

# R2-12 DEAD HORSES

A lecture given on  
15 January 1963

Thank you.

Sorry to keep you waiting. There's an operating climate of emergency these days. And sometimes the emergencies are great and sometimes they are small, but they're all emergencies. And that's because they weren't predicted. That's what makes an emergency. Did you ever know that? That's just a failure to predict. Everything else is life. All right. Well, this is what? The ...

*Audience: 15th.*

... 15th of January, AD 13, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, lecture number one.

All right. Well, you probably came in here tonight to hear something clever that'll resolve all of your cases very easily, and I regret to tell you that in the Washington raid tonight's lecture notes were seized.

Well, this is – this is a lecture on the subject of Routine 2-12. And there are several things in this lecture, but amongst them is what to do about dead horses. I finally taped this one. Life now becomes very easy for you. If I make life much more easy for you, you'll collapse for lack of problems. I'd hate to do that to you.

Well, let me state the problem first. Very often you do a “represent” or a “present time consists of” or “what are you upset about” list. Those are all represent types of lists, don't you see. And the confounded thing behaves like a wrong way to list. They are very, very difficult to complete – very, very, very difficult to complete – and they cycle.

And when I first noticed this, why, I didn't know whether to send for aspirin or the auditor. How the devil could a represent list be wrong way to? How? It's not possible. So I've actually been worrying about this and trying to do something about this here, now for, oh, I guess about ten days or so. I've been studying this above all other things very, very hard, because this was a puzzler. I “vas poozled.”

Now, a wrong way to list cycles. Now, somebody's going to – somebody's going to see a right way to list, sometime, and it's going to sneak up on an R/S, you know, and before it gets to the R/S it's going to give a dirty read and then it'll rock slam and then they will see a couple of dirty reads or something like that and then they won't see the dirty read for a little

while and then when they get up to the next rock slam, so they say, “Ah-ha! That list is cycling.” No, the essence of a cycling list is that the needle periodically goes clean. It’s the fact the needle goes clean. It isn’t whether it R/Ses or DRs. It’s the clean that you should concentrate on there. Needle goes clean, beautifully clean, very fine, very nice, very clean and you do another half a page just to make sure that it’s good and clean, and you’ve got a complete list and all of a sudden, it isn’t clean.

So you roll up your thetan sleeves and you go on and you list further, and the next thing you know, you got maybe a DR. Maybe even an R/S. Then it cycles out and it goes clean again.

How long will it keep doing this? A long time, I’m afraid. Probably forever. The needle will never go clean and stay clean – always dirties up. Now, this is quite periodic. A list which is right way to runs a cycle as well, and that cycle goes ... Probably you’re sitting there, before you start to list you’ve probably got a clean needle. And it’ll go into a dirty needle and then you get a dirty read on an item or two and then you get a rock slam and then maybe you get a dirty read, and then – then you – it’s kind of a dirty needle that looks kind of messy, and then after a while you get another rock slam. And then after a while you get another rock slam. Never really goes clean. And it goes on and on and you finally find yourself with less rock slams.

Now, this is in an oppose list. And if you are listing wrong way to in an oppose list, you will find that the frequency of R/S is increasing. And if you’re listing right way to, the frequency of R/S is decreasing.

Now, wrong – this is quite marked. On a wrong way to list on an opposition ... This is an opposition list, wrong way to, every. I’m only talking about opposition lists at this moment. On a wrong way to list you’ll have something like this: You’ll have one R/S on page one and a couple of R/Ses on page two and about three R/Ses on page three. And as far as you can tell up to this moment, there is no right way to or wrong way to, because a right way to list looks exactly the same way. But let’s go on and describe the right way to list now. You see, that’s one rock slam on page one, two on page two, three on page three, see. That’s either right way to or wrong way to. You can tell by the needle tightening with just a few items. But this isn’t this type of test. I’m just talking about needle manifestation.

And if your list is wrong way to, along about page four you have four slams and page five you have five slams and page six you’ve got six slams – you get the idea? The incidence of rock slam is increasing.

Now, oddly enough, along with the increase of the incidence of rock slam, the periods of clean needle are increasing. See, you’re liable to get a rock slam, dirty read and a clean needle, see? And a dirty read and a rock slam, and a dirty read and a clean needle, see? You’ve got clean needles starting to show up here and the incidence of clean needles starts increasing.

But that's not-important test. The important test is ... And you can tell this by looking at any pc's list. This is what is important. Because you think you are just going to be worrying about your auditing and you ain't.

I'm worrying about your auditing right now, see, and it's time for you to get it all down real good right now, because you won't have any time to worry about your auditing after you get out of here.

Every one of you is going to be worrying about other auditors' cases.

Now, your own worry about cases, that ends very soon up into the future. You'll have this bicycle so that you can – not only could ride it on pavement, you can ride it – ride it on a rutted street, you can ride it on a tightrope, you can ride it on a tightwire going between the poles of the two maintop peaks. You could probably ride it backwards, you know, ride it standing on your head on the seat, peddling with your ears. That you won't be worrying about anymore, because all of a sudden it'll all go straight and you will say, "*Bleahh*, there it is, see."

One of the reasons is I'm finding you indicators, indicators, indicators, indicators, see. I'm taking all your bugs out of it so you get maximal gain all the time, see. And you're learning those, and you're very lucky, you've made a lot of boobs, you know, you've made a lot of goofs. You know how agonizing it can be. You know better than to let somebody else make all those goofs, see? I come along and tell you how not to do those goofs, boy, that's important information, see.

Well, you're going to be teaching somebody in Santa Ana County, something of the sort, or you've got a co-audit running down there and you're trying to take care of it over the Telephone. They don't know these goofs are important. They don't know what important goof is being made. They have no idea of the importance of goofs. They don't know R2 bulls are more potent than auditing bulls, see. They don't know these things, see? They don't know these things, see? They haven't lived through this, see? And under your direction they've got to live through it – and somehow or other without losing any pcs. That's the important thing, because in the field, in R2-12, and in organizations with R2-12, unless you're very slippy and you're very quick and you don't let them go ...

You see, you guys, it didn't matter, you see – you couldn't get out of here. There was no Transport. No transportation has left England since the *Mayflower*, you know? But – but somehow or another – somehow or another – you've got to keep it degoofed and you've got to ungoof cases so that you don't lose any and so forth, because a case can get awful sick on 2-12.

You can put him awful well in a hurry, but he can also get awful sick, man. And he can feel like he's lost his last enemy. He can feel terrible. And it can just go out through the bottom of the floor, you see, just bong! He was coming along fine, then this person that the

Registrar said you – had too many pcs, so they got somebody on the third week in the Academy. This is very illegal, but it happens every now and then. And this person in the third week in the Academy was put on this HGC pc, and the pc was doing fine and did fine up till Wednesday and then when they went down – didn't appear Wednesday, and somebody went down to the hotel to find the pc and the pc can't get out of bed. Two black eyes swollen up like baseballs.

Well, you're going to have some bad moments. And the questions you ask is, "Was it wrong source? Was it listed wrong way to? Or was the list incomplete?" See, those are the questions you ask – wrong source, wrong way to or list incomplete, see? And what I'm telling you just now about this frequency of R/S is your best friend. It isn't the length of the list, although you look at lists of forty, fifty pages, you say, "Oh, *zut-thlah!* Horsefeathers" – to use an archaic expression. "That's just a goof That's just wrong source or something stupid."

No, no. You've got a list there and it's thirteen pages in this guy's folder, see. And it's a thirteen-page list, and because you have been on the ball, anybody you talk 2-12 to, you've practically hung them up by the ears for not putting down the data in the folder. The pc's name on each sheet. We don't care about each page, but certainly each sheet. And the date it was listed. See? And the question that was listed. And whenever he saw an R/S on the meter, put it down, get the meter up close to him *someplace while he's listing, so he wont miss it!*

I'll show you how ... This'll probably be a favorite method of auditing. "No. No R/S." Oh, you've seen it yourself Marvelous. Meter completely out of the auditor's range. He can't see if the thing is R/Sing while he's writing, you know?

So anyway, you've already impressed on these characters – I don't care if they were in a co-audit or in the Academy or the HGC or it was a field auditor you were – you were briefing in and training; you've – we assume this – you've already impressed on them with *branding irons, to keep the data, keep all the papers together, write legibly so somebody can read it, you see?* You've already – because that's your only saving grace. If they haven't done that, cut your throat, boy. Oooh! You won't know nothing no place. Because they're going to goof. Just assume they're going to goof, see?

Don't go off on the happy idea that nobody's going to goof, because 90 percent of the time the first auditing on this is done with somebody who already R/Ses someplace where it'll do the most harm. And he – well – so let's say he has an item; it isn't an RI or anything, but he has an item which will come up someday, known as an amanuensis as an oppterm. It's a secretary. And the mere fact of sitting there writing restimulates this horrible oppterm, see, to him. And he somehow or another can't keep track of it all, see. And he starts to audit, it's sen. You look for it in auditing, you look here and you look there and eventually it turns up.

Anyhow, that's the kind of thing you're running into, see, so you impressed them on that.

Now, the only thing that'll save your bacon is that folder. And you get ahold of that folder and it's just about the first thing you look for – increasing incidence of R/S. Just look for a list where there are more R/Ses on the end of it than there are at the beginning of it. And when I say the very beginning of it, it takes the pc a little while to groove into it and there's very seldom very much R/S on the first page. So we're talking about the fourth page or fifth page in comparison to the second page, is what you want to look for. And you want to look at about the second page and along about the fifth page – let's say the fifth page was the end of the list.

“Oh,” you say, “look at that. There's more R/Ses. Why don't you turn it around and list it the other way, the way you were supposed to?”

“Well, the terminal was ‘a gruesome killer’ and the pc said that couldn't be him. So of course, we had to say, ‘Who or what would oppose a gruesome killer?’ Otherwise it was too painful.”

Oh, you're going to hear some, man. I've heard some beauts. “I started to collect them and then I was too busy writing up decent lists so I didn't bother to collect them.” You'll hear something like this. It isn't that I don't trust my fellow man. The funny part of it is, I wouldn't put them into their hands if I didn't think they could climb the hill. All I'm trying to tell you is, you got two hills to climb, see, just like I had two hills to climb. Get so I can do it and then get you to do it, see? You've got exactly the same hills to climb. Get so you can do it, and get so the other fellow can do it. Get the other fellow to do it. See, you've got the same hills to climb. We'll always be climbing these two hills, see, to some degree.

But the first one can be climbed and that's dusted off. You know you can do it, because there is a finite end to Routine 2-12. First time we've ever said that about a process. You realize that? There's a finite end to learning it. There isn't some new rule going to turn up in the card game. What I'm trying to give you now are indicators. Indicators. I'm looking for things to look for. I'm looking for things that explain certain oddities that you are running into.

All right. Now, this frequency of R/S, the needle that keeps going cyclically clean, is another part of this. All right, that's wrong way to. Now, you get what I mean about it? Of course, you've got it wrong way to, you list it right way to.

Actually, the easiest way to test a right way to or a wrong way to is simply to list a page or half a page each way and find out which one tightened the needle – and that's wrong. Take the one that loosened the needle, always. And the funny part of it is, that's a wonderful way to get accustomed to inspecting pcs' appearances for skin tone. That's marvelous. You see, it's all a trick of spotting then and now. So you've got to have a now to become a then, see. You've got to look at them, and say, “All right, this is the start of listing.” How did they look? You know? And then list yourself a half a page and look at them again.

See, those are the two points of comparison. And you will very rapidly become accustomed to seeing what a pc looks like if he's listing in such a way as to cave in his bank. It isn't just wrong way to that caves this in, you see, you can list the wrong item and cave it in, you can take the wrong source and cave it in. See, almost anything you do wrong in Routine 2-12 darkens the visage and skin tone of the pc, mucks up his eyes, does this, that and the other thing to him. It's all facial and it's very visible.

But it gives you good experience, listing right way to and wrong way to; you're picking out which one is which. You just take these two opposings and figure out which one is which, and inspect the pc very closely as you are doing that, and you will actually see the pc's skin darken.

Now, oddly enough, it won't lighten on the right way to list as fast as it darkened on the wrong way to. It's going to take maybe a couple of pages of listing to get his skin back to where it was before you wrong-way listed it. Nevertheless, it gives you a comparison, gives you a very good idea of it.

Now, you want to become an expert on this, on skin tone and eye and so forth. And the expertness is totally on selection of points of time, you see. You can't compare this piece of paper to this piece of paper. See, look at your axioms of knowledge. There must be data of comparable magnitude for comparison, one with another, before you can know something, you see. You can't say this is a big meter unless another meter exists to be smaller or bigger, see. You get this idea?

So you have no data of comparison on a case unless you mark a moment in time, zzzt, and you say, "Well, that's how he looked." You see, you do this several times. You do it for the overall process, you do it for the right way you're listing, you do it for this and that, but you keep in mind how he looked – you take a good look at him, you know; you take a photograph of him – and you say, "There he is." And now fifteen minutes later you compare that first "there he is" with how he is now, see. And you get a then-now comparison. Is he lighter or is he darker? Those are the only questions you ask. It's as simple as that.

This is the doggonedest darkening mechanism you ever saw, but I didn't say that he went black. He actually doesn't go black. He just goes darker. Because some pcs go yellow, some go green, some go gray, some go black, and the lightening process could possibly sometimes be confused with – in gray. But you just have to get used to these things.

But frankly, they get whiter and whiter, which is a very interesting thing. You'd have to have a lot of sun lamps to keep up with it. They go lighter. And there's your best index.

And you should be able to get to be an expert on this, so that you're supervising five, six pcs in an HGC, or you've got fifteen or twenty of them in a co-audit ... Just get practiced on this kind of thing. It's not a very difficult trick. And you say, "This is the beginning of the

session.” Just look all around and see how they all look and best way to do that is choose the one who looks worst, you know, and relate everything to him.

And you don't want these guys being listed backwards and upside down and out through the roof, so after everybody's been industriously listing or doing whatever they're supposed to be doing about a half an hour passes by or something like that, take a look through the room and compare it to that first look you took, see?

You see this guy over here: he actually is not much greener, but he's greener, see? So you take this bird and you know that it's wrong source, wrong way to or an incomplete list, and you immediately make it your business to find out what's wrong over there, see? Then you can keep everybody's head out of water.

This is terrific processing when done right. And the righter it's done, the more terrific it is. You can't oversell it, done right. See? But boy, you could sure shoot holes with it done wrong.

And you'll hear people saying, “Oh, God, so this is Scientology. Oh, no. Oh, God. Oh, jeez. Never felt so bad in my life.” You know? It's a wonder they keep on getting processed at all. But you can do these things real wrong with 2-12 and you can really pull the rug out from underneath somebody. And let me make a little comment here as we go by this: Until you get to be an expert or until somebody is expert, don't let them process children. Why?

Well, actually, the kid's having a hard time concentrating his attention and you could put a kid off much quicker and the – his doggedness is not there. He won't keep plowing into it, he'll just know he felt bad, so he doesn't want anything more to do with it. It's just a snap adjudication, don't you see? So don't let anybody who doesn't know 2-12 backwards process children. Make it an absolute requisite that they get perfect results on adults before they are ever let near a child.

With that proviso, 2-12 works on children around five, six, seven, eight, nine, in that range. I don't know about the five, but we already know about the later. It works like a dream. They just sit there and they just saw wood and they work right away, and they'll list like mad and so forth. They're cute as a bug's ear on this stuff. Quite remarkable. They R/S perfectly and so forth. But don't goof them up, because they won't sit still long enough afterwards to be patched up. You see why? So don't let anybody be processing kids until they do very, very, very flawlessly well on adults.

All right, let's get back to this dead-horse proposition. I'm talking about all this opposition listing and frequency of R/S and frequency of clean and so forth just as a rundown of what I was up against in the represent list. Imagine my embarrassment to find a represent list doing the same thing as an opposing list – slightly less violent.

In other words, it wasn't with exclamation points that it was doing it, like it does it in an opposition list, but all the signs were there. Now, here was my question: How in the name of common sense can you have a wrong way to represent list? Well, the first thing you'd say, "Well, who or what would represent Scientology to you?" Then your wrong way could be, "What does Scientology represent to you?" I mean, that's the same thing. So that isn't contained in it.

"What does Scientology not represent to you?" The same thing. "What does Scientology represent to you?" See, I've just been going around in circles here for days. That's why you haven't seen very much of me; I've been wearing out a rug. I've been walking in small circles. How in the name of God ... ? I won't – I won't say what I really said. I'll tell you exactly what I said. It's this exactly: "Goddamnit, how the hell can a represent list be *backwards?*"

You know? *Pow!*

And I'd go back at it again, you know, and I'd take a look at this thing, and so forth, and these lists can go on and on and on and on and on, because it was a hole in 2-12. You guys had discovered it. You, too, have made discoveries.

Anyway, that's what I said, and even though it was profane, I don't want withholds from you. It's so preposterous it took me about ten days to wrap it up. And it's so simple. *Heh-heh*, it's so simple. It was very little to do with the *wording – heh-heh-heh*.

A flaw in man is that he does not know himself You ask this guy, "Have you got any enemies? Name your enemies."

And he says, "Oh! Joe, Bill, Pete, *blah, bo, blah, zaaa, blah, blah, and thuhh, and thuhh, and zaaa, and zaaa, and zaaa, and da-da-da-da-da-dah.*" Automaticity, see. Always can name enemies.

You say, "All right, name yourself"

He says, "Name's Joe." End of list.

In other words, the person is much more capable of observing enemies than selves. So he gets on a stuck flow of listing terminals, and you've got to fix his represent list so he will list ... He gets on a stuck flow of listing opposition terminals, don't you see? Stuck flow of listing enemies because they're so easy to list and you've got to give him a list wording which permits him to list terminals. And that is the wrong way to represent list. I think somebody ought to take their hat off. It's taken me about ten days to figure this confounded thing out. That's what it is.

You say, "What is – what does Scientology represent to you?" And he right away figures in terms of enemies. So he lists *oppterm, oppterm, oppterm, oppterm, oppterm, oppterm*. Once in a while he accidentally puts a terminal on it – very accidentally. "*Oppterm,*



*oppterm, oppterm, oppterm,*” he lists. “*Oppterm, oppterm, and oppterm, oppterm, oppterm,* and *oppterm,* and I can’t think of any more, really. That’s the end of the list.” And you didn’t have any R/Ses. Where’s the silly R/Ses? Furthermore, if you keep doing this you will see that the needle is going clean and then dirty, and then clean and then dirty. And every time you try to go down this silly represent list you find you can’t make it. It goes too dirty to be nulled.

So you abandon that list and say, “Who or what does present time consist of?” or “In present time, who or what are you in contact with?” or anything like that.

So, he leans back and he says, “*Oppterm, oppterm, oppterm, oppterm, oppterm, oppterm, oppterm, and oppterm, oppterm.*”

And you say, “Where the hell are the R/Ses?” And you’ll find once more the needle goes clean, and dirty.

Now, if you’re lucky, you’ll have some R/Ses on it and you’ll find one. Once in a while it’s almost impossible to get one backwards. He’ll list a terminal every now and then and it R/Ses. Not just because it’s a terminal, but he’ll list an R/Sing terminal frequently enough to give you some R/Ses, see. But he’ll give you an interminable list. And he’s liable to get down to the end of it and feel rather badgered by the auditor and the process and because he’s now on a stuck flow against his enemies.

And you watch those faces go black or green – in other words, they’ll darken. He’ll start to look older, faces will darken. See, going on a stuck flow. *Dzuh, dzuh, dzuh.* Eyeballs get big, red as fire. It’s very visual. These manifestations are not really tiny, they’re quite marked if you know what you’re looking for.

And you say, “Well, we didn’t get any list with that – uh – ‘What does present time consist of?’ Let’s – let’s do one now – let’s be very smart. Uh-uh – let’s see. ‘In present time, what have you been reasonable about?’” or something like this.

And he’ll say, “Oh, yeah,” and he’ll list that. “*Oppterm, oppterm, oppterm, oppterm, oppterm, oppterm, oppterm.*”

Well, it’s very simple: The case that gives you a wrong way to – looking represent list – even with rock slams on it; you know, it behaves like a wrong way to opposition list – or the case that gives you dead horses, (see, that’s the same case actually) is merely somebody whose next item up is a terminal. Isn’t this idiotic? The next available item on the case is a terminal. You’ve got nothing but lists of *oppterm*s. Grim joke, huh? I think it’s kind of lucky I figured this one out.

In other words, before you get the terminal off the stack, he hasn’t got a prayer. And yet he’s listing *oppterm*s, so of course you’re never going to get the terminal off the stack. You understand? So he’ll just go on plowing himself in. And the more he lists *oppterm*s, why, the more it plowed into the mass he gets and the unhappier he gets about the whole thing and

the more MEST he feels, the more hopeless he feels. Because what's the bypassed item? It's the terminal he is being right this minute in the session. That's the bypassed item. You got this now?

You see the circumstances of the wrong way to list? Of how this thing looks like a cycling list; it takes forever; you can never get it cleaned up – the wrong way to list. Of course, you know the dead horse type of list. This also takes in the skunk list. You know, it keeps running out to no item. See? Those oddball lists are all under this same heading, on a represent basis, which is “present time consist of” or something like that. The pc is being asked questions which result in oppterms, whereas the pc, next item up, and his case isn't going to go anyplace past this item – the next item you've got to find on the case to make it whiz is a terminal. And you're not asking questions that give you any terminals. You only get opposition terminals.

Supposing his terminal was “a bad boy.” You might as well be asking a – we don't know this terminal “bad boy,” you see, because we haven't found it or anything. But we're busy listing a represent list. We're asking, in essence, “In present time, to a bad boy,” see, “what does life consist of?” And he'll give you schoolteachers, masters, truant officers, police, juvenile delinquency squads, see, and he goes on and on and on.

And you want – just to make my point here, sometime, you – when you've patched up a pc where this is occurring, find the item, see, and go back and take a look at his two or three earlier dead horses; you'll find out he's done nothing but list the same item. They're all what a – whatever you found, see. You found “a rabid skunk employed by the government” or something like that, you see?

You know, he'd fallen low, man, and you'll find this one. You go back and look at those early dead-horse lists he was listing, they'll all be what this thing opposed. You actually have done its opposition list. But because he couldn't get a grip on it these things weren't R/Sing properly or anything else.

That doesn't mean you take the early lists now and compare them to the later lists, you just go on with 2-12. You oppose this thing; now he knows where he is. Obviously he knows where he's going. But of course, in view of the fact that he *can't* see from the terminal point of view what is the enemy of the terminal, he then just is giving you such randomness that it is fabulous.

This again is not an index of how you find this. But in actual fact he doesn't know from what point of view to look at the enemy. So then, of course, he cant give you the right enemies. He can just give you all of existence. And there are quite a few items in all of existence. Some of you may have found this out.

Well, that's how you can get a wrong way to represent list, which is the confoundedest thing I think I ever had anything to do with. It sounds impossible when you

look at it, as a piece of Chinese puzzle work, it just sounds impossible. How could you possibly have a wrong way to represent list? Well, you could say, “represent” and “not represent.” That unfortunately does not solve it. It does to some degree, but it won’t immediately give you a long stream of R/Ses. It’ll make the pc feel better. “What does present time not consist of?” may not give you R/Ses, but it’ll make the pc feel better, see. But you don’t get your item and we’re trying to do 2-12, see? We’re not trying to make the pc feel better or worse. We’re just trying to get our items and get the pc’s bank in some kind of a condition to find goals on, actually.

What we’re trying to do is clear away his PTPs, get out of the road his hidden standards and open the highball for 3-21. And most – most cases – in fact, practically all cases – have got PTPs and hidden standards, and those that have been cleared, have been cleared in spite of these. And in at least one case I know of – after the case had gone Clear, couldn’t quite stay Clear, you know, keep falling off of it about every two weeks. The PTP had never been gotten out of the road.

In other words, the technique was powerful enough, actually, to clear somebody without removing the PTP. And – but boy, it had really taken some doing. She slams on “LRH.” And her – she’s been getting less Clear and less Clear and less Clear. I’m a problem to her. She’s committed some overts, you see? She deserted her post and intended to cave in the place down there, before she got Clear, and then she’s never – never straightened this out. You see what’s happened?

But this is pretty tricky. It’s almost impossible, see, to clear or audit a pc sitting there with a PTP. 2-12, oddly enough, can be run on a person with another PTP than the one you’re picking up and you can still get the item. I know I’ve had that as subjective reality lately. Suzie hadn’t been bothering to clean up any PTPs on me to run the session. And just before the session, you see, I get fifteen, twenty telegrams – “Kennedy threatening to commit suicide unless you . . .” You know, that kind of thing.

And I come into session, you know – PTP. And I try to get them off and put my rudiments in; she pays no attention to it. And goes on and it all lists up and packages are perfectly all right. Although the pc gets a little dispersed at times.

In other words, you’re auditing the central PTP so actually you can audit beyond and by and along with current PTPs, you see?

Well, man, you can’t run 3-21 currently with a PTP, particularly a PTP of magnitude. To find a goal, the pc’s attention has got to be all there. So you have to get the big, the big, the big PTP that is unknown to the pc, actually. He doesn’t know what his present time problem is. He’ll give you lots of present time problems, but he’ll never tell you what it is.

That one’s in his road, and then the hidden standard. You know what a hidden standard is. The individual’s hidden standard is, if Scientology is answered by this, you can

get a list of hidden standards, by the way. “What would have to happen to you for you to know that Scientology really worked?” That is your – the perfect question. That gives you a whole list of hidden standards.

You’ll be surprised. “My left ear would have to stop burning.” Actually, every time this person has ever been processed, they look at their left ear, see, to see whether or not it is still burning. Now, if the left ear is still burning, then they know the process hasn’t worked. But if their left ear is burning a little less, then they know the process has worked slightly. And they give you all of their goals and gains straight off an index of the burning left ear. I’m not joking.

You’ll find this in a vast majority of pcs, if you search for it. “What would have to happen to you for you to know that Scientology really worked?” Just for fun sometime, and as an exercise to understand a hidden standard a little better, you ought to take somebody and have him list a few. But of course, if you don’t complete the list, he’s liable to have an ARC break.

But anyhow ... He’ll give you a whole bunch of these things, you know – his stomach would have to stop hurting, or something. Well, actually, this hidden standard is quite interesting. It is a circuit which is telling him what to think. And that’s the 100 percent definition of what a hidden standard is. It’s a circuit that is telling him what to think. And it’s got some kind of a signal system rigged up. You know, it works if. That’s actually a communication-type system. It’s quite involved. It’s like an automatic trainstopping-signal system put up by the *Baltimore-Ohio* or something, you know? Like a train stops at section 83, and the brakes – potential brake shoes and lights go on in all other sections in that particular zone and area. And a small man jumps up with a flag and waves it in the nose of the engineer and knocks his coffee cup out of his hand.

All kinds of super systems, you know, they’re very complex. A hidden standard is not a simple system. It’s a circuitry response. You see, that is an item, in other words, that he consults. And he says to this item, “Is it true?” And the item has a signal system by which it tells him whether it is true or false.

And most people you are expecting to leap up in the air and tell you, “Oh, yes, I understand Scientology works,” have first had to ask one of these systems. Quite interesting. They don’t think at all. They read the record on one of these systems. The FDA – give you a rather degraded example. They think the whole world is composed of two valences. There’s two valences. The world is composed of victims and victimizers. There are no other items.

The fellow manufactures cars; he’s a victimizer. Fellow buys a car; he’s a victim. So of course, he’s dead against industry. Because all industry or manufacturers or managers or something are baddies, and all consumers are victims. Everybody’s a victim that isn’t an emanator of some kind, see? And those guys are victimizers.

Lacking any other than these two terminals, of course, they themselves are victimizers and the only thing that they will ever create is a victim.

Those people will never create anything but a victim. And the more power they get the more victims they create. Nothing ever works out. You finally get communism, socialism, super-liberal-osis of some kind or another, where you've got all of the – the whole country, the population is a victim, see?

They're all victims.

Now, a fellow who stands on his own two feet – this solves a lot of riddles, by the way – the fellow who stands on his own two feet in such a government is regarded as – there must be something very wrong with him. In other words, self-reliance, the worker who wants a job or likes his job or something – there's something wrong with him. So they just move him aside. He – something wrong with him. They just get rid of that one quick, because there can be no such terminal. Life is a sort of a dreary game that goes on between all of these victimizers who have to be stopped, and all of these victims, and there's nothing else goes on in life. It's one of the weirdest looking pictures you ever wanted to take a look at.

That's a do-gooder in first, second, third, fourth and overdrive. And that's all the tune he plays. And he's trying to protect everybody from himself. He gets down to a point where everybody is his own victim. That's all the – all the way anything categorizes. And this gets to be very, very, very upsetting to these boys, because they eventually can see no purpose in life except making more victims, you see, or holding off more victimizers or something.

Look at all the elements of life that are missing in this type of a combination, you see. Nobody ever likes to buy cars, nobody ever likes to make cars, you see. All those elements are missing. There might be billions, hundreds of billions of other types of valences, but they miss all these. So it gets down to this two-pole proposition. Of course, they're a pushover for anybody who comes along and says, "The poor worker."

"Oh, the workers are victims, huh? Oh. Oh, well, yes. Well, let's see if we *can't* cut their hours and raise their pay."

And that goes on, but it goes over a whole cycle, and as these boys pass into charge, they take away all the pay and give them twenty-four hours as their daily schedule. They've done it in Russia and all over the world. I'm just not talking through my hat.

I really got one into the Bantu down in South Africa. They were talking about "Communism! Communism! Oh, marvelous stuff, this communism! Oh, *boy, ug-ug-ug-ug-ug!*" you know.

And I said, "Do you realize that you don't get paid for working in a communism?"

And he says, "Is that so?"

I said, "Yeah." I said, "They don't give you any salary."

And they thought about this and they walked around in circles about it and that was the end of communism in South Africa. That's why it isn't down there now.

The white man – he's not quite that smart. He doesn't grasp this that quick. He's not quick like that. He doesn't recognize that the end product of this sort of thing is no pay of any kind whatsoever. But the Bantu, he was plenty smart. He grabbed that in a hurry. Actually, you could just see them unload off the bandwagon in all directions. I'd get to talking to them on a street corner, you know, or the back lot or something like this, and they always bring up these burning questions. And I let them have a few data.

Well of course, that's a do-gooder gone mad. He's got nothing but victims left. The way to handle him, of course, is to sympathize with him. You know,

"You poor fellow!" You know, "Fate has not permitted you to get ahead the way you should've." And he'll go right from the victim-maker valence in which he is in, see – he'll go straight into the role of the victim. He's defeated instantly. That's a valuable datum for you to know.

Because you'll run into them plenty. The world just abounds with them. The UN practically consists of nothing else. They've made all the main Congo victims now. Now they've got all of Katanga. Katanga was the victim maker, you see. They made victims out of the – out of Katanga. They fixed them but good. And now everybody can be a victim. And you watch it, the next boy that comes in there to take control will be a real victim maker. He'll be a honey.

This has nothing to do with whether or not you like humanity. If you like humanity you leave that kind of politics alone. You think I'm a rabid Tory if I talk like that. No, I'm just as rabid on the subject of Tories! I'm what's called indiscriminate and unspecialized in the number of oppters I can list.

Now, you've got to look this over and recognize that one – that the thing man is tuned up to see first is an enemy. And when they go completely potty, they can see nothing but enemies. Everything is an enemy.

I've seen a little beetle crawling across the floor and wondered whether or not he rock slammed on PT. See, that'd make everything – was an enemy. You know, probably that's true. This probably is your last rung of case. You say, "Present time," and it rock slams like crazy. See? That immediately tells you that you've got nothing – you've got nothing you could list as a represent list. See, because they all depend on present time as an understood factor. That'd be pretty grim, wouldn't it? You – they could only oppose.

And here's the type of question you would ask: You see, your do-gooder never recognizes he's a victim maker. He loses that. That's out of sight, that's missing. He'd never

put down a victim maker. You'd have to ask him a question ... You haven't got victim to list from, don't you see, so you have to ask him a question – a simple question like this: “Is – who or what in present time would have your problems?” And he'll put terminals.

Now, you've got numerous variations of this. Nobody recognizes what he is being as easily as what he is facing. In other words, terminals are harder to pick up than oppterm at the entrance to a case. So you get wrong way to represent lists and you get dead horses and you get skunks. And that's the source of all of these. And you must ask a question which delivers into your hands, terminals.

You have somebody rock slamming on “reasonable people” and the list doesn't go anyplace or it cycles, there's something wrong with it. It's going to be an endless list, there isn't anything going to wind up on it, it doesn't R/S; if you did null it, it skunks. That kind of thing. You're going to ask him, “Who or what would object to ‘reasonable people’?” In other words, you can swing – you understand that you can run a represent either way. See, you have – that's not an oppose. That's a rather oppose-type question. I wouldn't recommend it. But I'm just trying to give you the idea.

You say, “In present time, who or what would have your problems?” You've got to ask him, “Who or what in present time would live the life you are living?” “In present time, who do people – who or what do people think you are?” You – I'm trying to teach you the method of thinking, not give you a bunch of pat lines to list, see? You've got to ask him a question, see, by which he will list terminals.

It could be as simple as this: “Who's looking at me?” You wouldn't say, “What are you that is looking at me?” you know. You could ask him for something like this: you'd say, “Who's looking at me?” or “Who might be looking at me?” or something like this.

And this character that had laid dead horses like crazy, wrong way to represent lists, nothing could null, the thing always skunks and so forth, would lay you down probably a very nice rock slamming list, which would rapidly terminate in a reasonable number of pages, would have less rock slams on the last page than the first page, would be very nullable, and you would be able to take off from there.

It's just the accident. Some cases have an oppterm – probably the majority – have an oppterm as the first item up. In other words, all this is – you not only see the pc deal cards off the top of the deck ... You know, he's just like he's dealing a deck of cards as his items. *Pock-pock-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pock*. He'll just deal them out. Well, that's actually just like a deck of cards. The first one comes first.

Pcs very often dramatize the next item to the one that you are calling. In other words, that card is ready to come up next, so it's being restimulated. All right. Similarly, packages come up the same way. And you can get ahold of a pc – the majority of pcs, the first item up is an oppterm. They're a bit overwhelmed, don't you see. So they're being an oppterm, and

so forth, and they name an oppterm and it comes up very easily. That's the side of the package that's going to materialize. So you take it from there and you list it out and you oppose it and everything is fine.

Ha-ha, yeah, but these other characters that have been giving you a bad time – and they're not few, that list wrong way represents and cycling lists, you see, and skunks and dead horses and any one of these manifestations; endless lists that won't null on represent – these characters simply have a terminal as the next one up. And of course you're asking an oppterm-type list question. So you must ask a terminal-type list question.

The crudest rendition of it would be, "Who the hell are you, bud?" That would be very crude, but is in essence what it is. You say, "What problems do you have in present time?" Remember that "You, you, you, you..." See, that – there's a "you" there, and that's an undifferentiated pronoun. So you have to back up back of it and differentiate that pronoun. You say, "Who or what are you?" in some way or another. "Who'd have your problems?"

You've listed a dead-horse list. Ask him, "Who or what would oppose all these things?" You'd get a valid list, see? Give him the list so he could hold them. You'll get a rock slamming list. You get the idea?

There's too many tricks in this, there's too many ways you could do this for me to overburden you with rote. I just want you to firmly get the idea of what this is all about. And that is that the majority of pcs can deal off an oppterm and go sailing, see? And you've got that as a rock slamming item, it's reliable, you oppose it, and 2-12 works gorgeously. That's the majority of them. The rest of them that you're going to have trouble with have got a terminal there as the next one up, and unless you ask for that type of list – *bang!*

So you more or less count on the fact that they're an oppterm-type case, until proven otherwise. And all of a sudden you find this case is *oaaugh – umba – rupp!* Dead horsing, haven't seen any big R/Ses, doesn't look good to *you*.

Do a flip. List something else.

Give you an example: One of them was, "Who or what would you hold off?" It's liable to get a terminal on it yet.

All right, let's reverse this list and do it the other way to. "Who or what would hold off things?" That'd be good enough, you see, to get a terminal on the list. They all don't that smoothly translate. But you do a type of list that gives the terminal, and you wont have any more dead horses and wrong way to lists. And that's how you can have a backwards represent list.

Okay?

Thank you.



