R2-10 AND R2-12

A lecture given on
8 January 1963

Thank you!

Well, how are you tonight?

Audience: Fine!

I'm glad to see you again! I arrived just in time to save you from a fate worse than auditing!

All right, this is the what?

Audience: 8 January AD 13.

Eight January AD 13. The Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, lecture number one. The year started out beautifully; for days I received nothing but good news. On New Year's Day I had, oh, I think there must have been six or eight telexes, nothing but good news. You know, the most good news I'd ever seen. The next day of good news, next day, I think, then the fatal fifth arrived and we don't know – but what, that isn't good news too. And before I get on with this lecture where I have something important to say, I'll take up the US government.

The story is very, very briefly told. I've got it all in now, and all the returns are in and the casualties have been counted. But in August I wrote Kennedy; he was offered by me at that time help in the space race – speeding up the IQ, straightening out pilots.

And this, the White House has already asked us twice for presentations of Scientology and we've granted them, and they have done weird things like fire the fellow who asked for them and that sort of thing. But actually the president of MIT himself was fired, I think for trying to suggest that – at least it was within the same twenty-four-hour period.

And anyway, in August, thinking that it would be a good gesture I wrote him a letter concerning this, at the White House and time rolled along and the FDA suddenly became very interested and the organization was sniffing around the corners. And suddenly the US government – let's not compartment this thing down, see, it's just the government – issued a smear campaign in the Washington press, calling us all sorts of hard names, organized this thing completely, down to the last detail and actually the papers were on the streets before anybody appeared at the organization. Interesting, isn't it? Hours later somebody appeared at the organization.

Anyway, they raided a church and seized philosophical and religious texts for burning and meters. Armed raid on a church. Stop and think about it for a moment. How could they

get away with this? How'd they do this? Well the way they did this was lie to federal court! And they're in trouble! Today are they in trouble, man! They didn't tell the right name of the organization to the court and so got a warrant. But there is no doubt about who issued the warrant. It says right there, "The president of the United States," issued the warrant. Says so, right on the warrant.

And they didn't tell the federal court who the warrant was for. They said it was for the Distribution Center and the Hubbard Guidance Center and the Academy of Scientology. The premises of which are all rented by and under the name of the Founding Church of Scientology of Washington, DC. And they avoided the mention of books. So in the papers, no church was raided, no books were seized. Not in the papers. So they carefully corral this and they broke into the organization and actually made quite a mess of things.

They burst into sessions and snatched E-Meters off the auditing desks and they just had themselves a ball. They got down to the DCI, by that time somebody in HCO said, "Do you realize that you're raiding a church?" And this kind of slowed them down. And they got down to DCI and bucked into Anton and he was wearing his cross that day and they got much calmer. In fact they got awful quiet. And they came in like a lion and they went out kind of tiptoeing. They knew they'd collided with something and they figured there would be repercussions. Of course there will be repercussions.

The immediate thing that it – will happen – there's supposed to be – we're supposed to go to court to claim our property and give reasons why and actually this is very easy action to win. The warrant is false, all of the titles seized, almost without exception, predate the E-Meter. And they cant connect the E-Meter and these titles because the E-Meter wasn't even in existence at the time of most of these – like *Dianetics: Evolution of a* Science. Furthermore, they're Dianetic titles and Scientology is practiced at the church.

These things are very easy to win, this thing'd be a hands-down, our New York attorneys say crash-crash all we ought to do is go in and grab the property, and so forth. But our Washington attorneys say no, we had better use this to unseat the current administration. So they're not going to fight on the court day of the twenty-fourth, they're going to delay that and the – bunch of ads are being placed in newspapers in the Bible Belt, giving the salient dates and data which I have just got through giving you. Kennedy isn't in much trouble, you see.

And today something was mailed to Congress which is just reconvening. Every congressman's – senator I think the program said, would receive a statement by me saying I would like to have a meeting with President Kennedy, because I'm sure that we could settle our religious differences and that…

Anyway, it may be very well, we may even make them Scientologists. I frankly was getting worried, you know. We'd been ignored too long! Here we are, sawing away at the very foundations of "man is mud – man is an animal," you see, chipping away at the sacredity of psychology and things like this, you know, and nobody paying any attention at all, sooner or later was going to break someplace . . . I didn't, however, expect it to break on the note of complete insanity. And it couldn't have broken on a better note.

They – I don't think they did one thing right. See, once they got the error rolling they really did it up well! And they'll probably be hearing about this for years. Well anyhow, the main danger of it is that we get very fixated on the US government, frankly it isn't a big enough target to be worried about. And we spend a great deal of time, working, sweating, slaving, trying to push over the government when as a matter of fact it's halfway over on its back…

The thing which we should do is to, of course, get on with the job of good processing and so forth, and there's where we have it made. Not fighting the government.

The government – the government turns out to be its own worst oppterm! But I think – I think maybe if a few of the guys and I were holding a war council over in my office at 1927, trying to figure out something to get the government to do that would call some attention to Scientology, I think this suggestion probably would have been offered and we probably would have polished it up and I don't think we could have done a better job than the government did off its own little bat. So there we are!

Now, actually no auditor, no organization, nothing is threatened. They didn't – they didn't threaten anybody. And as far as that's concerned no warrants were issued for anybody, nothing like that, see. They did just a half – a half-delirious job and did it halfway, and – strictly straitjacket stuff. So anyway, the organization's going on as usual, everything's going on as usual, except those kids over there are doing meterless auditing right at the present moment.

I'm sure a few of them were smart enough, although they haven't put it on the wires because they're afraid it'd be inspected – I'm sure a few of them were smart enough to have their meter parked underneath their desk – or left home that day. And I'm sure there are meters around. Actually, there's quite a stock of old 57 meters and I imagine those things, you can – you can read a rock slam on one of those, you know?

So anyway, that's the sad story. Now, let's get on with something important.

You have been wrestling around now, with Routine 2-12, and this is a lecture on 2-10 and 2-12. And, show you what raids of that sort of thing do: they actually just slow down technology. I have a bulletin on my desk right now, which is one about half-written on a very fast, simple Routine 2-10. And you need it. But here's the gist of the situation on 2-12.

I put it in your hands, you've been wrestling with it, you find out what it's doing, what it can't do, what are the difficulties with it, and some of you have had considerable success with it. It's very, very good success you've had with it. And some of you have had moderate success and some of you have darn near chewed the pc to pieces with it, and some of you have almost spun in on it. This is a very varied set of results from one process.

Now, it's quite important that a process not give a varied set of results, so I've been taking complications out of this whole technology that you're doing, watching the mistakes you've been making, apprehensions and misapprehensions about it and have been boiling it down – boiling it down to its essentials and giving you far more indicators. When you see this, why this is true. And when you see that, that is true. Not leaving it up to any kind of

decision on the part of the auditor, he just sees – he sees the needle is acting this way and therefore he does so-and-so.

This – this is much easier to learn. Now before you go into eight thousand nine hundred and sixty-seven questions, all of which are based on a complicated comprehension of Routines 2-10 and 2-12, let me give you a dissertation on the simple, pure version of what this came from. Okay?

All right. The basis of this technology is as follows: You do a list – and this is not as it was, this is as it is – you do a list. You don't take a list, see, you do a list – this is the pure technology – and get that down to a point where only one R/S is seen on nulling. Only one R/S on the list on nulling. If you had more than one R/S on the list on nulling, your list is incomplete. Now, what do we mean, tiger drilled? No, no, just seen the first time you go over it. You call an item off, if it's going to R/S, it'll R/S, and that's all there is to that.

You got that as a step. You take a list. A list. Not – you don't take an arbitrary list, you take a list question. And having taken this list question, you complete it. And having found the item that that list completes to, you oppose it properly. Now, you could oppose it two ways. In view of the fact that you make mistakes in opposition – and you do, most any of your long lists comes from mistaken right way to or wrong way to, such as, "Who or what would a catfish oppose?" when it should have been, "Who or what would oppose a catfish?" – those are your long lists.

Why, just list it both ways. Just list it both ways for a page, just a page. And notice which one the needle was stiffer than the other on. In other words you'd list, "Who or what would a catfish oppose?" and noting the character of the needle and tone arm – tone arm plays very little part in this – and then turn your page over and list "Who or what would oppose a catfish?" for a page and, "Who or what would oppose a catfish?" gives you a looser needle than "Who or what would a catfish oppose?" The wrong way to always gives you a stiff, jerky needle. And the further you go on a wrong list the more the pc surges on cognitions and invalidations and that sort of thing.

In other words, if he thinks a thought and you're running a wrong list, why that would have been a tick early on the list and if it's – if you keep on going for another dozen pages it's a half-a-dial fall when he does this, you understand? In other words your needle manifestations are increasing and on a wrong list you have more R/Ses toward the end of the list than you do at the *beginning* of the list.

Let's take the second page of the list and compare it to the last page of the list: there's more R/Ses on the last page of the list than there are on the second page of the list, you probably have been listing wrong-way-to. The reason for that is the bank beefs up on a wrong-way-to. In other words, the bank is getting more solid, and so forth, and therefore your R/Ses become more frequent and et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. You understand?

Now, in other words, you could tell, there, right at the outset, a pretty good guess anyway, because you listed "Who or what would a catfish oppose?" and this needle is, see, stiff! And it goes: *Bzzz zzzz zzz! Bzzz zzzzz zzz zzzzzz! Bzzz zzzzzzz!* See, and then it maybe

goes a rock slam. Maybe not! Who cares! But it's just stiff! That thing is not going anyplace. It is not rising. It is not doing anything. It is stiff, man!

And the other one, you turn around and you list it and the needle is stiff for a moment and then – then starts – starts flowing and drifting around and so forth and you say that's right way to. And you'd think it was the other way around, but it isn't. Okay?

And that's your second item and then you get that one the same way – to one R/S, when seen when nulling. One R/S seen when nulling. Nobody said anything about Tiger Drilling. One hasn't even mentioned Tiger Drilling. This one R/S seen when nulling.

And when you get to the end of the line, that's your package. Now, what should happen when you find an item? On that first list or that second list, what should happen? I got some nice indicators for you here; you'll be very happy with these things. This makes it a little – make life a lot easier to live with. I've been looking for indicators like mad. In other words, I've been trying to put up signposts. I had a half a dozen signposts up on this road and I… There was this rock, see, this big rock and it was a white rock and I said, well that's good enough. You just go down to the white rock and there you are, see.

And a lot of you are having trouble with white rocks. So I now – been putting up signposts around the white rock, you understand? And then signposts beyond the white rock directing you back to it. And this indicator – this indicator you'll be very, very interested in.

If you give the pc the wrong item, he will instantly have more mass, perceived by him than he had a moment before – markedly, this is. Now, that's not pain, that's not sen, he doesn't have more pain or sen. He's got more mass. See, he – where'd this mass come from? Well, it came from the fact you just handed him a wrong item.

In other words, you say, "Catfish! Well, I got your item here, Joe! *Ha-haha! Ho-ho!* I got your item here! *It's catfish!"*

And Joe says, "…"

And you say, "All right, did you perceive something when I said that?"

"Yeah! Ruddy thing with a tail showed up in front of my face!"

You right away – wrong item. Now, let's not worry about what he perceives. Let's not get into this one, see? Now, we say – now, you understand, he had item – he had some mass there and he perceives it. But it's not more mass than he had before when you say this first item to him, you understand? He always knew he had this little mass there. See? But it's this kind of action, see? Here's your pc's vision area, the top of the desk here. And you say to him, "catfish!"

He says, "Where the hell that come from?"

Got the idea? And actually it's this visible! Now, you may only perceive it by something crushing into him hard. But, you understand? I'll do that again, see. Here he is, he's got a relatively clear field, see. You say to him, "Well Joe, I just found your item here! It's catfish!"

He says, "What? Where'd that come from?" You know, that sort of thing. "That's very interesting. Yes, I guess that is my item, I've always sort of been like that…" See, it's that kind of a reaction. "Oh yes, that's my item, yeah…" You know, wild burst of enthusiasm, you know!

Well, that's wrong source, wrong way to, or incomplete list. Of course you understand that a wrong way to is also wrong source. It's "catfish a oppterm" and it should have been "catfish a term." And – but a wrong source, wrong way to or incomplete list. Well, with this test, whereby you're going to list it both ways, on your opposition, you shouldn't be making many wrong way to's. So it usually would boil down to the fact that you just haven't got a complete list.

Now, if your list is incomplete another indicator shows up. Your pc, in the next few minutes will ARC break inexplicably. And you won't be able to get your *rudiments* in. And you can run General O/W and stand on your head and wiggle your ears and do all kinds of things, try to amuse him and get him out of it, but he's still ARC broken.

You find that the very reasonable auditor says, "Yes of course, I can understand how he is ARC broke, because I did goof and so forth." They don't realize that this extreme ARC break is from Routine 2. That's a Routine 2 mistake. It's not an auditing error. It's nothing the auditor did, except he didn't complete the list.

The usual fact is that when an ARC break occurs, it isn't really that you've gone by the item, in my experience it's been it isn't on the list yet! I'm prepared to find an exception to that, but I have not found any exceptions so far. It just isn't on the list yet. Now, here in essence, you get completely the reverse aspect when you package.

Here sits this thing here, see. Pc already – always known it's been there. And you come along and you say, "Well Joe, I've got your item here. It's a waterbuck!"

And he says, "Oh, yes? Where'd it go?" Right item, mass diminishes. Wrong item, mass increases. That's a handy one, isn't it? And you'll find that's quite invariable, that is the McCoy.

Now, if it's incomplete list – not wrong way to, but incomplete list – wrong way to he won't ARC break because he's been ARC break the whole – ARC broken the whole time – a little bit, but he won't – he won't go up in smoke. Now, when I say ARC break, I mean up in smoke. I mean he goes into complete apathy, or blowy, or something – it's quite misemotional. He'll be misemotional all through the time to the next session, and so forth. He's liable to blow up in your face. He goes out of gear, fast. And that's usually incomplete list. That's usually incomplete list.

You get all kinds of puzzles – I've got a puzzle right now. Where's Ray? Yeah, I got a puzzle right now, on his pc. I just wrote in there – I just wrote in his folder – he – doing beautifully, see, he's been doing just this. He's been doing just what I described to you, as this Routine 2 activity. And he's got two R/Sing items, ah-ha-ha, on his list, ha-ha. And, the items are on the first page of the list and he's gotten many R/Ses that follow, but those R/Ses evidently don't fire on nulling or he hasn't nulled them, but – or – but they're not firing on nulling.

Now, that list is incomplete, or he hasn't got the item. He has not got the item yet. And the pc says, "Oh yes I'm fine, I'm not quite up to understanding what this is all about," and so forth. There'll be reservations of this particular kind.

He just hasn't got the item, that's all. It's either later on the existing list, but I don't think it's ever been put on the list, because he's got two R/Sing items. He saw one of the items kind of go *pfiff!* and he took a little tiny "suppression of" off and it started to R/S about an inch wide. And he already found one of the other items an inch wide. And he – because he confused the second list he was doing with first list on Scientology, because the other item was Scientology. So he started to pick it up off the list. Oh, no! So I've got in there, big red letters, *"No,* no, no!" exclamation point. Complete that list. See?

Now, there's only one place where a pc knows, exclamation point, knows. A pc really – a lot of the time doesn't know whether it's pain or sen. A pc, a lot of the time doesn't know what he's worried about. And he doesn't – certainly doesn't know what his present time problem is, what is really eating him up – this always comes as a surprise to him. But he does know something. He knows whether or not it's the item.

Now look, if he didn't know what the item was, then the process would have – not be working. See, the item – see, it's only against the pc's knowingness. See, you're only auditing up to the pc's knowingness. So if he doesn't know it's his item, well, that's it. You've had it. That's good enough test right there, so that's another test. See.

Pc queases around even slightly on the thing. You haven't done it, man. Something's wrong here. He's got to say, "Oh, well, yes, catfish, always has been my item," and so on. You don't get that kind of response when you get the catfish, man. *"Oh! Catfish! Oh!* What do you know! Yeah! Yeah, catfish!"

See, a pc's knowingness is paramount in knowing whether or not it's the item. Not the – not the item you're representing perhaps, or something like that. But when you find an item, the pc knows it is it. And when you package it the pc knows that's a package. He won't even discuss the matter with you, that's it! See? But, if he isn't quite, "Oh, yes, yeah, oh yes, they go together as a package, yeah, yes…" That's not good enough, see?

"Oh well, of course! Yes! Ha-ha! Waterbuck-Tiger! Ha-ha! Golly! Funny I never recognized that before! You know, I often thought those that…" So on and so on and so on and so on! "Oh yes, of course that!" That's the kind of response you want. Got the idea?

Because if you don't get up to the pc's knowingness, where have you got to? You haven't got any other place to get to! Now, the funny part of it is that Routine 2 carries forward a little miracle all by itself, when it's done in this fashion. Now, you understand, I'm talking to you now, about just this Routine 2 I'm talking to you about, see? You do some sort of a list and complete it. Now, not – now understand that list is – I'm not even talking about it being from anything, you understand? See? Just do that list and complete it and then you oppose it and the two items go together and the pc knows all about it.

When you do that you get the funniest little miracle you ever wanted to see. They go *pffsssssffffff!* Gone! Where the hell's the mass? You no longer got a rock slam on one, you no

longer got a rock slam on the other one, you might have a little dirty needle if the pc had a withhold or something on it. But it's *gone pfffffsss!* But the mass is gone too.

So properly done Routine 2 delivers less mass, and wrongly done Routine 2 delivers more mass. Now, this is so marked you can even put the pc on a scale day by day. If the pc gains three pounds on Tuesday, he had wrong Routine 2 on Monday. See that? This is the old havingness test, you know? The thetan does develop energy. And the way he got that energy is you saying to him like this – this is where the energy came from, this is the three pounds that he got, see?

You said: "Well, well Joe, that's – got your item here, it's a catfish!" Three pounds' worth, see? Catfish!

Says, "Where the hell did that come from?" See.

Now, actually you didn't materialize it, as the auditor. Don't get spooky about the thing. Because the thing was there to grab. See, it was there to grab and it did have mass the moment his attention went on it, but the reason it had mass – is – it – was not fundamental.

See, it's like grabbing the third withhold from the bottom of the chain. It sticks. Now, the fact that you've grabbed a nonfundamental mass and told a lie about it, that it is the fundamental mass, brings about this instantaneous solidity. It doesn't take place tomorrow; it takes place right now. Bang! Funniest looking thing you ever saw. Funny – funny experience.

And then let's take up the next step, then, of – you might say, this is pure, theoretical and can be done, it's not just in theory, it actually works right out in practice – Routine 2. Then we find another way to list another complete list. See, we make another complete list and we oppose that. And this has not been completely carried forward, but maybe one of the easy ways to do that is to reverse the first list. Now we're invading 3-21.

One of the ways of listing a goal and crossing up Routine 2 with Routine 3, is one of the best ways you can possibly list a goal. This is a – this is a doll. You say, "In present time, who or what would your goal (whatever it is) influence?" See? And you make a list "influence." And that list has got to be complete to only one R/Sing item on that first list you do of it, see? It's complete to one R/Sing item and there it is.

And then YOU take that one R/Sing item, you determine whether it's the terminal or an opposition terminal, and at that time you oppose it, get yourself a complete list to only one R/S, seen on nulling – see there could be a dozen R/Ses you see, on writing it down – now, only one R/S seen on nulling. Now, how do you see this R/S? Well actually just by calling them off You say, "boots, saddles, catfish, waterbuck, uh – gulp!" There it went, R/Sed. Didn't do anything else to it. You understand? We're talking about R/Ses you don't do anything else to to get them to R/S, when we say only one R/Sing item. You got that?

We're assuming that your pc is sitting in the auditing chair being a pc. Not completely snoring with missed withholds, you understand? And we assume that the pc is not being audited up against a horrendous and screaming ARC break that you could have figured out that your Routine 2 was bad, day before yesterday and you haven't solved it yet. You understand? We're talking about a pc, he's in shape to have something nulled, not necessarily

a clean-as-a-whistle needle, but he's in shape to have something nulled and you're nulling it and you just see that thing.

Now, oddly enough you call it the second time and the R/S maybe won't be there, but just – that you saw it the first time is enough to say the list isn't complete. The way you do that – I'll give you the exact way you do that. You come down here and you say, "Waterbuck, tiger." Now, let's just get the idea of forty items between each one of these, see. But we say "Waterbuck, tiger," tiger goes *ffflflflfl!* Little R/S. And then forty items and then you're nulling, you see, so far, it's tiger, see. And then you said, "Willow wand," *ffflflflfl! Ha-ha-ha!* Your list is incomplete! And at that very moment you don't say to the pc, "Willow wand is your item," or anything stupid like this, see. You don't say anything to the pc, except, "Well, I think it'd be a very, very good idea if we added some items to this list." See?

I don't care if we got two more pages to null. Don't null a list down to the end before you add to it. Stop at the second R/S. Always at the second R/S! You got it? And after you've added to it, if you see no further R/S on your meter as you're adding to it, you either missed it – missed seeing it – or the pc hasn't put it on the list yet, so you better go a little further – heh! The pcs will sometimes argue about going further on a list when they got more to put on a list too, don't forget that. It's the delicacy of the auditor to get him to list further without making him list under protest.

Usually the pc lists under protest, usually only when the auditor's really goofed, the item is on the list, or is answering the auditing question some other way. "Well, let's see if I can get enough items on this list in order to get away… 'Who or what would oppose catfish?' so that I can get enough items on this list so that we can get away from it and do something else?" That's the question he's answering. See, he's not actually thinking over, "Who or what would oppose catfish?" at all! And you have to get that question there straightened out.

But anyway, it's always the second R/S. Now, after you've – after you've got – seen an R/S on your meter, here, you've gone down the line and you've seen an R/S – and by the way I'll bet some of you are pulling a gag I saw an auditor doing the other day. And here was the way they were doing this. This – this'll amuse you. They were listing with the meter over here on the extreme left. And writing over on their extreme right. In other words their pad was over here and their meter was over there, so they'd only occasionally be able to look in the direction of the meter. You got that?

Actually the meter belongs up there almost in the pcs chest. And this list, you can actually put your meter on the clipboard if you have to do it on a small restricted area. But for God's sakes don't be writing anything on a list further than about six or seven inches out in front of that E-Meter. You understand? Because as you write, the needle is in your field of vision, and you can see it out of the corner of your eye. So you never miss these R/Ses when it goes down. Do you see how you do that?

In other words, you keep your listing up close to the dial, and the dial in line. And if you can get the list, the meter and the pc in a line, you can keep them all in order. Just one line, see, straight out from the auditor, list, meter, pc. Why you won't miss these R/Ses as they go down. Be pretty hard to do.

All right. That's just a point.

So anyway, you've had your second R/S. So you added to the list. You saw an R/S as it went down, you say that's good enough. All right. You go back and you test your first R/S. Even give it a little Tiger if you want to, you know, just on been suppressed or anything of the sort, you know. This thing is now quiet. It's quiet when being called, quiet when being tiger drilled, it's quiet! There's no charge on it. See?

You go to your second one. Now, you understand, if there were two of them, neither are it! You want to… I got an auditor the other day on this, and the auditor couldn't get this either. Now, listen: *Neither* one can *be it. Why?* Why can neither one of these be it? Because putting the second one down didn't take the charge off the first one. So the second one can't possibly be it. It's never going to be either of the two that R/Sed. And you'll know if your list is complete now, if you can't get either of those two to R/S. Got it? So you test both of them. And if either one of them gives you an R/S your list is incomplete.

You could go on cycling like this but ordinarily you don't. It's usually just you find two R/Ses on the list and you continue the list and the R/S disappears off of both of them no matter what you do to them and you go on down the list and null the new part of the list now, and you'll find out it R/Ses like mad and there aren't two R/Ses on it, or anything of the sort. There's just one and that's your item, you tell it to the pc, you get the less – mass phenomenon, pc's happy as a clam with the thing, you oppose it, runs like a well-oiled dream. There you are. You understand?

But it's never either one of those that R/Sed. If you can get anything on a list to R/S by standing on its head, by shaking it in a paper bag, by putting brown sugar on it – I don't care how! See? If you can get anything on a list to R/S except the item, the list is not complete. You get two R/Ses on a list regardless of how you get those two R/Ses on the list – I'm not telling you methodology now, I'm just telling you the basic truths of life about the bees and birds. Two R/Ses – item not on the list. If either one of them R/S after you've added to the list, your list still isn't complete, because it can never be those first two. Got that?

And ordinarily those R/Ses are perceived just by reading. Someday you'll have the bad luck of having a very suppressed pc and you'll go down the list and when the pc listed the thing they suppressed it like mad and you'll miss the R/S and you'll know then, that you goofed. And you will have to do something extraordinary. And also, as far as I'm concerned the item is not on the list, because the pc inexplicably ARC breaks. There is no explanation as to why the pc ARC breaks and yet he ARC breaks.

You say, "Well it's a waterbuck."

And he says, "Well all right, it's a waterbuck. What do you know, I never noticed that over there before, anyhow, you know, it-it's-it's right all right, I got an item here that… Yeah, it's a waterbuck all right. Yeah, guess it is… But you know, I haven't been getting any of your acknowledgments lately! I wish you'd speak up!"

And you, heh! Don't do this, man! Don't do this, "All right, in this session, have I missed a withhold on you? Is there something I've nearly found out? Have I missed a withhold on you? Have I missed a withhold on you? Have I…"

"Well, yes! You missed a withhold on me. Of course you missed a withhold on me! Naturally! You haven't gotten anything I've said in the whole session! You don't acknowledge! Naturally!"

You say, "All right." Finally got him to say something, see? "Have I missed a withhold on you? Have I missed a withhold…" Two hours later: "Have I missed a withhold? Is there something you nearly found out?"

You could go on like this three sessions later. Trying to clean rudiments, "In this session has anything been suppressed? In that session when there was that terrible ARC break, is there anything you invalidated? Is there anything you failed to reveal?"

Now, that's taking the course of auditing to heal up gone-wrong Routine 2. And auditing won't heal up gone-wrong Routine 2, believe me. Take it from me, it won't do it. That's one of the troubles you're having, is your Routine 2 goes wrong and then you try to cure it up with auditing. And of course you're trying to put out the fire by spitting on it. It just doesn't go out, that's all!

Finally you get smart enough to say, "Somewhere around here I'll bet I've missed an item." Which of course is the biggest missed withhold the pc can have. And you say, "All right," so on.

"Well I don't want to list on that list, I've answered all the questions on the list, you got everything."

"Well just for fun, let's list on the list."

"Oh but I haven't got anything, yeah," and so on. "That's the whole trouble with the thing right now, is I'm listing under protest!"

I, about this time – say, "Well what question have you been ask – answering?"

"Oh, I've been answering 'Who or what would doodlebug a *wup-wuk,* or whatever it is, whatever question you've got, that's what I've been answering."

And you say, "Well all right, now, at any time have you answered it for some reason? Have you deeded something about this answer? Have you decided?"

"Oh well, yes! I deeded I put it on the list when I said 'tiger.' And, heh! I've been listing since, well, heh! What would oppose a tiger, heh? Heh-heh!"

He hadn't been listing "Who or what would oppose a waterbuck," see. Or he's been listing, trying to get enough on the list to make the auditor shut up. See, it's – there's something different going on here with the auditing question. Now, we're just down to the basics of auditing, don't you see? You finally say, "Well I don't care whether it's tiring you or not. It's evidently right way to, we've already stressed that. Apparently the source was okay. Apparently that. And the only thing we've got here that could cause this is you're not putting enough items on this list. So you just sit there and start giving me items, no matter whether you're ARC broke or not, goddammit! Come on, next item?"

"Oh, well, if you put it that way

Pc goes on, all of a sudden puts the item on the list, you'll see the thing R/S, as a matter of fact he's been fighting the item, don't you see? And see the thing R/S and boom, he's got it on the list, you check it out and it's all of a sudden that phenomenon happens, see? Where'd it go? You know? Whole package, if it's the second item, goes *psssss!*

And you say, "Well, how's that ARC break?"

And he'll say, "ARC break? ARC? What ARC, oh, oh, well, oh – oh that! I don't – I don't know why you were worried about it, I'm not worried about it!"

That's almost the only ARC break you get in this. Actually you can take it from a wrong source and the pc'll grind on forever just muttering, a little bit now and then. But you get these spectacular ARC breaks just when it isn't on the list, that's all. You got a few indicators now, on this? See this?

All right. Now, I said the stylized – the pure method of all of this was very simple, in that you completed the first list. Now, the more arbitraries you introduce in it – I'll take my hair down here and give you a few of the facts of life – the more arbitraries you introduce into any pure technology, well, the more trouble you're going to have with it. I'm not talking about signs, rules and indicators as to how to do it right. I mean the more arbitraries as to how it is done – that you introduce into something – which are unneeded, unnecessary to its execution, the more trouble you're going to have with it.

At the time that R2-12 was developed we were having a lot of trouble with rock slammers, and we were having a lot of trouble with this and that and the other thing. I coped with this best way I could and knew and found out – now listen very carefully – that R2-12 could be done at several levels of action. It – you could get several different kinds of results out of it. If you do R2-12 right, even against an arbitrary that's quite arbitrary, as your first source…

Well, let's say they had five rock slamming items on List One. And you pick one of those closest to the session; you do that you're going to make a change in the pc – just listing it, regardless of finding the item. And you list that out and so forth and you get the thing more or less complete and you find an item over there and you oppose it, see. All right, you're going to get change in the pc.

Well, let's say that this was kind of poorly done. And you found one of these rock slamming items and you listed it out and all of a sudden a huge mass materialized for the pc and you oppose that and so forth. Hell, man, you've still changed his mind! with regard to this situation, see? You still have. You'll still get a result.

Now, nobody, in what I'm telling you now, is invalidative of this, because I'm telling you on the basis of a – of an improvement of something that was already pretty good. Now, therefore, you could get a mediocre result that'd be quite impressive to the pc simply by listing a list, not even nulling it. See, you can even list the wrong thing and get some kind of a – of a result.

There are a lot of results to be had here. I'm here tonight trying to tell you how to get the purest, best result. I'm trying to tell you how to get a miraculous result. Now, I found out

in doing these other things you ran into more trouble than I ever thought you'd run into. Quite a few cases around ran into a lot of trouble – probably a lot of trouble in organizations right now, as they're doing it on staff.

So, let's move this thing down to its absolute essentials. And let's take a look at the source of any of these difficulties you have had. Now, any time you pick something, there's either of two sources of lists, actually. There's the present time – three sources of lists – there's the present time environment of the pc. There is the auditing environment of the pc, were talking about his livingness environment, don't you see, that's one list source. And then there's his auditing environment. You know, the auditor and Scientology and that sort of thing. And then there's parts of existence, as a source – so these three pet sources.

You'd say number one and number three might overlap and true enough they very often do, but nevertheless you can ask for them separately. Now, I gave you this in – this influence for the goal and this not-influence for the goal. That's – you already have the pc's goal, so you get two entirely separate attacks on the situation, "In present time who or what would your goal influence?" and you'll get a rock slamming list. And then you get – you've packaged that all up, see? That's all packaged, you want to take off again. Well, you're not likely to get much on influence in present time, but you can get a not-influence in present time. Gives you a rock slamming list, don't you see?

So you could say: "What is part of your life and livingness in present time?" and "What is not part of it?" This gives you two separate sources from life and livingness. Each one of them could be handled as a complete list. And each one of them damn well better be a complete list. That's your first list I just described to you, see.

Now, if one of them doesn't rock slam, the other one will. But usually if the first one did, the second one also will. So you've got two separate entirely different list sources in life and livingness. Now, let's take the session. Now, we got to find something that isn't rock slamming in order to get a list. Now that's a new look, isn't it? You never represent a rock slamming item. Just never never never. I don't care if it was done in 3GA Criss Cross. We got away with it then, for various reasons, because it wasn't long and we weren't packaging and we weren't doing it for keeps and we were just using it, it was softened off by goals.

But it becomes fatal to do this in a Routine 2. You just never – must never, never, never write "a represent" or "a consist," or "an influences," or "an upset about" – from a – or anything like that – from a rock slamming item. In other words, "In present time, who or what does your life consist of?" Well, that's a somewhat clumsy question but I'm just giving you an example here, see. And the pc'll go downhill like a toboggan, if your "life" rock slams. You got to test the source. Just make sure the source is not rock slamming. DR? That's okay. Rock slam? Boy, that is definitely not all right.

See, actually, you should tiger drill your source a little bit, see if you get a rock slam. If you get a rock slam, you do one of two things. You can either oppose it or skip it and take something else. And the best thing to do is skip it and take something else, you got that? Don't be so triumphant that you got that thing to rock slam because you'll be representing a rock slamming item and that's fatal. And you mustn't – that's a big rule – you mustn't ever

represent a rock slamming item. You only oppose those. Never represent, always oppose, a rock slamming item.

All right, so, "Your life…" *Bang-bang-bang-bang-bang!* You better not write "Who or what – in present time who or what does your life consist of?" you know, nothing like that, no, no, no, no, no, no. Because that's representing a rock slamming item, I don't use – care if you use "consist of" or any other such word, or "associated with" or any such wording will give you the same mess. No, you'd better say – you'd better say something or other that doesn't rock slam.

You'd better say "Who or what do you associate with…" associate with – associate with – it's all right, see…… in your life?" No, no, no, no, no. "Who or what do you associate with?" That's all right, you'll get a list there. Got the idea? This – in other words, you avoid the R/Sing source for a represent list. That's another rule. Avoid it.

Now, why do you avoid it? Because it's always out of the context of another list, which is always incomplete. So, you actually, to do pure, beautiful, magical Routine 2, you never pick something out of midair that the pc hasn't listed. You all of a sudden find "me," you know? Ho-ho! You say, "'Me!' Hey, that slams! Oh, well, heck! Now, we got to oppose that." No. You had better avoid it. Why? Because "me" is a part of a list you don't know the heading of and which is incomplete. You got that? That list is incomplete. And "me" is probably right out of the middle. And if completed would probably give you something else.

So just any out-of-the-blue rock slamming item that the pc presents to you, just consider it as part of a list that hasn't been completed. Now, it may or may not have been completed.

Now, actually there's no great destruction to doing something with that. But it doesn't give you total and optimum Routine 2. That's not terribly destructive. You've been doing it. But you notice how long those lists can run? You notice sometimes they don't complete? And you notice the great percentage of coterms that you get out of it. You notice that? And furthermore I'm finding out that it takes you longer to handle one of those than to find out what the original list was in the first place and get it completed.

Now Routine 2 goes very, very fast, on raw meat particularly. It's – well you take a session, you get a list. You know? Take a session and you null it. I'm talking about two, three-hour sessions now. I mean that'd be slow sort of Routine 2, but *pocketa-pocketa-pocketa*, see, you're always coming up with a result.

All right. What if you – what if you found that Scientology was rock slamming. Now, from a security measure and in actual fact, you could oppose Scientology and the case will make a gain. See, that's in actual fact. Even just oppose it and write a long list and abandon it and the pc'll do better. But that's got a liability. That list is liable to go forever, it's liable to be out of a context of another list. What's the title of the list? So we've got our life and livingness, see, type list and there can be positive and negative life and livingness. Unless one of them rock slams, at which time you'll have to find some way to get around that rock slam. See, don't do anything with a rock slam from source.

Avoid that random rock slamming source that came from no place, see. No matter how attractive it is. And your second is your positive-negative Scientology list. Well look what you're up against. Supposing the pc rock slams on Scientology. You can't say to him, "Who or what does Scientology represent to you?" See, because that's doing a represent. Now, how are you going to get around that? You're going to have to take some part of Scientology, or some way of stating Scientology, so that you're not representing Scientology.

It'll be – have to be something identifiable by the pc that doesn't rock slam, and then you've got the positive and negative side of that. What does represent it? What doesn't represent it? See? What is part of it, what isn't part of it, I don't care how you state it, you – it's the same list in actual fact.

And then, you have as your third category, also positive and negative; you've got existence, parts of and you're actually asking him now for anything on the whole track he can dream up. You not asking for a present time anything. He usually gives you the present time item that's next to come up.

Now you go back over some pc's folder. And you find out you did a Dynamic – Dynamic Assessment on this pc. And here are the dynamics all beautifully written out. And four of them rock slammed. That tells you your source. It's from an incomplete list. And it'll behave like an incomplete list source. And you say, "You rock slam on Scientology" and he's instantly got this mass. Where'd it come from? Do you see that? In other words, it obeys all the rules of an incomplete list. It's not something different or special.

Well it's up to you to complete the list. How're you going to do it? Well, you're going to get clever. If Scientology rock slams, how are you going to complete a Scientology list? Well, you'll just have to find something about Scientology, that is broad and embracive – "Mental activities," or "Ron's work," see, something! We don't care what it is. Avoid that R/S. And then you can list it positive and you can list it negative.

See, you list it positive and get your *whole* package. See, you do your original list, see, that's that complete list, down to whatever it is and then you do an *oppose* to it and that gives you your package. Now, that saves you one list, doesn't it? And it saves you the hardest, toughest list, so it's much shorter to do it this way. So you get this – that packages, and, if you do it right, just like I've been telling you, here, see, it'll go *bbzzzzmmmm!* A lot of mass disappears and the pc feels great. In other words that will blow. That will blow with rapidity. He won't feel somewhat better about it, you understand? He'll feel terrific.

All right. Then you can do a negative. "Who or what isn't part of Scientology?" If Scientology didn't rock slam. And then you can do a Dynamic Assessment. And you say, "What are the parts of life and existence?" And "What are not the parts of life and existence?" And it gives you two more potential packages – two more packages, not two more items, you understand.

So there's a source of six packages, right there. Now, I would say that they were the basic packages of Routine 2. Six packages – twelve items. You should be able to get off that. If you can't change a fellow's life with those twelve items you ought to quit.

Now, you – the degree that you will succeed in this, the success that you will have in this, is monitored this way: As long as you repair Routine 2 with Routine 2 and not auditing, you're okay. If you do right Routine 2 and repair things that go wrong with Routine 2, you can keep everything beautifully polished up and flowing beautifully with a little bit of auditing. But with a little bit of Routine 2 and an awful lot of auditing, mid ruds and general O/W and preparing the pc and getting the rudiments in – boy you're just going to get that pc no place. See?

Because you can straighten up the case with Routine 2, where auditing will fail. Routine 2 is more powerful than auditing. Why is Routine 2 more powerful than auditing? Because it is hitting at the present time problem and the hidden standard of the pc. The hidden standards of the pc and the present time problems of the pc are the things which has gotten in the road of pc progress from the beginning of Dianetics and Scientology. That's the one thing the pc can't get across: that he doesn't know these things exist.

He really doesn't know what present time problem he's got. He appears that he has know – does know, the moment you've gotten it. But he actually didn't know until that moment. A case makes no forward progress to amount to anything in the presence of a present time problem. A hidden standard is another thing.

He is finding out if his sciatica still twinges. And that is everything he is doing. In all of his processing he only compares it to his sciatica. That's the hidden standard. You ask any pc you're processing, to some degree, he has a hidden standard. You say, "Do you feel better because of processing? All right, how do you know you feel better because of processing?" And he – if you drum at him for a while, he'll come up with his hidden standard, and sometimes these things are quite interesting – whether or not the tips of their ears burn. See, he knows he's getting better because he gets a warm feeling in his chest and so forth. And he's actually sitting there in session waiting for the warm session to turn on so that he knows he is better. It's quite amazing!

It's a very interesting little – little side alley of research some HPA Academy student should undertake sometime to do. Just ask them how – ask – go around and ask his fellow students how do they know they're feeling better. And an Academy Level without any 2-12 at all, why they'd have abundant answers! "Well what would – what would – what would some healing have to do to you, what would some healing have to do, to you in order to – that you knew you were better?" And you'll get an almost automatic response on the part of most people. Sometimes they have to think for a while. And they finally tell you, "Well I'd – back of my neck wouldn't be tired anymore." Well, they're telling you they're trying to find out if an item is shifted – that's what they're actually telling you.

Till you get the hidden standard out of the road, he does everything through this. And oddly enough, because it's really a circuit he's consulting, all of his answers as to whether or not he's better are from the circuit. And this goes much deeper than you would think. He's in consultation with a circuit. Supposing it was a member of the FDA! Ho-ho! Any case gain – it'd tell him he's worse! Do you see, that's the hidden standard.

All right. Well, a present time problem, it's just – present time is just plowed in. He is so fixated on present time, you see, that, huh – huh, he can't take his attention off. Be quite painful for him to invest any time in improving. He's just got to be totally alert and up here in present time, bug-eyed fighting this thing all the time. You've seen pcs come into session worried about their – the wife, or worried about the husband, or worried about their job or something like that. You actually could process them, bang! Bang! Thud, thud! Crash, crash, crash! On and on and on, with the most violent and wonderful processes and so forth and take a graph on them afterwards and they got absolutely no change whatsoever on the graph. We've done that many times.

You run a liability now, with omitting your Model Session, of not catching that momentary PTP. That momentary PTP can keep the more fundamental PTP from showing up sometimes. But, Routine 2-12 is usually worth taking a chance on. It's usually worth taking a chance on, because it is so much greater a PTP and it is so much greater a withhold and it's got so many more overts in it than you could possibly get off with rudiments, that most of the time you can get away with not using a Model Session on it.

All right, so what do you do? You get, you pull the dumbbell to pieces, you make it disappear; there goes their PTP. Another dumbbell; there goes their hidden standards. Maybe the same one went both PTP and hidden standards, don't you see? Then you get another one; here's their fixation on this, that or the other thing. Here you get another one; and they can all of a sudden see the walls and didn't ever know they couldn't before. You work it on up, you're suddenly at a position where if you list goals on them, they won't give you these first eight or nine items.

If you had listed goals on them before, they'd just give you the intentions of these PTP circuits. And you'd just get nothing but on and on and on – intentions of these circuits. I got some actual case history on this, which is quite interesting. I don't care how long the goals list was, the pc was just listing their PTP circuit goals. They never listed back of that, which I thought was fascinating. So, of course, you could never get the pc's goal on the list.

Now, they can move on the track enough now; in order to put a goal on the list, you could do 3-21 after you had a few packages out of the road with Routine 2. Now, that is actually the purpose of Routine 2. There isn't any other purpose back of it. It's not really to make the pc feel better and it's not to make the pc fly and it's not to make the pc get a big reality on Scientology, nothing. It's none of those purposes. Any of those that add in are simply bonuses and they're all very, very worthwhile; and you do perfect Routine 2, you will get some very, very miraculous results. It's very well worth doing.

Now can you get a goals list? You get a few packages off of somebody and you get them off of him well and he all of a sudden just starts presenting you with his goal. Various things of this character occur. But you're trying to clear up the PT environment to a point where the individual can be run on a Goals Process and cleared.

Now, there is your essence of the thing. Now, the repair of a case, or anything like that may be another story entirely. And it has nothing to do with this very pure rendition of Routine 2, which I've just given you. If your auditing can compare to the very pure rendition

which I've just given you, you'll have marvelous success in auditing, there is no doubt about that at all. Okay?

Thank you.