also will tell the auditor lies about the fact that they're invalidating items. We found pcs doing that.

They don't want to list on the thing, so they invalidate the items as they hand out – the auditor. Well, they can only do that to somebody who was not demanding a clean needle before he started nulling or something, because all that material would have to be pulled up. But in final essence, the repair of a 2-12 activity is very simple. It just follows the exact materials I've given you. Doing 2-12, of course, follows that same thing in order of importance. The more items you bypass, the more gummy the case is going to be. That's for sure. The more times you try to represent rock slamming items, the foggier the case is going to get. The more incomplete cycles of action you stack up on the case, why, the less luck you're going to have.

So, running the case parallels repairing the case. That is the same rules of running the case. It's fantastic how an auditor will sell himself on the completeness of a list, try to put together items, how the pc will go along with him, there are only six items left in, each of them were DRing, and we finally packaged them up. You did! Where's the RI? It never occurred. And that, of course, you know right there, was an incomplete list. You never had a rock slamming item come off the list. Well, that rock slamming item never came off the list because the pc never put it on the list. Very simple explanation! List is incomplete. Which all comes under the heading of the patch-up I gave you.

This is relatively simple once you break yourself down on the amount of randomness and importances which you think you see around in it and actually groove it down to exactly what it is. It's a process of opposing rock slamming items and represent those that don't, in order to get rock slamming items so as to oppose them and so take apart the GPM.

The closer you enter to the auditing session, the less PTP the pc is going to be audited over the top of, so you have R2-12. There are other things you can do with R2-12 and you're going to get into an embarrassment someday, a horrible, horrible embarrassment, and that embarrassment will be this: Is you keep getting rocket reads on items. Supposed to be doing 2-12. Don't get rock slams, you get rocket reads. And sooner or later somebody's going to come to you with this terrible problem. Well, the first thing you do is establish whether or not it *was* a rocket read. And if it *was* a rocket read, a rocket read is superior to a rock slam. That's all there is to that. So the item rocket read, so you oppose it. Simple.

And then you do that and you're very, very embarrassed by the whole thing because the pc keeps continually intruding his goal into the session. What do you do with that? Well, the best thing to do then is to get the goal checked out and tell the pc whether it is or isn't and then go on running 2-12. That's your best repair for that embarrassing situation.

If you find a rocket reading item, your first action is to oppose it, of course. And then use it to find a goal with. If the pc hasn't already laid his goal in your lap. Or if you find a goal, get it checked out. Don't leave it in doubt! Don't have the pc sitting there for the next seven days wondering if that's his goal. Because it acts just like a wrong goal, all the way. No, get it checked out, get it checked out right now, and if you can't check it out, why, fine, clean it up a little bit more and check it out. Then the pc's got his goal, and you'll find out he'll do 2-12 better.

Remember that even though you do have his goal, is no reason he can run on his goal. We've had case after case that couldn't go Clear mostly because they had too much 2-12 bric-a-brac sitting in the session. And they were trying to clear across the top of a PTP. And you know that they could be forced all the way to free needle. But it never quite stays free. And that can go on for hundreds of hours – we already know – just because actually there's a PTP connected with the sessions. PTP connected with Scientology. They can't get across it, and it's always still there, and it never blows clear, and it's sort of like trying to empty a pot with the lid on. Can't be done. We've Seen case after case after case. In fact about 80 percent of all cases that have tried to go Clear are hung up on that exact one right there.

That's how important R2-12 is. It isn't a case of something that an HPA can do, or a simple thing, or a simple way to produce a good result on a pc, it is simply that people will never go Clear unless 2-12 is run right.

Okay?

Audience: Mm-hm.

Thank you very much.