

AUDITING TIPS

A lecture given on
14 August 1963

Okay, well, how are we today?

Audience: Fine. Great. Good.

I'm getting into the medical scene, I'm swapping terminals. How are we today? Nurse, get the bedpan.

Well, you should be having a demonstration, of course, today. But, there's a lot to-of ground to cover one way or the other, and I'll try to give you some helpful hints in auditing which will make up for it.

First and foremost, this is what?

Audience: 14th.

Fourteenth August-you surely keep my time track nice and straight, thank you. 14 August, AD 13, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

We have a lecture on auditing-style, kind, type, how do. If you must audit, why, audit to a gain. The customer is always right. I mean, the preclear is always right. It's true. The significance-the significance is less important than the TA action. TA action on the right significance brings about faster clearing. The benefit is in the word "faster." The right significance and no TA action equals no case gain. Keep the itsa line in. Get TA action.

When training an auditor, get him to figure out how many ways you can cut an itsa line. And maybe dawn will break. The smoothest auditing is the auditing which least cuts the itsa line. "Auditor" means "listener."

It takes a lie to hold aberration in place. Serious aberration surrenders easily. It's the mediocre that takes the long haul-mediocre type aberration.

The primary difference between Scientology and psychiatry is that psychiatry is authoritarian and tells the person what's wrong with him-often introducing a new lie. Scientology finds out what's wrong with the person from the person. And then knows more about it than the person-but listens anyway. Listening is the badge of superior knowledge. He who has superior knowledge is privileged to listen. It's only he who has no superior knowledge that talks all the time-Confucius.

Now you got these maxims, and pearls of wisdom? In actual fact, with that data you could go straight out and evolve all of Scientology-just like that. It's remarkable, isn't it?

But, you mustn't in actual fact discount-just because it's discounted to the pc-you mustn't discount the backbone and body of knowledge of Scientology. Soon as you tell somebody that he's lived for the last thirty trillion years-of course, thirty trillion years is a drop in the bucket-soon as you tell somebody he's lived the last thirty trillion years, and so on, he's liable to be hit with a feeling of unreality.

That unreality busily boils off. But he natters while it's being boiled off. How it's all unreal, and that sort of thing. Well, he's actually running off unreality and you shouldn't pay much attention to it. Remember, he's now talking about an unreality. And he never talked about that before. And in the process of talking about it he actually is raising his ARC with whatever it is. Even though he may do it very slowly.

Now, there are two kinds of talk that a pc indulges in-two kinds of talk. Talk one is theta talk, and talk two is entheta talk. It's theta talk that brings you out of the woods with a pc. And the entheta talk is the symptom of an ARC break. So auditing actually divides down into two actions. Is getting theta talk out of the pc, that's one action. And that's keeping your itsa line in, because it's the theta he's generating that's blowing his bank apart, you see?

And the entheta talk is handled by locating the impeded charge of theta which is barriered in the bank. We call this bypassed charge. In other words there's two actions here. One, you can let him talk, and keep his attention directed indifferently, sometimes, but keep it directed in the direction of the right significances. Don't keep it directed to such a degree, however, that he ceases to get tone arm action and ceases to talk, see.

The other action is in actual fact putting in the itsa line for the pc. And that's how you cure an ARC break. You find out by assessment what trapped charge has been ticked and is trying to get loose. He'll just natter as long as that charge is trapped. And the auditor can then locate that trapped charge and free it. He'll desensitize it.

So there's two auditing actions in actual fact, you see. This first and foremost is listing with tone arm action. And then secondarily locating, by assessment or any other means, the trapped charge.

Now a pc who is-who is talking smoothly and on and on and on-even if the pc is crying about it-is not interfered with. See, don't interfere with that line-that's interfering with the itsa line. Just let the pc roll, see. But the pc is not talking about the bank, but is talking up out of the bank - natter, natter, natter, natter, natter, "It's all bad; they're-they're after me; they're caving me in; what you're doing to me; what everybody is doing to me; how bad they are"- you know, talks like a newspaper! Then you realize at that point that this talk is really not doing the pc any good at all.

This pc is in an ARC break. He's protesting cut communication lines, you see, in his environment usually, and so forth. He's protesting unrealities. He's protesting lack of affinity, or its absence. And what's happened there is that charge has been ticked and missed. And unless the auditor gets very, very busy and locates that charge and indicates it and lets the pc see it and figure it out, why, that pc is going to go on nattering and you're not then going to get an increase of case.

Now, in the old days we said that if a pc could talk his havingness down ... Remember that?

Audience: Mm-hm. Yes.

Well now, you've probably wondered how that sits today. That only applies to Case Two, which I have just given you. A pc only talks his havingness down when he's natter, natter, natter, natter, natter. And you'll find in Case One, where the pc is talking about his case, is talking about his bank, is talking about himself, his past and so forth, and you're getting tone arm action-you'll find out that the longer he talks, the better his havingness gets. Do you see that?

Of course, the whole phenomenon of havingness is raising his ARC with his environment. So if he is in a situation where he's-he himself is cutting his ARC with his environment, then of course his havingness will drop, because his ARC with the environment is what we call havingness. Havingness is simply – can be defined as ARC with the environment. That's all. That should be very elementary to you.

But now let's see, how many ways can you cut an itsa line? Now, the best way to do this is to get somebody the graph, of I – was it 2 August? The HCO Bulletin that has the big graph on the back of it that gives you the cut itsa line, shows you what the cut itsa line is?*

Audience: Fourth August.

Fourth August – thank you.

Now that 4th August bulletin has a nice graph there and you should-in training an auditor-you're going to make-you're going to make marvelous strides if you do this. In training an auditor, if you'll just give him that graph and you'll say, "Now go ahead and list the number of ways you could cut this itsa line." When he's done that, why, "Give me an example of each one of these" – that's your practical aspect, you see? Give me an example of each one of these cut things. And then give me an example of each one of these things how that needn't have been cut, or you would overcome it if you did this inadvertently. In other words, get him thinking on this subject. Get him to comb his hair out on this subject so that he is not walking around in a fog.

Because it's one of the most complex things you ever heard of – if you want to make it complex. And everybody's going to have a different bug on it.

Now, I can draw you up the communication cycles which are contained in the auditing cycle. And these are all very neat and there'll be drills for each one of these things, eventually. But it all comes down to this. Initially getting the pc in-session, which is interested in his own case and talking to the auditor, and then keeping the itsa line in, in such a way as to give maximal tone arm action.

Now, when we state it that way, we're stating it the way a very skilled auditor would look at it. See, this is the hallmark of a very skilled auditor. And it's simply an expansion of a highly elementary definition which I gave you in the first place. Now that's – this, where the skill comes in. That's a skilled auditor.

**[Editor's note: The issue Ron refers to having the chart attachment is HCOB 4 Aug. 63, E-METER ERRORS, COMMUNICATION CYCLE ERROR, which can be found in Technical Bulletin Volumes, Volume VII.]*

In other words, he can get somebody interested in his own case and talking to the auditor about it-and then keep the itsa line in, directed in such a way as to give maximal tone arm action. And if you add to that: And knocking out the significances necessary to resolve the case fastest-now you have the super-super-super-skilled auditor! And there you have actually delineated the various levels and grades of auditing. That's just to the degree that you expand to the last definition I give you.

Now, if you want to move an auditor downstairs, in terms of level – I mean, if you want to get an idea of the lower levels of auditing, then the upper levels – all you have to do is keep snipping pieces off of that definition, and you'll get lower and lower levels of auditing-till you even snip off “tone arm action” and “assessment” at the level of Book Auditor. You don't expect him to know anything about a tone arm. You don't expect him to be able to give an assessment, if he wasn't getting tone arm action. So you just define for him that you keep somebody talking about his own case and you continue to listen to him.

And the odd part of it is that he's going to get a lot more results than mucking up crisscrossed actions that he doesn't understand. You see, you've given him enough right there and you're going to give him an E-Meter now – and he doesn't know anything about an E-Meter, and you're going to give him an E-Meter – and he's going to wonder, “Let's see, the tone arm, is that this knob at the bottom that snaps? No, that-that's not it uh-and tone arm action. Tone arm action, what does quite that mean?” And he's watching this tone arm action, he's putting down “3.001” – he's gotten so he can read verniers, you see – “3.002, 3.001”. Pc is getting tone arm action, you see, obviously. Adequate tone arm action.

In other words, you get the idea-you've got to keep giving him these significances, and keep giving him these significances, and keep giving him these-and finally train him in on what a tone arm is. Well, you've been over that yourselves so often, and so long that it appears absolutely ridiculous that nobody would know anything about it.

Well, just sometime, just hand an E-Meter to – well, a psychiatrist or somebody – and say, “How do you operate this thing, bud?” And – keeping his professional lingo, see, “How do you operate this thing, bud?” – and he comes up with the same thing he’s told the Food and Drug Administration of the United States: “It cures things.” Cures things. Thing is around for eighty years-measuring emotion, and so forth, in the world of psychology. And that’s the best technical opinion that they can come up with-it cures things. I don’t know, I think they-seven and a half volts through the thing, that put on the person you see-and if it runs through his hands for a little while, why then he ceases to get speckled fever or something. I don’t know – I don’t understand this!

You see, you give a piece of equipment or something like that, or you give a complication to somebody, and they Q and A with the complication by making it far, far, far more complicated, to a point where it no longer means what it meant. See, you can just chase this thing over the far horizon. It ceases to have any value at all. So it is better to stay-now listen, because you’ll be training a lot of auditors-now, listen here-remember-remember: *Pound one simplicity home*. Don’t make *it complicated, just pound one simplicity home at a time*. And you’ve got it made.

You’ve got some people on a co-audit-just keep him talking and when you’re absolutely sure he’s shut up, and he’s said everything that he’s going to say on the subject, why, you just look at him intelligently and you just ask him for something else. And that’s all we want. See. And that’s all we want. We want you sitting there, and when he finally-see, you don’t even have starts of sessions or anything else, see. And when he’s finally finished up talking and saying what he wants to say, then you say one of these questions to him, you see. And it’s here. And we don’t even care if it’s the same question every time or another question or something- but your idea is to keep him talking about himself. You got the idea? And that’s all we want. We just want you to keep him talking about himself. That’s really what we want and let’s not get off into your inability to duplicate the auditing command, or you’re waiting there to get in a new auditing command. Let’s not get in there about whether you acknowledge what he has said, let’s not add any complication to it at all.

That appalls you suddenly, as you take a look at it. You take all those things in as automatic, don’t you? How can you get along without them? Well, it’s up to you to find out. Because at that level of auditing all you want to have happen-all you want to have happen-is somebody telling-B telling A about their troubles. We don’t care what they say. He’s not going to have a tone arm to look at. He’s not going to have any complications like this. So he’ll want to know how can you tell.

So you add then, the next step. The pc gets brighter and talks better. That’s his index of success. You would express that as more ARC. And that’s the most elementary basic of auditing there is. You could take some old-timer and you could take his own auditing trained patterns-and you could say, “If you were auditing you-if you were auditing you, what part of

your case would you start for?" Sit back, man, that's it! Tone arm sit there and move beautifully. Clean up all his past auditing, everything else.

Now, I've given you there the various levels of auditing. See, if you'll only recognize it. See, those are the various levels of certification, that. That actually automatically establishes your zones and patterns of training. Now where we exceed those things, we lose. It would take quite a while to get administration wrapped around that much simplicity. But you eventually will get to a point where you'll see that simplicity achieved. And that's the ideal. That is your ideal.

Now, as you move along in auditing a case, you're going to be confounded with this basic problem. Soon as we move up and put the E-Meter in somebody's hands-of course we're confounded with this problem before. But because we haven't got that level of skill in the auditor, we don't pay any attention to the problem. And the second that we graduate somebody up to putting a meter in his lap, then we want to see that TA move. And when that TA moves, we've got charge coming off. And there's your basic problem, is how do you keep a TA moving? That's going to worry you, that worries Mary Sue on your cases, that worries me on her case, that worries people, people, people, that worries Mary Sue in auditing-anything. How are you going to keep that TA moving?

Now, that is the deepest problem in auditing at this moment. Not what to audit. That is not the deepest problem, that problem has been solved. The other problem is how do you keep the TA moving on that particular pc? That is the problem, man. And when you walk upstairs to the highest level of skill, you of course keep it moving by addressing the case to certain significances. How do you keep it moving This gives you a *lot* of problems. I could delineate these problems by the hour. Now we're getting into *complexity*. So you're now going up to a supervisory level of auditing. Takes quite a lot of knowledge. How do you keep a TA moving?

Well, the basic stop of a TA is time. The reason they stop is time. And the biggest time stopper is the GPM. I beg your pardon, that's as far as a-that's as far as an incident-type of incident is concerned. That's a great time stopper. But a GPM never becomes a terrific time stopper until it has been grouped in one of these between-lives screens or some analogous type of incident where things are redated, or cross-dated or something like that and it gets stuck and at wrong times. The GPM is incipiently, then-if it didn't exist, you see, you probably would get no time stopping at all-probably nobody could group a bank. You-you got that? That-because that's perfectly true. I followed this out, painfully tagged it out bit by bit. The only time my tone arm has ever stopped moving is on GPMs. I've got good subjective reality on it, good objective reality on it and so forth. It's a GPM. If it weren't there, it couldn't get latched up on one of these screens or anything else, you see. It's a big time stopper because it gives the mechanism of instantaneousness in present time. And it floats in time, so therefore it can appear anyplace. And then it gets pinned down in these between-life area screens and there goes your TA action-thud! Stops. That's it.

So, that's all-that's all very interesting. It sounds terribly final. And it doesn't make it a simpler problem but if you know that, you can get this thing disentangled more easily. But that's-that's what that is. So then we assume then, that as far as significance of incidents are concerned, why, the GPM plus any grouping incident gives you billy-o as far as the tone arm is concerned. That is what is in the bank that will stop tone arm action. You got that?

Now, what auditing action stops tone arm action? See, now this is a different problem. This is a different problem. There is an auditing action - it's the same action. It's wrong dating. You get the wrong date on an incident and your tone arm action starts folding up. Pc can't even run, by the way - can't even run the incident you're trying to run-can't do anything with it. It's got a wrong date on it. You'll find that a wrong date tends to group incidents. It does all kinds of wild things. If somebody has got a 3-D visio of a facsimile, then I can tell you man, you've got the right date. And as he runs through it, it stays 3-D and stays in one place, boy, you've got the right date. Don't start worrying about dates.

But if he's running it, and a half a dozen others at the same time, then it's a lead-pipe cinch you've got the wrong date. This doesn't necessarily mean that you can find the right date, but it means you have *got* the wrong date. Got that?

Now, when you wrong-date a GPM, what do you think happens? Here is your greatest incipient wrong-dater anyway-it floats in time all over the place-and when you get the wrong date on a GPM, brother! That is a grim situation. It will stop the tone arm almost as though it ran into a truck. Wrong date.

Now, this is mixed up with the fact that the GPM *is* possible to date. Do you understand how faintly I make that statement? It is *possible* to date a GPM. That is a very faint statement. But the mere fact that it is a GPM gives you the tiniest possible reads on dates. It gives you the tiniest reads and the roughest job of dating of any incident. And after you've dated one, why, that date is as valid as it gets tone arm action. But that doesn't mean that a half an hour later, on a redating situation you're not going to find another date. How do you like that? Perhaps you didn't realize that this amount of sneakery was going on with regard to one of these confounded GPMs.

But I tell you this for this reason: The way you're dealing with GPMs, there's no sense as an auditor of going into tears back of your meter-because lord knows you will feel like it! You've just got this thing beautifully nailed down, at some incredible date you can't even keep in your head, see? Gorgeous, see? Trillions all over the place, and so on. Boy! You're sure glad to have that! Picture showed up-fifteen minutes later pc is going into an ARC break or starting to natter about your hairdo or something. You give him an assessment. And it says "wrong date." It assesses out to a wrong date! But how could it assess out to a wrong date? We just had the right date. So we very often would be foolish enough to back off Be very foolish, you see - foolish enough to back off and say, "We got that one right-dated. Let's see if we can find something else that is wrong-dated."

No, you better take what's nearest and dearest to your dating, because that GPM probably has another date. You probably dated it onto a screen. In other words, this was the screen date. That's still a right date-but it's a screen date. And when you redate it again, that's-the pc has blown enough charge now to be aware of the wrongness of this date. That's all that's happened. So you redate the confounded thing and you get it off the screen and it moves someplace else. And you've now got a right date.

The difficulty with this-the reads are absolutely microscopic? Hundred and twenty-eight on a Mark V, you see? All rudiments in. All the pc has got to do, is you say, "Greater than," he thinks, "Less than" and immediately you get a read on something else and bzzong! Here we go, see? So you delicately, cat footedly date this thing and you get a beautiful read and you get a blowdown and you say, *aahhhhh!* You know. Meter is up there at five-and-a-half on the tone arm-you got a beautiful blowdown when you got this new date – and you're all set and all ready to go.

You run some more items out of the thing and fifteen minutes later the pc is finding fault with your necktie. So you do another ARC break assessment and so on-pc absolutely can't go on. The only time you do one is when the pc just can't-he's passed into such a stage-two there that you can't get any auditing at all. And you do an assessment and by God, it comes up wrong date." Oh, but wait a minute! You had a blowdown on the thing! No, you moved it to another screen. Nice.

Completely aside from the perils of just plain "his rudiments go out" so you get a wrong date, you see. You've got the thing that the thing has got a lot of dates! So, you finally get it back and you finally-you say, "I heard Ron say something about that one time, and I'm really going to get in this thing real good. Is this an actual track date?" And it reads-actual track date. You didn't also ask, "On what screen?"

So, you get your new date and after that it runs like a doll. But beware, you actually could start dating on a certain series of GPMs-now listen-and go seven sessions trying to find the date of the series. Be wonderful if you kept the pc's itsa line in the whole way. And don't turn off that itsa line. Because you've pulled a whole series of GPMs off screen after screen after screen-you're straightening out his track like crazy. But you could sit there and just chop him to ribbons by never letting him help you in any way, shape or form. Take all the data off the meter. Never let the pc volunteer anything. And if you then went seven sessions with all this, your pc would be going downhill like mad, don't you see? You wouldn't be getting any tone arm action either.

You see the liabilities-you see the liabilities of this confounded thing called the GPM? False track actually is nothing because it is never false track. They might show you some pictures and say, "That is track," but they're usually still pictures, solid pictures and very brief pictures. When it comes to track-there are false pictures, yes-but when it comes to track,

false track-actually you shouldn't use the word and I shouldn't have used the word false track-because I've since found out what it is.

When you invalidate somebody's time track hard enough and hit him hard enough, he puts dub-in over the top of the actual picture. And the dub-in looks quite like the actual picture but it's just a little-little film over the top of it-and as you start to audit it, that film comes off and he sees the actual picture. And actually, it isn't too different than his own track.

He won't find much Variation in his time track by the reason of having had his track invalidated it to dub-in. I've now found this out, you see-he's still got his track. He's still got his- still when he was a big thetan, he was a big thetan, you see? And when that has happened to him, it happened to him. He might have oddly askew pictures on the subject and the thing was all grouped in one locale by a screen, but *that's his track*. When you've run it over, the pictures all of a sudden start going into 3-D and he sees these things as looking a bit better than they did and he's got a better sense of reality.

The reason most of you have-in pc's particularly-find unreality and the pc kicking back is because you haven't run across it enough to scrub off the false picture. See, that is unreal to the pc. Unreality is force and invalidation, don't you see? That's what unreality is. You ever run a car into a brick wall? Things momentarily looked awfully unreal! Well, that's the same phenomenon-unreality. You hit somebody hard, and things get unreal. They get unreal down to a point of unconsciousness. What is unconsciousness but a total unreality. Now, that's all unreality is.

Of course, unreality stems from the ARC pris-side of the situation-it's a sudden, steep drop in ARC. That really gives you some weird waves of this thing. At the same time he's being hit, he's also got, not only the ARC break with MEST, but he's got some other consideration on the subject of ARC break. And it gives him an ARC break that that particular thing would hit him.

See, it's compounded. That he runs the car into the brick wall and the impact and so forth renders him unconscious- but he's got another ARC break on the ARC, you see, side of the thing-this was the MEST side of it, his unconsciousness, you see. But his other ARC break, with magnitude, is the fact that that wall would do that to his car! See? And it's an ARC break with the circumstances of the situation. Shouldn't happen, you see. Protest, one way or the other.

Now, dealing with pictures then, you get a considerable unreality coming off, and when you deal with these pictures, you get into ARC breaks-which is the only point I'm making here about dating-and you'll notice that an ARC broke pc only reads on the exact subject of the ARC break. All other reads go out. A severely ARC broken pc, then, does not read on the meter, except on the bypassed charge which caused the ARC break. That's the one hole in the E-Meter-because it won't read during an ARC break. Well-wait a minute! In a GPM you're always auditing an ARC break, aren't you? He's ARC broke like mad! Time is all askew and

he's been captured and stuck in that thing and oh, you know, all this kind of stuff going on. And of course the E-Meter doesn't read well-he's ARC broken with himself for being such a fool as to be caught. You know, there's all kinds of crisscross ARC breaks. He has ARC breaks with matter, energy, space and time because somebody would-it would obey-to quote an exact ARC break I noticed myself at the beginning of a GPM-because it would obey such low-toned people! Perfectly logical ARC break.

Well, so the ARC broken condition of the pc in the area influences the meter read. Meter is reading very badly for that area anyway. This is the hill that a very skilled auditor climbs. But, now, listen to the good news back of it.

If you just keep trying and don't cut the itsa line, you will get tone arm action in your effort to date it. And the itsa line and blowing charge will increase the pc's reality on the incident to a point where the date is more and more real. And you will see bundles of facsimiles start to come apart.

For God's sakes, put this down in letters of fire because someday as an auditor this is well, I can give you a lot of tips about auditing-but someday as an auditor you're going to be-sit there and you just-just feel the tears under your eyelids, it's just too desperate, you know? *Gawd!* You tried!

You don't dare say anything to the pc-you're out of communication with the world, you know, and you've *tried*.

"Is this GPM more than two trillion years ago? Less than two tr-what did you think of? Oh, all right. Is this GPM more than two trillion years ago? Is it less than two trillion years ago? Apparently less than two trillion years ago. All right. Is this GPM more than five hundred billion trillion years ago? Less-that's a wrong date, excuse me. One and one-half trillion years ago? Less than one and one-half-it doesn't read. It's all blank. Let's see. Have you been thinking of anything?"

"Well, let's do another order of magnitude, huh? Tens of years ago? Hundreds of years ago? Thousands of years ago? Tens of thousands of years ago? Hundreds-tens of thousands of years ago. Is this GPM tens of thousands of years ago? Ah, is it more than tens of thousands of years ago? Greater magnitude than tens of thousands of years ago? Less than? Is it tens of thousands - oh, that's good, huh! Nice read!" See? "All right. Is it more than fifty thousand years ago? Less than fifty thousand years ago? It's less than. Is it more than twenty-five thousand years ago? Less than twenty-five thousand years ago? Less than. Is it more than ten thousand years ago? Less than ten thousand years ago? Less than. Is it more than five thousand years ago? Less than five thousand years ago? Oh, you thought it was greater than fifty thousand years ago? Oh! Oh, all right. All right. All right. All right. Was it more than seventy-five thousand years ago? Less than seventy-five thousand years ago? That didn't read, did you . . ."

You're very foolish if you don't interrupt that somewhere along the line. "Well now, what's been occurring to you while this has been going on?" And get yourself a little TA action, see? And bust it down. Because frankly, you can go on like that with a very, very tough GPM. It's just like-just like trying to catch a slippery fish. One time it's trillions and the next time it's thousands and then all of a sudden, you ... Why does it do that? You're slipping it off one screen and another screen, you see? And its restimulation factors are blowing, and so on. So, you've got to keep your itsa line in while you're dating.

That is probably one of the toughest things that a pro has to do-keep the itsa line in while dating. You get to sweating over this E-Meter and you forget about the pc to some degree-and if the pc is thinking about it and talking about it, why, there it is.

So much so, that I like to try to run the tone arm action out of it without dating it directly up. Get any idea the pc might have of the date. And just let him talk himself along the line until he either gets the date and gives it to me on a silver platter-or gives up completely, throws in the sponge so it squishes and then go ahead and date. And then try-if I can't find the date, do it all over again and just keep arguing and talking about this, you know, back and forth and getting my tone arm action. Because get this, now: If you *just keep trying to find something* and keep the itsa line in while you're doing it, you will *eventually find it*. *Clang!* But this is one of those things that you wouldn't ordinarily discover in the run-of-the-mill activities of auditing. You just wouldn't ordinarily discover it!

Because how often are you going to be willing to put in seven separate sessions trying to get the date of one *GPM*? How often would you do this? You jolly well wouldn't! You know, you'd say, "Well, it's amounting to no auditing, pc every once in a while gets ARC breaks, this is a mess, I'm in tears half the time, this is-the whole thing is just sending me straight up the wall and so on."

Well, relax! Because this is a stable datum-and this is a stable datum that you can just put back of your left ear that isn't going to be cancelled by tomorrow's bulletin. Because I've seen this happen, now, and I've seen it done. I know it's true. You just keep chewing away at trying to date or locate or get the character of something or get the *pattern* of a GPM-you just keep the pc headed at it, keep that tone arm moving and keep trying to find it-and suddenly enough charge will have disappeared off the area so it'll all *go-sssthung!* And you say-there it is like a stage set. You wonder how in the name of God did anybody ever miss it?

As I say, that is something you ordinarily wouldn't *discover* because you probably wouldn't give seven consecutive sessions to the-just one lousy little subject of auditing. Like, what is the pattern of this wildcat GPM? And one minute you're running this-you're trying to date it, see, and your dating is kind of going haywire; but you're trying to get the pattern-that's what you really want. And the pc is down in the cellar. His morale is just zero. How in the name of common sense is he ever on God's green earth going to get the pattern for this GPM? *Uhhhhh!* Wildcat GPM, my God-the thing-you tried out any other kind of a pattern.

You've asked him about it several times and you've asked him about this and you've asked him about that and it just - just *uhhh!* Just horrible!

"Well, maybe the first one is - maybe the first one is - is 'to be a spirit.' I think it's here. I think it's a goal. I-I *think* it's a goal. Maybe the first-I don't know that there is a goal in it, you understand, but there is certainly positive and negative items, or something in it."

Now, the more you put the itsa line in with the meter, the more you ask the meter for this data, the less you're going to win. And you've found that to be the case. Yeah. So, the pc just chews away, and he says, "I think it's 'spirited-never spirited'."

All right. Now, the wrong thing to do is to shake your head and say, "No, that didn't rocket read" and so on. Just, "Go on, tell me some more about the pattern." Don't keep him repeating anything. And he says, "Well, I think the next two items on it are 'undoubtaditably to be a spirit' and 'doubtaditably to be a spirit'. That's what I think."

"All right, well, go on, go on, give me some more on the thing. Your tone arm's moving, but you're not getting RRs."

He's going to tumble to it suddenly. Hell say, "Well, hell, no! This thing has nothing to do with spirits, it's 'to be drunk'!"

You just keep him chewing at it and you'll see TA action, TA action, TA action and all of a sudden hell come up with something. Well, all of a sudden he leans back-if you don't cut his itsa line and chop him up-all of a sudden, "Well, the pattern of this thing is very simple. It's just plus and minus and then a dichotomy. See? It just goes drunk-not drunk, sober-not sober - I think-then it says, 'to be drunk.' Yeah! Yeah, that's what it is! It's 'drunk-not drunk, sober - not sober, 'to be drunk.' Oh yes! And then it fires the other way to. Then it fires with the items reversed, to the left and right. Yes! That's the way the thing goes. And it goes-it goes, over here, it goes, you got-got-got 'drunk' over here on your-on your right, now, see? So it goes-no, now wait a minute, now wait a minute. The way this thing goes-the way this thing goes is 'drunk-never drunk.'". And boy, you see that meter all of sudden take off, see, getting this one. Rocket read. "It's 'drunk-never drunk, sober-never sober, to be drunk.' No, no. No, no. No, I got it now! I got it now! It's 'sober-never sober, drunk-never drunk , to be drunk.

And you just keep him chewing at it, rather than sitting there trying to ride him into a hole. Now, the hell of it is, is you take anything as complex as the Helatrobis Implants, it takes you longer to get the charge off without the pattern than with the pattern. But the pc trying to understand this thing and trying to run this thing and so forth and trying to get a grip on it, sometimes will kill his own TA action if it's too evaluated. Why? The itsa line is being put in for him. The itsa lines are being put in for him. What is it?

Now, a meter is very, very didactic. It reads at a lower level of consciousness than the pc, but remember it's just a little bit lower. And you blow some charge and the pc will become conscious of what the meter becomes conscious on. All a meter does is become conscious of

something before the pc becomes conscious of it. It just reaches the pc-it reaches him up just a little bit further along the line, and therefore gives you a preview of coming attractions.

Well, now do you understand, you could look at the graph-you can look at a graph of your itsa line-whatsit-itsa, see, and you see that you can say, "Whatsit?" and the pc can say, "Itsa" and you've got auditing happening. Ah! But what if the pc says, "Whatsit?" and the meter-you use the meter to say "Itsa." You want to see tone arm fold up? You've reversed all this now.

Now, pcs will do this if you create a meter dependency. And you should always keep your meter back. Don't do anything. "What do you think?" is a very good way, although a pc sometimes mildly ARC breaks on it. He very often says, "Yeah, but I want to know!" You say, "All right. Horse? Goat? It *was* a goat." "Reads on a goat" is the safer statement to make. "Is that right? Is it a goat?"

"Yeah, it's a goat."

Pc is demanding information. Well, this means he's given up. Now, when he's given up you can help him out, of course.

Well, let's take a look here-let's take a look at this whatsit-itsa line. And supposing the pc-you ask, "Whatsit" and then put the itsa in on the meter. And then you ask, "Whatsit" and put the itsa in on the meter. And when you ask "Whatsit" and put the itsa in on the meter. Don't be surprised if your tone arm action ceases to exist. I don't know, you must be doing some kind of an audit on something-but it doesn't have anything to do with the pc, don't you see? That's the way to get good and messed up.

You say, "All right, whatsit," and then, "Well, all right, I'll help you out here. Itsa." I don't know what the auditor's doing there, saying, "Whatsit, itsa. Whatsit, itsa. Whatsit, itsa. Whatsit, itsa. Whatsit, itsa?" Where's the session? See, it isn't anyplace! It isn't anyplace at all.

But your pc must not be pushed down into the depths of despair. You say, "Well, what do you think the date is?" It's a nice way of dating. The pc says, "*Uhhhhh, daaaaaooooo*. I just don't know. I just haven't got a clue." Date on the meter for a while. And you're starting to get near it, "Do you got any idea of the date now?"

"Oh, yeah! It's so-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so." And you say, "All right." And that's it. That's quite common; but the reverse can also be true. You start dating, "You got any idea of what the date is?" And he says, "Well, that's a so-and-so, no, it's a so-and-so, what's it-so-and-so, and so-and-so. It might be more than billions, but it's less than trillions. Seems like it was just yesterday, you know, but it isn't really. And so on and so on and so on and so ... It's pretty unreal. It all-and so on and so on and so on and so on and so on and ... Well, I just don't know, my God, I just don't know. I just haven't got a clue!"

Oh, well! By all means, now, in R2H it's very simple, he says it's 58, 57, 58, 57-I don't know whether it was 58 or 57! You say, "Well, the meter flicks every time you say 58. All right. Good. Is 58 a wrong date? That doesn't read. Apparently 58."

That's more desirable, don't you see, than having him quit. But, look at this trick of using a meter. "Well," you say, "well, what-what do you think the date of this thing was?"

"Well, it might have been this, it might have been that, but on the other hand, it was some-tha-it might have been this and it might have been that and it might have been something or other and I-well-bu-I give up. I don't know. I don't know, I just don't have a clue."

You say, "All right, we'll do an order of magnitude on this. Was it tens of years ago? Hundreds of years ago? Thousands of years ago? Tens of thousands of years ago? Hundreds of thousands of years ago? Was it millions of years ago? Tens of millions of years-that reads. Tens of millions of years ago? Tens of millions of years ago? Millions of years ago. Millions of years ago - that reads. Millions of years ago is the order of magnitude" and so on. "Have you got any idea what this date is?"

Now what are you doing You're doing a different trick, aren't you? The trick you're doing now is using the meter to jog the whatsit line, see? Slippy, huh?

Audience: Mm!

Then the pc will sit there and say, "Millions of years ago! Let's see, was it five million years ago? Six million . . . "

They sometimes develop systems. The picture comes in clearly on six, but doesn't come in on five, you know? So they say five and a half Got a clear picture, so they say it must be five and a half Then they realize if they say five and a quarter it turns on heat. "Must be five and a quarter. Five and a third. Five and a quarter, five and a third-five and a quarter! Five and a quarter. Must be five and a quarter million years ago. Does it read on the meter? Five and a quarter million years ago?"

"Well, do you think it was?" See, because if you said, "Oh, yes, that reads on the meter!" You know, see? It's the acknowledgment of what they've just done, but at the same time they're still depending on the meter. And you sometimes have them say, rather satisfied, "Well, it's a five and a quarter million years ago!" See, they're saying, "Does it read on the meter? Does it-five and a quarter million years ago?"

"Well, do you think it is? Do you think that's the right date?" See, that's a way of snapping back your itsa line in, see? They tried to hand the itsa line to the meter. "Do you think that's a right date?"

"Yeah! Yeah, that's a right date-that's a right date."

“Okay,” you say, “that reads.” See, by doing it in reverse, you see, you get them certain-and then say, “Well, you should have been certain about it all the time because it also reads on the meter, see?”

Of course they have the feeling that you’re sort of a spy hanging over their shoulder anyhow, because you’ve got the meter in front of you. So they’re afraid to be right. And the more evaluative auditors have been to them, the more chopped they have been in their auditing, the less itsa line they have had in, why, the more queasy they are about being right. So they will tend to invalidate themselves. And you can just pick up pcs any day of the week, they just invalidate themselves like mad. All the time, all the time, all the time - invalidate themselves.

One of the ways they do this is to invalidate what they’ve just said and ask you if it reads on the meter in order to be validated by the meter. And the more an auditor can do this without being a nasty slob about it, see, “Well, I’m not going to tell you what it says on the meter-you think I want to create a meter dependence with you?” and so forth. I’m afraid that wouldn’t be very workable, you see.

But, if you can-if you can use that meter to boost the whatsit line and coax the itsa line in, why, you’ll be very successful with the meter-very adroit. And only date when the guy just throws in the sponge. It goes *squash* all over the auditor’s reports, you see. Because you can get up to a point of asking him for more than he can give and that’s one of the ways of cutting an itsa line. See, every time the guy gives you something, ask him for some more.

I’ll give you a way I’ve done this, see-pc very proudly says, “Ha! I got a picture here! A color picture. Got a-got a color picture of some mountains.” He’s very satisfied at this point, he’s communicated the whole lousy lot, see? And you say, “Well, what kind of mountains are they?”

“Well, they’re just mountains mountains.”

“Any- anybody in it? Any people on . . .”

“No, there’s no people in it!” We can just hear their tone come right on down.

So after the guy has said, “I can’t find this date. I don’t know what this date is.” After a guy has chucked in the sponge and you say, “Oh, come on, 4 give me the date.” Cut your throat! You see? Because what you’ve done is stretch an itsa line beyond its ability to stretch. What you need to do is plug in a little bit more restimulation. See? So you’ve actually bled off all the restimulation that is there. So you just use the meter to knock another block off the glacier and let the pc clean it up.

“Order of magnitude *bla-bla-blo-wow, bla-ba-ba-ba-bow, bla-blow-blowblow, bla-bla-bla-blaw, bla, bow-bow-bow, bow*. All right, you ge-coming any closer to what the date is, now?”

“Oh,” he’ll say, 44 yeah, yeah, you say-you say the thing is-is millions of years ago, and it’s-yeah, yeah! Yeah! It’s so on and so on and so on and there it is and so on. It’s five-five and a quarter million years ago. What’s it say on the meter?”

“Oh, all right, well is that right? Is that five and a quarter million years ago? Is that okay?”

“Well, yeah, that’s okay, what’s it say on the meter?”

You say, “Well, it says you’re right.” Or “It isn’t reading on the subject, at the moment.” Slippy. Dangerous-awful dangerous territory to be haunting around very much.

“But I want to know what it says on the meter!”

“Well, at the moment it doesn’t say anything on the meter.”

“All right, then it must be some other date!” the guy says.

All right, now you don’t ask him, “Well, what is that other date,” see? Say, “You want me to do another order of magnitude?”

“No, no, that isn’t necessary; I think the thing actually is trillions-three. Trillion-trillion-trillion. Not trillions-two. That must be what it is. That must be what it is.”

“All right.”

“Will you check it for me?”

See, you’re on the spot now. You’re on the spot. It’s a very, very slippery little contest that you can run in this particular line. It’s perfectly all right to tell the pc what a meter is reading, what his tone arm is doing, that sort of thing. He’d be quite relaxed about this thing. The moment the **pc** starts relying on the meter instead of looking at it himself, why, you’re in trouble. You get him in too much of-that’s relying! Dependency. Let him create that dependency and you’ve spoiled some of his case. You’ve spoiled his sense of time and that sort of thing.

So it’s a very nice point. It’s a very nice point. And you have to solve that by being alert. And the basic rule is: is use your meter to get in the whatsit line and coax the itsa line.

And at last resorts, such as a howling ARC break, of course the only thing you’ve got left is your meter. The pc isn’t talking or thinking. That’s the last resort. So now you do ARC break assessments and that sort of thing - that applies to sessions, by the way. Doesn’t apply to you giving an ARC break assessment. Down-oh, Peter landed with all four thuds down there in Australia and-and he got everything wheeling and dealing in a hurry. Things were going in all directions quickly. He had this congress laid out and he-he’s fast, you know-he picks this thing practically up off of his bulletin line, you know, off his desk, and goes down to the congress and puts six auditors to work doing ARC break assessments on every congress attendee. He put them in a booth outside. So here were six auditors, you know, all during the

congress, going *bangety-bangety-bangety-bangety-bangety*, doing ARC break assessments, you know? And they're just cleaning up ARC breaks all over the place and everybody's saying hurrah, wonderful, marvelous, you know? He's industrious. I'll bet he didn't even get a chance to read the bulletin himself He's quick.

Anyway, now, it doesn't matter whether somebody's ARC broke or not ARC broke, see? You can give them an ARC break assessment out of session or any place else or every Friday in a Central Organization or something like this and keep things wheeling and dealing. But you can cut an itsa line to ribbons with ARC break assessments, man. You can just cut them to ribbons. *Swish-swish, slash-slash!*

"Well, I don't know if I've got the right item here or not; let's see." "Oh, well, I'll do an ARC break assessment." Sounds incredible! "Well, I don't know. I don't know if this is quite the right goal or not, let's see, this, well, right goal or not. We might have bypassed something here. It might be something." "All right, I'll do an ARC break assessment."

Cut your throat, man! That's putting in the itsa line with an ARC break assessment! Don't do it! An ARC break assessment has its value after all else has failed-and that's almost the same with the meter. The meter needle has its greatest value when all else has failed. ARC break assessment has its greatest value when all else has failed. Because the most operating thing you've got anywhere around you, actually, is the pc! You can take data from this pc. You get surprising data from the pc. Pc will sit there and *barketybarkety, bangety-bang*. He can give you more darn data.

Just because a pc says, "Oh, I don't know, is-I-doesn't look right to me, there's something wrong here. Something wrong. I don't..." That's no reason for you to do a thing! I know you have consciences-you want to get in there and earn your fee, earn your keep, pay for your own auditing, it's that sort of thing. I know you have an idea that if you just get busy enough and you heave enough bricks through enough windows, why, everybody will pat you on the back for being so industrious. Well, you're not ever patted on the back for being industrious. You're only patted on the back for getting ease advances, see?

Well, great day then, the pc says, "Rrrr, something wrong here, someuh-rmmmm-mmmmm-mmm." I don't care how long he goes "Mm-mm-mmmm-mm." Let him go on and "Mm-mm-mm-mm-mm." Just as long as that TA moves-that's all I'm interested in. And he can mutter and fumble and stumble and bumble all he wants to - as long as the TA moves. I'm not asking precise data from this pc. That's what's wrong with this pc-this pc has a lot of imprecise data. Very imprecise data. Let's take an ARC break assessment-also his confidence in his own bank is very, very poor.

Let's take an ARC break assessment. And you're going down the ARC break assessment. *Bark, bark, bark, bark, bark*-and the pc brightens up all of a sudden. And you've got two choices here. And one of them is *wrong!* The choice is to go on and complete the ARC break assessment. That's wrong! That's wrong-every time. The pc suddenly looked

bright. See, he didn't even say he had anything to say. Oh, you know! You'll see it, actually, sometimes a flash on the meter while you're doing the assessment, if you're not looking at the pc. "You think of something Anything?"

"Yeah! Yeah, it's actually the unknownness of the whole thing. I didn't know anything about it. I didn't know the guy's name, you see. Everybody's trying to tell me his name was Joe, but in actual fact I didn't know his name. And that-that was what that ARC break is-was all about. Heh! That's it!"

And you didn't get a chance to earn your keep, man! You know what 4 you're supposed to do-you're supposed to go down the whole list. Now, if you say to the pc, at this point, "Well, all right! Well, now how do you feel about that ARC break?" The meter goes tick. You say, "Is there something else about that, that you haven't told me yet?"

"Oh, well, yeah, maybe you didn't get that ... See, the guy-the guy-I didn't know his name, but they said his name was Joe. And I had never found out what his name really was. They just said it was Joe, you understand? They just said it was Joe. And I don't know that his name was Joe, see. And I never did find out the guy's name. I don't know what his name is. And that's-that's what the ARC break assessment is, all the time. They were trying to put this-this was-I guess it's a false datum."

And you say, "All right, good. How do you feel about that ARC break assessment?" Clear as a bell. See, he thought he'd interrupted you and he didn't quite get it across to you and he had various explanations, don't you see, why maybe he didn't have his itsa line in on you because he had distracted you and kept you, you see, maybe from assessing and earning your keep, you know?

Pcs have lots of weird reasons like this. But you shouldn't automatically assume. I know, because I myself have had this happen in a session while I was auditing. And it's very embarrassing! You say, "Does that clear it all up?" *Clang!* See? You say, "All right, is it all right if I go on with the remainder of the assessment?" The pc-glummer, glummer, needle getting dirtier, dirtier, dirtier.

Look, it would be better to leave the charge on it than it would be to ARC break the pc about it! Do you follow that?

Audience: Yes.

That applies also to GPMs. You can sometimes ARC break the pc like mad on some wildcat GPM just because you were trying to be precise all the time and the pc is arguing with you. I myself ran into an ARC break as a pc one time on the subject of-I had "to listen." I saw "to listen" come out of the floorboards of one of these GPM rooms. I saw it come out! I couldn't understand why I'd *seen* these words come out! Because I ordinarily don't do that in a session, see? So I said, "I just saw 'to listen' come out of the middle of the floorboard. We must have some kind of a goal in here like that." And the-and the auditor looked at the meter

and said, "It didn't RR." That, frankly, was the end of that facsimile. It was being held there by two frayed hairs, anyway! Very highly charged area, preceded by lord knows how many GPMs. The reason I got to the place, nobody will ever find out. But that's all it took, see? And the GPM folded up. Denial of the pc's perception of the GPM. Actually it took it a little bit longer than that to fold up. It took another slight blunder immediately afterwards, but that was the reason it folded up, see.

It was just-pc all of a sudden originated and said ... The auditor knows he's trying to run the goal, let us say, "to catch" or something, you see. And the pc says, "Hey! You know, coming right out of the floorboards here is these words 'to listen.' And - never saw anything like this before.

"Oh, no, that doesn't rocket read."

Well, the pc didn't give a damn whether it rocket read or not! You get that? He didn't care-he didn't care for a minute whether this rocket read or not! Very often in putting together a GPM a pc will be going and giving you the items, *bang, bang, bang, bang, bang*, bang-giving you the items, repeating them a few times-and all of a sudden will get to the next pair! Get to the next pair. And the next pair dinning his ears in, and the auditor says go back and clean up the old pair.

What do you do in a case like this? It's very interesting. Because if you leave partially charged items on the thing, the pc is going to ARC break and if you don't take the pc's next items, he's going to ARC break. What do you do? Well, you're an auditor. That's one of the perils of existence!

There is a solution. You can hastily write them down so he won't forget them. You can say, "I've got a note of those," and go on and get your items clean. That's just one solution. Did you ever think of the solution of going through a GPM and then through it again? That's totally possible too-but also dangerous because all sorts of weird things are liable to happen, don't you see?

So the contest of how you get a GPM discharged without cutting the itsa line is one of the more interesting things that an auditor can do. And it takes very, very skilled auditing in order to accomplish this fact. And the variations of it are so many that you couldn't possibly cover all possible cases. Your job is to get the GPM discharged and keep the pc in an enthusiastic state of mind so he will discharge the GPM. Because the pc in a lowered state of mind can't discharge the GPM.

Now, your *whatsit-your whatsit* line uniformly, completely, totally, thoroughly means just that-what's it. It's called "whatsit" because those exact words raise the tone arm. And the itsa line is called "itsa" because those exact words lower the TA. Or in a low-TA case, I think, reverse it-although I myself haven't seen this as an auditor yet. Too new.

Now, if that is the case, then we would say that the solution of mystery was the resolution of a ease and the restoration of TA action. And as I told you a little earlier, your cessation of TA action is your heaviest auditing problem. TA isn't moving. That's the case that drives you around the bend. A case will also drive you around the bend in numerous other ways. But when the TA stops moving, you've got a headache. That's a worry. Right now, right now, that's a worry.

So I'd like to give you a clue as to why this is. Whatever else you say about GPMs or a time or anything else, this is certainly true: That the pc is stuck on a whatsit for which he has no itsa. Elementary, my dear Watson. Doctor Watson, now, by the way-that was his gag-I took it from him.

Now, did you ever think of the possibility that the pc might have asked his own whatsit? Now, I'll give you an exact example. They do this all the time. It's not once in a while.

Now, this pc-pc sitting there, gives you the itsa, itsa, itsa. In the process of giving you the itsa, itsa, itsa, gets in two whatsits, on himself All right. Now, they got clear as a bell, everything was fine and you went just a little bit further and all of a sudden the pc felt foggy. The pc felt foggy because of the two whatsits. These are two new auditing questions, if you please, but you didn't ask them! But the pc asked them and now you've got some charge in restimulation that's not been itsa'd! And so the pc feels foggy.

You'll sometimes get this toward the end of session. You were doing fine and you asked one question too many and then you cant get the TA down and you don't know what happens. Well, ordinarily it stems immediately back to a question the pc asked themselves. Now, the most common cause of a TA going up in a break is the pc asked themselves a whatsit.

Audience: Mmmm.

That break gives them a short period of time without the auditing question in which they can demand of themselves a whatsit.

Now you, of course, because they've forgotten the whatsit, they never give the itsa- and you've got a high TA and you sometimes will struggle around endlessly and fruitlessly and forever trying to get this TA to do anything-put in your since mid ruds and every other confounded thing to get it to come down. The one thing that you seldom ask for is what whatsit did they ask of themselves. Could be put in other numerous ways: "Did you speculate about anything in the break?"

Now, the funny part of it is, is as-ising whatsits does not give you auditing. I've tested this out. That's interesting, isn't it? You don't as-is whatsits. Whatsit-you cannot run a case on solid mystery, in other words. It sounds impossible, but if you just, "Get the idea of

questioning things. Thank you. Get the idea of questioning things. Thank you,” you would just drive the tone arm up, and it wouldn’t come down.

Why? Because the bank is composed of a cure to the problem. Or as Reg was saying a few minutes ago, the puzzle, see? And the reason the puzzle is hung up is because there’s something in it which was a cure. Cures brought about problems. And to as-is problems you have to pick up the itsas. That itsa was always a cure to some problem which is now holding it in place. So it takes both the whatsit and the itsa to get the stable datum and the Confusion off. The whatsit is the Confusion the itsa is the stable datum. So you announce the Confusion and the pc gives you the stable datum and of course you get restoration of balance. You get the thing blowing off.

Actually, in tiny vignette, this is the mechanism of a GPM. And it’s just the common questions that you use, you see? You would have to ask somebody, “What have you been puzzled about? What was the answer to it?” That’s a little bit blunt. “What answers might there have been to it?” Two-way comm is something that drives some auditors around the bend. They don’t realize that two-way comm maybe won’t run an engram, but it will blow off all the locks. So you could say, “When did you first become aware of this problem?” That “first” is a bad thing to use, but it nevertheless keeps somebody diving at it. “Give me a time you became aware of this problem.” That starts a two-way comm cycle, don’t you see?

Pc says, “I have a big present time problem about something or another,” see. Big present time problem.

“All right, well, what solutions have you thought of? Have you ever had similar problems in the past? How do people ordinarily solve such a problem? When did you first become aware of a need to resolve this problem?”

Now you’re drifting off back into the whatsit, don’t you see? But you can get the itsas of almost anything. I think it’s interesting, isn’t it? Therefore auditing questions, to be valid, must balance between announcing the puzzle and getting the cure. But if you have him inventing cures, then the puzzle will get more puzzling. So you-the only way you really produce a gain-a gain in auditing-the only way you ever really produce a gain in auditing-is having him become aware of the problems and the solutions which he has had for those problems. And then you get tone arm action.

That’s a theoretical dissertation, but it’s also quite empirical. Takes the whatsit and it takes the itsa. And if you never let the pc reach any of his own itsas, of course, you don’t get TA action. There are many ramifications to this; there are different types of processes produce different Potentials of TA action. There’s a lot you can go into about this. It will continue to be a worry, but I’m giving you the exact fundamentals of what causes it to cease when a tone arm stops. Okay?

Audience: Mm.

We're way over time – thank you very much!