AUDITING BY LISTS

A lecture given on
16 April 1964

Thank you. What's the date?

Audience: 16th of April.

Sixteenth of April. Have to make you work for this lecture one way or the other. AD 14, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. How are you today?

Audience: All right. Fine.

Good.

All right. Well, I haven't anything to talk to you today about. You're all doing marvelously. You just couldn't do better unless you began to audit. And all the departments are going well. They even tell me there's going to be a checkout in a week or two in Practical. Yes, things are looking up, looking up.

There is one good news item which is marvelous, is apparently, *The Auditor* is going across with a smash – the new magazine. And we almost never have reader mail on these national magazines, and so forth, or PABs. Nobody ever bothers to write. They write on other lines, you know, but they almost never mention these magazines. And it's very peculiar that *The Auditor* on its first issue immediately – crash, bang! You see, letters pouring in to the editor and everything going off with a bang and a crash and a thud. So we launched that one into an aura of great success. So let's hope the whole Auditor's division goes ahead along that line. Let's hope they all go along with great success. And a lot of us were on to that publication and we have the magic key there.

All right. Now, I hope the situations in Class VI are going to remedy anytime now. And some of you are going to get brave enough to really go out and confront the tiger. I've been swamping up any little odd bit or piece that you might collide with. It's down to a point now where a collision with an error or an oddity wouldn't do too much to your pc anyway. You'd catch it in due course.

But that's pretty well ready to go. That's pretty well ready to go and I want to see some of those Class VI students here really moving up because – don't look so pale – because it—just because a couple of them got moved back off for inadequate TA division, and so forth.

It just shows you something. I had a lot of people finding goals on this, and they never found out that one of the series is nonexistent. Very interesting to me. I mean, I do this all the time. I mean, I'm working in some particular field and there's some glaring error to be found there, and so forth, and nobody ever finds it. And it drives me ahead into zones and areas of greater responsibility. And you really bog me down with responsibility, and so forth, because I figure if I made an error, you'd go along till heck was a pup before you'd ever turn it up. And yeah, it's—really saddles me with one, you know. It's a serious situation. As a result, when I audit, I audit the bank and the pc and all the future mistakes you're going to make, and it makes my auditing quite difficult.

But this area is pretty well swamped out now, and pretty straight and I've gotten into a zone now of overcorrection. I'm now, having made one little slip—see, I didn't release it. I was going to recheck it before I released everything and then before I released it, I—on the recheck, why, I found out there was an error. And there was also a bit of a line plot error. There was a word or so missing out of the line plot. But I'm now into an area where I'm overcorrecting.

You see what I mean. I mean, you do this with a pc every once in a while. You can also do it with a piece of research. You find out that it was the break of reality which upset the pc, you see, and then you go on looking, See. And if you go on looking far enough, you'll have the pc upset all over again. See, you get your good indicators back in and then you go looking for something that is wrong. I've now done this with some of our upper—level materials, and so forth. I've gone so far looking for something wrong, don't you see, that now all I can find is invalidation of what's right.

But you're in very good shape this way and things are all fine. I want to see some auditing teams going on it. And why, I'd say now that we lie about 200 to 300 hours of auditing from OT for about at least 30 percent of the people I'm looking at right this minute—providing, providing, providing you audit. That's necessary.

I want to talk to you today—those were all just announcements and so forth—I want to talk to you today about Auditing by Lists. And I'm getting so tired of writing somebody in north Darwin (you know you don't dare go too north in Darwin, you get your feet wet, you know) and somebody here and somebody there, somebody on course writing down the explicit directions of how you audit by list, that I think I had better make it public property. I think that might be a very good idea. I'm not yet in a position where I can release the whole of Auditing by Lists, because we haven't, you know, cleared up and straightened up all the lists by which you audit.

Now, Sherlock Holmes used to turn to Dr. Watson every once in a while and say, "Watson, the needle," you know. He used to turn around once in a while and he'd say this, you see, and Watson was supposed to give him the needle.

But Level III is the needle level. That's the needle level. Level II and lower are tone—arm levels. And your first level that pays any attention to the needle—except to use it for centering the tone arm—is III. Now, that's very important because that's your HCA/HPA level.

Now, as you realize now, a co—auditor can be known by the fact that at this level he has an HCA certificate, and a classified auditor can be known because at this level he has an HPA certificate. We're separating them right there, so you better get your certificates turned in and straightened out.

Anyway, a very, very careful study, a very careful study—of auditors and auditing lies behind all of these level divisions. And with a great deal of skill—and it does require apparently a great deal of skill—once a person is accustomed to auditing a pc, he can then learn how to use a needle. Now, very few auditors who are simply monkeying around with the tone arm and so forth are aware of the amount of skill necessary to use a needle.

Let me tell you some of the difficulties of using a needle. A needle, unlike a tone arm, can be upset by the pc's reaction to the auditing session or question—unlike the tone arm. Now, you can't tell, really, from the tone arm action, whether or not the pc is upset or anything else. And the pc might very well be upset, but it doesn't reflect in the tone arm action.

You say, "Well yes, and so forth, it would go up." But I'm afraid that isn't a constant manifestation at all. I know a pc who, whenever she gets mad in session, has a TA blowdown. I've seen pcs blow their TAs down by protesting. I've seen all kinds of wild things happen to a TA.

So, a TA is actually not a direct representation of the reaction of the pc to the session. Whether you get TA action or not is, but after all that's a two—and—a—half—hour look, isn't it? Well, of course you pick it up within twenty minutes or something—like that, that he isn't getting TA action. But it really doesn't say whether or not the process is wrong or the—or the pc's reaction is wrong; it doesn't really tell you why, why you're getting no tone arm action.

In other words, the tone arm does not analyze the session beyond saying whether or not the pc is getting gain. But it doesn't analyze the session because the pc may not be getting gain because you're running the wrong process. So therefore, it is not a direct indicator on the subject of the session—a tone arm is not—because it includes the process. The process has a great deal to do with it.

Well, not so a needle. You start the action known as "cleaning a needle," and you immediately run into the fact that the needle, first and foremost, registers the session and secondarily registers the process or reaction of the pc. Your first needle reaction is session.

Now, the only difficult manifestation of a needle for an auditor to learn to cope with is what is called a "dirty needle."

Now, let's take this as the crudest manifestation—the dirty needle. Now, there's very few auditors are ever sufficiently self-flagellantish to recognize the source of a dirty needle. The source of the dirty needle is always the auditor. It's never anything else. It's always the auditor. If you've got a little *zzizz—zzizz,* you know, your needle is going tickety—tick, *ziz—zizzzzzzzizzzizzbzzz—bzz—bz—bz—bz,* just a little shaky, shaky bzz—and slow or fast—it's a little shaky *bzzzzz.* It's going up and down, and so on and so on; it's not lying there calmly like it's asleep. It's lying there as though it's got St. Vitus' dance.

This thing can only be as wide, by the way, as an eighth of an inch or something like that. But it's still a dirty needle. That dirty needle is always traceable back to the auditor's failure to handle the auditing comm cycle, one way or the other, or to handle an auditing cycle—which is a process or something. But the pc is reacting to the auditor's disability to audit. The auditor's done something.

Now, don't think every auditor is all—is sooner or later going to come out to a point where he never has a dirty needle. This is not an attainable absolute. Because the auditor varies in his emotional stresses in sessions. And the auditor is trying to get something done; he's completely out of sympathy with this pc who is just giving him the 5,765th problem, when all he's trying to do is to find out if the pc has suppressed anything. And the pc is going on at a mad rate.

Nevertheless, it is the auditor's reaction that gives the dirty needle. You would not get the dirty needle just because the pc is going on endlessly not following the process. But when you bring up the pc with a dull thud by failing to acknowledge, by insisting the pc answer something, by chopping his communication in some particular fashion, by not accepting his answer—any way that you could possibly interrupt the comm cycle—you'll see magically appear before you a dirty needle.

In other words, the pc could have done the wildest and most incredible things on a process level without acquiring a dirty needle and gets a dirty needle the moment that the auditor gives them a bad time or chops them or squares it up or does an unsmooth action.

So, there is a little piece of evidence that you yourself will see from time to time if you care to observe it. It might be a good thing for you to observe it occasionally, because you will never do a Level IV assessment unless you stand—understand the Level III skills of the needle.

Level III is almost totally devoted to needle. If you follow the needle, you will get tone arm action. If you don't handle the needle, you won't get tone arm action.

Now, the pc—let us say we have a question here, "Do birds fly'.?" and the pc has no charge on this question. There isn't anything in this question at all—"Do birds fly?" There's nothing to this question. The pc doesn't care about birds. He hasn't any answer to it. He has no interest in it of any kind whatsoever.

So you say, "Do birds fly?" and the needle registers absolutely nothing. It's a completely smooth flow. And at that moment you went slightly cross—eyed and you didn't see that it had a very smooth flow, so you decided to ask the question again. And you say, "Do birds fly'?" and that's it; you've had it.

It's a sort of not handling the pc's answer anyhow. It's actually not taking the needle reaction which was there to be had. You simply didn't see it. So you forced this question down the pc's neck. Even if you say, "That was equivocal. I will have to ask it again." Well, usually that gets you over the hump but not always.

So we asked this question again, "Do birds fly?" And at this moment the pc said, "Oh, blank!"—to himself. And you get that registering on the needle.

Now, the uninformed auditor believes at this point that he missed the read the first time and now has a read. He doesn't bother to clean up the pc's considerations, but he assumes that he now has a read on "Do birds fly"?" so he is going to clean this question!

Now, remember what I told you. The first reaction of a needle is to the session and the second reaction of the needle is to the question. So the auditor has assumed now—bypassing the possibility that it was a session reaction—he has assumed that he has a hot question, because the needle ticked. So he says, "Well, it read."

The pc said, "No, I don't have a birds fly—bluaaaaah."

"Yeah, but it read!"

"Oh, it read. Oh. Oh, I guess, let's see, 'Do birds fly?' I haven't got any birds. Let's see, do they fly or not fly, and so on. *Oooooooh,* let's see, *hmmmmooooooh,* let's see, 'Do birds *fly?'—duh—da—duh—da—da—da . . .*"

And you get the standard re—session reaction that some people like to think of as auditing. See, you've turned it on right there. Pc's out of session; he's not interested in what you're doing.

Now, you could sit there and you ask, "Do birds fly?" and you're going to get a bigger and bigger and bigger reaction to this question. Every time you ask the question you're going to get more reaction to the question, because your needle reacts first to the session and second to the process.

Now, the auditor eventually gets into an ARC break situation, let us say. The pc explodes all over the place. He eventually gets List 1, and he starts down List 1 and he clears

up the ARC break, and finally, and so forth, and then he gets a smooth needle again. But supposing this auditor never had learned anything about cleaning up a needle or that the needle reaction was primary to the session and secondary to the process. And let's supposing the auditor hadn't any clue about any of this: While he's doing the ARC break assessment he does the same thing. He gets the wrong level or something of that sort, and he does it once more.

Therefore, you don't let auditors at Level III assess anything. This takes a senior understanding. Now, *if* the pc has already been upset, it will be because the auditor could not handle the needle. To let that auditor now do an ARC break assessment on the pc is going to result in a multiplication of the ARC break because this auditor has already not handled the needle, and handling an ARC break is a process of handling a needle. That's a technique of handling a needle, you see.

Now, even an experienced auditor—I've seen them goof an ARC break something marvelous, just wrap it around a couple of telegraph poles and leave it there in a pile of junk. ARC break the pc on an ARC break assessment. Pc all of a sudden originates and he says, "Well, the charge was so—and—so." That was what it was. Brightens up, everything is fine, and the auditor goes back to the question he is trying to clean. The pc now protests this question because it wasn't that question, it was the other question, so it makes it seem to the pc that the auditor has not received his communication. So he gets a dirty, chopped—up needle. The auditor tries to ask this question, "Has a communication been ignored?" And of course this question is being protested by the pc, so you get a bigger read on it. And the auditor insists that the bypassed charge is an ignored communication. The pc is trying to insist that it was a broken reality. And between the two of them they stir up the most gorgeous ARC break you ever saw in your life. You see how this goes?

All you have to recognize about a needle is that the needle, first and foremost, reflects the Condition of the session and secondarily reflects other things that you're flicking and ticking at.

Now, you're very, very lucky to have a Mark V meter. Early meters were about as sensitive as a Nazi. You got nothing out of them. In fact, I have seen meters that had been manufactured out from under, so lousy, so horrible and so on, that you practically could short the electrodes. Now, the meters which are being—you know, no reaction—the meters which are being used by infantry in Vietnam to hand to the communist fellow traveler who has just come from general headquarters—whatever it is—this meter, if it isn't a copy of the Mark V, would be a complete bust.

They don't know what this thing is supposed to be all about. They have no real clue. When you get your lie detector buzzards going around and your medics fooling around with a thing called the mind—they know what a mind is; it's something you attack with a scalpel and a saw—when you get these—it's very hard for me to use just pleasant language in dealing with it.

And we've got one down which Reg bought at vast expense—and I'm awfully glad we've got it, though; it's still around the place. It is a medical doctor's E—Meter. Marvelous thing, I don't know what it's supposed to tell, but it's marvelous. There is no way you can reduce the sensitivity on the confounded thing, and it's geared up to read horses or mules or something. I don't know what it is, but all that needle does is bounce from both sides and so on, on body motion. It won't give you anything but body motion. It has no faintest mental reaction traceable on it anyplace. If somebody moves his foot across the room from the person handling the electrodes, this thing falls three and four dials. You think I'm kidding, man, but you ought to see that thing. It is an absolute beast! The medical doctor's E—Meters.

Actually even the sensitivity has nothing to do with it. It doesn't—it isn't how sensitive the meter is that makes it a good meter. Somebody can throw together some old pots and tin cans and so forth and say, "This is an E—Meter," and you look at it and you squeeze the cans and, oh man, it flies all over the place.

That factor—the looseness of the needle—does not establish whether or not your E—Meter is an operative meter; nor the inactivity of the needle, as some of these old pots and so forth that were counterfeited up the line in the earlier days—that doesn't establish it either.

An E—Meter must measure mental reaction with a minimum of physical reaction, and that is the trick and that's the design of the Mark V.

Now, the Mark V will register an analytical and slightly sub—reaction. It is geared up so that if the pc has a reality on what you've asked him you will get a read on that thing on the meter, see. That's a very beautifully balanced little situation. And we're very lucky. It took years to evolve this meter. But it's a careful balance out of these factors. Every time somebody says, "Let's get a new meter," I throw up my hands in horror.

I remember, there's—there is a civilization a few galaxies over here that—it's got spaceships and backpacks and infantry zerp guns, and it's got this, and it's got certain types of motorcycles, and it's got that, and so forth. (Probably a lot of you are from there because every time it loses a battle they ship the people over here—the enemy does. They know what—they know how to get even.)

So anyway, this old civilization—this old civilization is just about the meanest area to try to put an idea into it you ever had. You see, they worked it out for years and eons and eons—been going for billions and trillions and trillions of years with an uninterrupted flow—which is pretty unusual in civilizations anyhow, see, and is on a complete, perfect no—Change.

And you say, "We got an idea for spaceships." Their spaceships aren't all that good. They're as good as spaceships can be, but you could undoubtedly make a better spaceship, you see. But they blow up on occasion and they do this on occasion, they do that on occasion. They mess up one way or the other. And yet to try to get any idea across to them

fills the hierarchy of that particular activity with absolute horror. Because they've lived with and through all of the areas of innovation, and innovation to them is dangerous on a departure from the highly workable.

Well, the—what got them into this frame of mind was, is the degree of workability which they demanded was a fairly flexible, wide—open degree of workability, you see. It'd take you a thousand years to go from A to B. Well, naturally that's unworkable. "Well, could you get there in a month or two, you know, from one galaxy to another galaxy or something like that?" "Oh, yeah. Yeah. Oh, easy." "All right. Well, that's workable."

Now, when you try to vary off of this level of workability you run into undesirable factors. In other words, you can get a greater (quote) *"workability"* which is much harder to work, you see. They've been through this so often that finally—I mean trying to give them any new weapon, tool or anything else would be absolutely—you just might as well bash your head against a concrete wall. I swear, you couldn't even change the design of a trigger guard. They've seen it all, and so on.

I'm afraid were getting that way about the E—Meter, because this has a greater degree of workability than you will ever need. This is already up in the stars. We fought this battle a few years ago and it was a rough battle to fight.

But frankly, this thing will read almost anything you want to know at sensitivity 16. Almost anything you want to know, sensitivity 16 will give you just about anything you've got.

Now, if you want to expand and magnify the read—you've got on the sensitivity knob, you've got 32—and if you want to expand and magnify the read, you've got 64. And if you want to expand and magnify the read, you've got 128. You're going upstairs now from any desirability. If this thing simply worked at 16 only, with the other knob set at 32, if you could never get it higher than 16, it'd still be usable at Level III.

We're in danger of stultification. I suppose if there's some new method of containing charge inside a battery comes out, that might possibly be altered in an E—Meter. You know, it'd run for ten years without recharge or something like that: That'd be desirable. But I don't think there'd be anything get changed inside the meter because as far as that's concerned, I've had it. I've fooled with these things for, ah, a dozen years! You never saw anybody get as sick of anything as experimental models of an E—Meter. If you want to really see me go into a screaming fit, bring me a proposed change in the design and circuit of an E—Meter so that it is easier to manufacture or something like this, or something like that. What! No, no! Horrible. Because I'm afraid we'll lose the workability we've got. And I want to impress upon you that that is a poised knife—edge.

You go pushing around this thing very much and depart from it very far, and you'll find yourself in a horrible situation of having improved yourself out of a workability. It may

have some new desirable factor. You may be able to get it inside your pocketbook, but it won't read a pc, you know. So this is what's known as holding the line on this.

Now frankly, the width and latitude of this E—Meter is so great that at Class VI you have to audit down around 4 and 6. And you're a fool if you audit above there and yet when you begin to audit, you will do it. You will learn this lesson all by yourself All with your own little paws. (I'd love to shoot those things down.)

Anyhow, you'll find out that you think you can get a better performance, or something like that, out of your pc or something by carrying it at a higher level of sensitivity. Or to make—to agree with the fact that Ron says you ought to get dial—wide falls on a goal or something, then you start jacking up the sensitivity in order to get the dial—wide drop, don't you see? You don't keep sweating it out to try to get the dial—wide drop at sensitivity 4, see. Various odd things. But you will eventually come back to the complete boredom of running the thing at 8, and start bringing it back within the levels of practical action which is around 4 or 5.

I can tell the difference between setting an E—Meter at 4 and 5. On Class VI material I'll accidentally let it drift up just to 5, and all of a sudden, I'm—"Something's awful live around here. What's going on?" you see, and retreat it back to 4. You know, kick it with your finger or something like that and it drifts up just one division.

Well look, at the highest levels we're running this confounded E—Meter at about what? What's sensitivity 4 in relationship to 128, see? We're something like driving a Cadillac, you see—we're driving a Cadillac along a level, smooth highway where you have no need of its springs, you have no need of its shock absorption, body weight, its horsepower—none of these things are necessary for what you're trying to do. All right. Well, let's keep it that way.

Because the truth of the matter is the E—Meter is designed around the needle. You could design a tone arm meter, which you wouldn't need the needle reaction of, that would just perform fine at II. We've already done it. And you could design a meter that would be minimal body reaction at Class VI and you probably could get away with it so long as you never had to resort to the needle.

It's the needle that gives you trouble on a meter. That is the one thing which you got to watch. A bad meter does not give you needle response. It'll give you body responses or it'll give you something else or it won't respond to thought. It's whether or not this thing is geared up to thought. That's what's important, and the needle is what ties it in to thought. It's its needle response—that is thought. And nowhere is as much demanded of an E—Meter as at Level III.

Level III is then the hot meter level! And if you can make somebody run a meter at Level III and he can really make a meter snap and pop at Level III, I assure you he's never going to have any trouble in any other level.

He gets to IV, it's a pipe. What's the trouble with assessment? IV is your assessment level. What do you do at IV? Why, you just go down and see what reads most and then you take it. So your assessment has got to be good.

But what gets in the road of that assessment? The phenomena the person should have learned at Level III. That is that the needle reacts to the session before it reacts to the subject matter.

So you got to be hotter than a pistol; you got to be able to sit there and keep that needle clean. And that is the first and foremost skill, because it requires that you keep your needle clean. That is to say, you keep your session good, so that at no time is the session getting in the road of the needle ticks which you're using to audit the person. And all of a sudden you've got a stray tick or a dirty needle or something like that, you got to be hot enough to pick up the considerations which gave you that oddball phenomena.

At III it is demanded—or nobody could really run III at all—that all of this data about the meter—how it reacts to the session, how it reacts to body motion, that sort of thing—this has all got to be known and it's got to be known terrifically well. The thing's got a *bzz—bzz—bzz—what* the devil is that *bzz—bzz—bzz?* Well, somebody who doesn't know what the devil *that* is, is not going to be able to straighten out the meter, because that is a session manifestation; the auditor has goofed. Something has gone wrong with the auditing cycle in this session and he'd better jolly well straighten it up right now!

He's trying to put in a rudiment, "Has anything been suppressed?" Well, he has a clean read. Now, he maybe doesn't know whether he had a clean read or not, so he thinks he had better ask the question again. So he asks the question again, but this time it runs into the negative. The pc has thought "nothing there," see. So now he has a read on "suppress" which is a session read. Up to that time—up to the moment he got the clean—it was reading the bank, you see. And then he cleaned a clean. He saw the needle; the needle didn't even quiver, "In this session has anything been suppressed?" and the needle didn't even quiver.

Well, if he said, "That read," and demanded to know, or if he simply, really, even asked the question again, that meter manifestation has passed from process and mind over to session. He's moved the meter over from something that is measuring the pc's mind over to something that is now measuring the pc's Condition of in-sessionness.

The pc was *with* the session and you were registering his mind. You make a goof with the needle and you've got a pc who is *against* the session and you are no longer reading his mind, you're reading his analytical session reaction. And you've moved the needle right out of moving in amongst the reactive bank into moving right amongst the session.

Now, at III a person has got to be able to tell that's happened. He's got to first know that it can happen and second know when it has happened. And when that thing has happened, not to keep on being a complete nitwit about it.

I've seen some real knucklehead—you know, I've watched a lot of TV demonstrations. I'm speaking from the—from the proud plateau of having made every one of these mistakes myself much worse than you ever made them. Because I made them with nobody telling me it was a mistake. I didn't have any help, see. I used to be in condition with a meter, I suppose—the Mark Vs are very standard now but meters of earlier days used to vary from meter to meter and you'd give an auditor a new meter, it'd take him—take him as long as two weeks to get used to this meter.

Well, it's the same transition you make from a IV—a Level IV—pardon me, a Mark IV meter, your Mark IV meter, shifting to a V. I saw Mary Sue do that, and frankly her hair was standing on end. She *uhck!* She felt like she'd been put in a jet plane, see. This thing would barge and bang around like it, and so forth, and she had to train her thumb into tricks that she'd never wotted of.

You've got to break with your thumb the sweep of a Mark V meter if you're running it on rudiments that you're really trying to pick up carefully, see. And you've got to ask the question with a certain timing so that the end of your question comes when the needle is still on the dial. That's all manual dexterity. That's vocal and manual dexterity.

You dream up certain tricks. This can get very tricky. You have to know exactly when to start asking the question and when to arrest the needle and get your thumb off in time that your thumb will now no longer influence the resulting read that comes at the end of your question. Complicated, huh? So it's complicated. I've had to learn how to do it, so can you. Because if you're running that high, man, you can pick a guy's brains. You really can pick his brains.

Now, needle manifestations do not just consist of ticks. There are things called slows and a speeded rise. Well, within the last few weeks I dirtied up a needle, completely unintentionally. I was asking "Suggested" as a button and I got what might have been a sort of a slowed speeded rise. Something funny happened with the needle. It was almost imperceptible. And I said, "Well, I'm not going to nag the pc about this," and went on to the next question. And that one was a mess, and the next question was a mess, and the next one was a mess. And I couldn't figure out what was going on. Now, there'd been a—there'd been an answer. I finally hauled it back, rehashing, and hauled it back. Suggest—there'd been an answer on Suggest which then operated thereafterwards as a missed withhold, see. But this fantastically slight manifestation of that needle—it was so slight that it was practically guesswork.

In other words, any change of pace of that needle is a read, much less reverse direction. So you're caught between the devil and the deep blue sea. Because this thing will read all the way south, if it reads on the needle it'll be real to the pc; if it doesn't read on the needle it won't be real to the pc. Now, they're cut in; they're absolutely side by jowl there, and so on—it'd give you some of the experimental design problems of the meter.

You know, early meters didn't read on some pcs because they were off the bottom and didn't read on other pcs because they were off the top and—ah, wild stuff, see. Well, we've covered that whole band now. And we have something that exactly compares to if the pc's going to know about it or can know about it, you're going to get some manifestation on the needle. But a very fast swinging needle gives a less perceptible reaction. See, if it were going very slowly, you would have gotten the more perceptible reaction. But that needle was traveling at the velocity of near light, don't you see, and it just vaguely changed its pace and the inertia of the needle was sufficient to carry it through the read. So it can get that rough.

But what kind of a pc am I talking about now? I'm talking about a pc who is passing off the meter anyway. What do you mean off the meter? Well, along about VI, at Level VI, when you get them in around auditing actual GPMs, your meter passes out of this world. You've got to start running it—if you're going to put in rudiments on a pc, you've got to run it at a much higher sensitivity, and the pc is already reading better than a Clear on a meter, don't you see? You somehow or other got to mesh this meter in against a pc who isn't really reading on a meter, who hasn't got that much reactive mind left, don't you see.

It gets pretty messy. And when the pc's postulate made in the session gives you a rocket read—so that your greatest manifestations are off the thoughts of the pc. If you want to see a big read at—when a person's had a lot of Level VI stuff run on him, why, just have the pc decide something—*pshooooo.* "What was that?"

"Oh, I just thought we'd had it, you know. We'd gotten it now." Pc's postulates are rocket reading, you see.

You're actually auditing somebody who is an electric eel to begin with, and what you're mainly reading is reactive material and all of this reactive potential is disappearing; because a reactive potential is, oh, a trillionth or some infinitesimal fraction of what the person is actually capable of doing by himself. It isn't just the plain statement of what you can do reactively you can do better analytically. That is an understatement.

Somebody has a compulsion to wiggle his ears, you see. All right, so he wiggles his ears. Well, frankly, if he didn't have an inhibition on the subject of his ears, his ability to wiggle his ears could set up a hundred mile an hour breeze, don't you see, if you do it analytically. It's not a proportionate remark.

If a fellow could paint somewhat—well, take Rembrandt, something or other (reactive chap)—he could paint somewhat, and so forth. Think of what the guy would have done if he hadn't had any reactivity at all on the subject. Wow! It'd just be strictly *wow!* It'd be that much better. It's magnitudinously better. It doesn't just pass from reactivity under your control so now you can do it just as well. It actually isn't even in the same order of magnitude.

For instance, I didn't get bright about photography until I started chipping around the edges of the GPMs about making pictures. I started to get real bright about photography. I

started to get bright on the subject, you know. I'd been going along, and so forth. And I realized, just all of a sudden, I had a perfect working system of photography all grooved in, so I'd never noticed it before.

We had a beautiful system of photography on the subject of color transparencies. Take a Rollei camera around here and just shoot about anything in the place and do it beautifully and gorgeous and everybody ohs and ahs over the thing. What do you do with it? It costs you three pounds five shillings to have a color negative made so that you can have a single print. And then the print costs you two pounds five. Something on the order of about five pounds ten, you can get a small snapshot, see. The interruption is, the color transparency doesn't cost all this, ifs just they cant be made into pictures.

So, last night I was just upsetting Reg about it. So last night I just all of a sudden said, "Hey, what do you know," and turned on Reg's big Rollei projector, and turned it on to a big screen, and took the Land camera and took a picture of it. The most beautiful color snapshot you ever saw in your life.

Brand—new use for Land cameras. Takes a beautiful black and white. You can then turn around and get a negative made of the black and white, by the way, for fifteen cents. We had—we had complete system sitting around here, and so forth. All it needed to do was to be put together and that was that, and we had pictures.

You can almost count on the fact that if you've got re—a reactive ability, you've got fantastic problems along with it. You could just count on that, if ability is at all reactive. Now, if you want to know whose ability is reactive, well, who is having problems with his ability?

The circus performer has a lot of worry about having to ... so on. But he is the wildest cannon—human cannonball in the world, don't you see. But he seems to have this and he seems to have that and something. Well, he's reactively being a cannonball, and so forth. Well, if you cleaned him up on this particular subject, he wouldn't have problems on the subject of being a cannonball, see. That's all very interesting from a viewpoint of that. The problems get added by the reactivity and the reactivity also de—takes all the power out of it.

Well, this is completely reverse to the way the psychoanalyst thinks that the world works. He said, "Be glad you're a neurotic, because you wouldn't have any skills unless you are neurotic," you know. Ding—ding—ding, here comes the wagon. Well, of course, he wants everybody to be neurotic; that's how he makes his dough. They wouldn't sit there that long if they weren't so neurotic.

The scope, then, of a person's ability depends on fishing it out into the analytical realm. And the magnitude of performance and so on is some fantastic, disproportionate figure. You've got a grain of sand to the mountain, don't you see? Brahms versus a musician, you know.

It's a good thing for you to know this—I'm just not riding a hobby horse. It's a good thing to know this, because every once in a while you're going to get a pc who is going to balk: He—he—he—what—what—what if he lost his, you know, what—uh—uh ...

There's writers around that just go around cultivating neuroses so they can write, you know, as though this has something to do with it, and so forth. And you sometimes actually need the data I'm giving you now. But the softest statement is whatever a person can do reactively, he can do far better analytically. That's the softest statement made, but I'm giving you the actual scope of the situation. Anything he can do only reactively, he's going to have problems with of great magnitude, and the difference of proportion of ability and so forth is some—one to some unimaginably large figure, you know—trillions to one, you know, something like that.

Now, what's this got to do with the needle? Well, there actually isn't too much of a problem at Level III because you've got mostly a reactive being. He's on the reverse order. You got one trillionth of a being and the remainder of it is reactivity. So at Level III your needle behaves fairly well on reactivity and doesn't get in your face too much on the session thing. There's a balance between these things, you see. Somebody can still be upset about the session and sometimes still even read a bit on the needle, do you see?

At VI this gets reversed. Now, you really see, you really see it the wrong way to. You ask if this thing is this way and you get a little tick and so forth, and all of a sudden you get a rocket read and you say, "What was that?"

"Oh, that. I thought something or other," don't you see.

So, your reactive read is getting much tinier and your analytical read getting much larger. But at Level III the reactive read is larger than the analytical read. Got that? Which is the only thing that saves anybody's bacon at Level III if he's having trouble cuffing around a meter.

But you got to know how to keep a needle clean. Well, therefore, you have to know to complete an auditing cycle, to complete your auditing comm cycle particularly. You've got to know when the needle—and it's just guesswork—when you've overreached a point and you're not getting a consistency and the pc seems to be unhappy about what you're doing with the needle, you've got to know then that you've got to go into the session part of it and straighten up the session part of it.

But don't keep straightening up the session part of it with mid ruds to a point where you drive the pc out of session. That's the beautiful point of balance there. You can harass a pc who is running all right until he is very aware of the session. See, you can turn it around the other way to.

So what's the trick here? It's maintain the needle in good Condition simply by maintaining your session in good Condition. That's all you have to do to maintain the needle in good Condition just keep your session in good Condition. Don't get the pc against the session. Don't get the pc against you. Don't start harassing the pc one way or the other about things that are not this way or that way or something of the sort. And then above all things, for God's sakes, never blame the pc because he's not behaving properly on a meter. All auditors sooner or later do this and then much to their embarrassment they find out they haven't been asking the right question.

It's this crazy. They've started from the last session—they've started the new session and they're not getting the same reads on the needle that they were getting in the last session. And they start blaming the pc for having done something between sessions. And then much to their embarrassment they look up at last session's auditor's report and find out they were running another question. See. They never cleaned off their last question; they did something weird, see. They're not asking the right question. That's why the pc isn't reading on the meter. Or they've got their session completely awry; they haven't got the pc in—session at all.

The needle, how to handle the needle, that is the basic foremost skill of Level III. And a person, to be a Class III Auditor, ought to be able to handle the needle backwards and forward without ever cleaning a clean or missing a read.

You clean a clean, you're going to throw the pc into a session awareness. He's already given you all he's got. Now you're asking him for more. Ach! You're going to dirty this thing up. He's got an answer, you don't ask for it—You're going to dirty this thing up. In other words, you're going to miss ä read. That kind of thing shouldn't go. You've got to—got to get those things ironed out as far as the auditor is concerned at Level III.

And he should realize that when he's getting screwball reads of some kind or another—like the pc says he hasn't got any answers but he's getting reads—it should eventually dawn on the auditor that the pc is protesting or invalidating or suppressing or doing something weird in the session about the session. He's got to recognize that the metering has shifted from the reactive to the session.

And with just that data—and practically no other data than that—you really wrap up needle reading. That is needle reading. The peculiarities, inconsistencies and oddball nonsenses about reads ... Well, let's just take body motion. So you got a big, sweeping read all of a sudden. I had a pc, every time a foot was scraped across the floor, an electrostatic current was generated and you got a read. And yet it was always done completely silently and without any other body motion. Well, that's a session reaction, isn't it? So, it doesn't fall beyond that, and it's simply up to the auditor to find out *what's going* on! That's all.

"What you doing?".

"Oh, I just moved my foot."

Now, with that data and knowing just that, you can do Auditing by Lists. And if you don't know that data, you can't do Auditing by Lists!

Now, Auditing by Lists is going to confuse people left, right and center, because they're going to say this has something, then, to do with assessment. No, it doesn't have anything to do with assessment at all. Because on Auditing by List you are not interested in which level or item of the list reads. That you are not interested in at all. You are simply interested in going down the list and making sure that each one in turn is cleaned up if it reads. You're not trying to go down a list and find one of these levels. Remember, that's the operation of an ARC break.

All right, now, get this—get this difference. Assessment means reading down a list to find out which item on that list reads more than the other items on the list, which is *the* item. We are trying to find the item out of a list of items—whether it's listed by the pc or an arbitrary list, see. That's assessment. That's trying to find the item.

Now, Auditing by List is no effort to find any part of the list greater than any other part of the list. This is just sawing wood. There are this many cords of wood up there and it's going to take so much time and action to saw up these cords of wood, and that's all he does with the list. He just makes sure that each question on the list, in turn, is no longer reading when he leaves it. And that's the whole action of Auditing by List: making sure that each question taken up in turn is no longer reading, which requires the action, of course, of reading the question to find out if it reads and then continuing to get actions to the question—get answers to the question until the question no longer reads, noticing now that the question is no longer reading and passing on to the next question.

Along with that—what I've just given you—noticing that he is getting reads that are session reads which aren't associated with the question, see, that's part of that. Otherwise he's trying to clean up session reads by reading a question. You know, pc's been protesting for a while. Pc has a withhold. He's messed up something in this session, see. So now he continues to get reads on the list which aren't from the list. This requires the auditor differentiate between these two things. And that's all there is to it.

So, we get, we get, "Do I see a cat?"—tick. "Very good. I have a read here."

"Yeow—yeow—yeow, it's.

"Have you done that?"

"Yeow—yeow—yeow, yeow—yeow."

"All right. Do I see a cat? All right, that is clean. Do I see a dole. That is clean. Do I see a horse? That reads."

"Yeow—yeow—yeow, yeow—yeow—yeow."

"Do I see a horse? There is *another* read there."

Boy, shoot the auditor who never learns that trick. That is one of the slipperiest tricks in auditing. That causes more ARC breaks to say, "That still reads." You see what happens is, you just told the follow he hasn't answered the question. You've given him instantaneous ARC break.

Any time something—a question reads twice in a row, it is always another read. It's not the same read, ever! Nothing ever "still reads." It always has another read. It reads again on something else, always. That is the understanding of the auditor's palaver. The auditor works that into his patter. It's always *another:* "I have another read here." It's a major auditing error. It's a really a gross auditing error to say, "That still reads." Because he—what's he done? He's just refused—refuted the fact the guy just cleaned it up, and the truth of the matter is he has *another* read. It's not the same read that he had before. Always another read.

So, we just go down this list and we read the question and if it gives a meter reaction, we get an answer to the question. If it doesn't get a meter reaction, we don't get an answer to the question. Then we just simply check the question again. If the question now has another read on it, we get another answer to the question. And we keep getting more answers to the degree that the question is more reads, you see? And eventually, unless we clean a clean or miss it completely, we get a null needle on that question. And now we go to the next question and we do the same thing with it.

This is Auditing by Lists. This is all there is to Auditing by List.

You have put in the auditor's paws the *totality* of the process. And if you're doing auditing supervision on this and you have a bunch of people worrying about this, let me tell you something. You stand back in the corner with a sawed—off shotgun in your hand. You just wait for the first one to ask some dopey, stupid, Q—and—A question, and just blow his head right off. Just splatter it all over the other students and they won't do it anymore. And let me tell you from long experience, that's practically what it takes.

I'll show you what I mean. "Have you ever kicked a horse?"—this is the question we are asking—"Have you ever kicked a horse? All right. That reads."

Pc: "Well, actually I kicked a cow once. Uh—I know. I remember it very vividly; very vividly. I kicked a cow once."

"Oh, yes. Well, what about kicking a cow?" That's the moment you pull the sawed—off shotgun up, cock it and fire it. It's an incomplete cycle of action. The next thing you know, this person's needle is going to look like so much jam. You're going to have the pc all loused up and ARC broke. It doesn't matter how happy they look just now, all this is going to catch up with him.

His question—blankety—blank—blank it!—was "Has he ever kicked a horse?" An h—o—r—s—e, horse. So he says he kicked a cow once. Okay, so he kicked a cow. All right. And you simply let him tell you all about kicking this cow. And you give him a sort of a half—acknowledgment and you say, "Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes . . ."

"Oh, you're asking about a horse. Oh, yeah, there were some horses there. Oh, yeah. Yeah, I did kick a horse." Get the idea?

Or if he's answered "a cow," and so forth, and you say, "Well, all right, all right, kicked a cow. Now, how about a horse? You kicked a horse? The question was a horse." You have to do that very delicately because you ARC break the pc again that way. You're making him wrong, see.

"Well," he says, "Hm—mm. Hm—mm. No, I just never have kicked a horse." Needle.

Oh well, now, you've got one of your interesting problems, haven't you? You've got a needle reading one thing and the pc saying something else. What do you do?

Well, the one, two, three of it is you simply make sure that your read isn't coming from a session miss, see. "Are you protesting the question? You invalidating the question? Are you upset about the question? Am I cleaning a clean? What—something—something gone ... Oh, that—doesn't it. All right. Thank you." Get that all straight. "Now, have you ever kicked a horse? That reads."

"Oh, it still reads? Well. Oh, well. Ha—hah. Guess I'd better think it over then."

And you'll find out that's about the most serious reaction you'll get. "Oh yes, and I never told my father either. Oh, man! Oh, that was—yeah, yeah, and he licked my older brother for doing it. Had hoofprints all over the horse, you know. Oh yeah."

"All right. Good enough. Thank you. Now, let me test the question; just let me check this question now, just to make sure it's clean: Have you ever kicked a horse? All right, that's clean. Thank you very much." And go on to the next question.

Get the idea? There's nothing really fancy about this. It's just the one, two, three, and you've got to—your auditor at this point has got to understand the combinations that can go awry, see, which is to say, it can come from reactive to session. You've got to get an answer to the question. You mustn't Q—and—A with it.

I've known certain schools of thought on this subject that if he said a horse—you said a horse and he said he kicked a cow, then you ask him about the cow, but halfway through that he cognited he kicked a dog. And then halfway through the dog, why, he cognited he kicked a pig, and each time the auditor said, "Well, how about the pig; how about the dog; how about the pile. *Zah—zah—zah,"* zah—aaaaaaaa. There they go over there, way over. They're going up that rise over there someplace, you know. Here's the session here, see, and they're just traveling up over the rise of the hill.

They've just left it, man. That's nowhere. They never completed a cycle of action. A Q and A is simply a failure to complete a cycle of action. Whether an auditing cycle or an auditing comm cycle or a program cycle, he just didn't complete the cycle of action. So you've got to complete those cycles of action on Auditing by List. If you start List 62, don't get a sudden wild idea in the middle of the night and start tomorrow on List 65. No, finish List 62. See what I mean?

Now, what are these lists? Well, they're nothing more than the plus—minus misdemeanors and upsets that an individual could have. They're based in various lines and levels. A lot of technical aspects can go into the manufacture of a list. Now, we used to make auditors around here do lists for certain pcs. Now, that was a big gag. They'd do a list for a pc and everything would come along fine. So an auditor, also, should be able to do a list for a pc as well as take a canned list.

But once the list is made, it is simply—whether the auditor did it or it was done for him or he something, now it is audited by list and is simply taken at question one and is cleaned through to the last question in just that fashion.

Now, there's really only a hatful of little lists that can be done over and over and over and over again. And these are lists like L1 and what we've got as L4 in your mimeograph work—L1 and L4. You can clean L1 and then you can clean L4. Now, actually those are used as Auditing by List. They're not used for taking up an ARC break, because they're not on an ARC break pc. They just have all these factors in them, so you go ahead and clean them up.

Now, whether you vary the question or not is beside the point, but is "Have I _____?" would probably not be used by you. It'd be, "Has anyone ever _____?" or something like that. You Hobson-Jobson the question over to be a broader scope, don't you see? You don't have to put a time period to it or anything like that. You just go on and clean this list.

Well, you, oddly enough, can clean List 1 and List 4 and List 1 and List 4 and List 1 and List 4 and it just goes on almost endlessly. That's because of the generality of the list. It's not a particularized or peculiar list to just this one pc. It embraces all the actions of life, so it's a repetitive list and you can go over it and over it and over it. You could keep on going, in other words, and using a pair of lists alternately, one against the other.

And each time you're doing the same action and it's simply Auditing by List, which is an auditing action, which simply consists of what I've just been telling you about reading the needle, making sure the needle is clean on that question, making sure your auditing cycle was good, making sure ifs clean, going to the next one, making sure that that one was clean and so forth before you left it and just going on down to the last question. It's as simple as that.

No arguments with the pc or upsets, you see, about this and that. Don't monkey around with it. Pc who is very recalcitrant and so forth, it looks like this thing is all going to pieces, why, you might have a missed withhold or something like that crop up and hit you in

the face. So it becomes part of Auditing by List to be able to keep your rudiments in, of which missed withhold or Fail to reveal is one.

But look at rudiments, in actual fact, and look at Prepchecking. Isn't Prepchecking really Auditing by List? It's just cleaning the question and then going to the next question, and that's actually all you're doing with it. It's a simple action. So Prepchecking comes in also, then, and anything we ever knew ...

(International Idlewild here today. I got to get that new machine gun; they just advertised it.)

The Prepchecking, Sec Checking, all of these other types of—of "clean up the needle," then, all come at Level III. And if you want to know what is Level III: Level III is that level where you clean the needle.

Well, that brings us to Level IV, of course. Well, what's IV'.? Well, IV takes the list for an entirely different reason. And the individual is now totally accustomed to lists, so at Level IV he takes this for an entirely different reason: He's trying to find it.

So, Level IV—you're trying to find something on the list, you see. You're trying to find that one level which you are now going to use and audit—that's for service facsimiles and things like that. Which one of these things is it? Well, it never bothers anybody at Level III, you see. He doesn't care which one of these things is it or not it. He just uses anything that reads. You got the difference? All right.

Well now, this permits you as a pc, of course, very, very little width. Yeah, you got very little width of wander. So therefore you find out that you have to kind of stick to it. And you can get sick of the question, but remember that you go up from boredom to enthusiasm.

Now, there's a lot to know about a needle, but none of it exceeds anything that I've been telling you and most of it's on the basis of familiarity.

I've done a lot of theorizing about why people can't read needles when they can't and so forth. I found out that they couldn't see a still. They couldn't tell when something was still. That was what they couldn't tell. It wasn't that they couldn't recognize a motion, it was because they couldn't see a still. They couldn't see a reverse of direction or something like this. It had to do with visual acuity.

And you get somebody who's got a comm lag in ordinary living of five or ten seconds, and so forth, he's going to have an awful time reading a needle. So it goes over rather easily into case.

But you know, you're only trying to do a familiarization deal with training. It's just the degree with which you'll familiarize somebody and you can lick all these things just by getting somebody familiar with the needle itself, even if that's as odd as just Reach and

Withdraw from the meter. And just meter drills in general is being a—coming accustomed to the meter and watching the needle and doing things like this.

Now, one of the interesting things that we've had going around here is we've had two or three people standing around watching one person put another person on a meter, and the two—and two observers. And you know, the auditor and the two observers are just in wild disagreement as to whether the meter had read or not read.

Your bulletin drills and so forth have all been gauged to overcome these bits and frailties and so forth. There's been a lot of work on this as you can see the number of drills that exist. But there is your toughest—your toughest application is your Auditing by List, as far as the needle is concerned.

Now, if a person can get through that then, of course, a person can assess. A person can assess ARC breaks and they can assess Prepcheck subjects and they can assess this and assess that. And they can take up, of course, lists of service facsimiles, and they can also learn to list. And now they're getting all ready to graduate course into Class VI materials, which is—takes this as a matter of course.

It's really easier to read a meter at Class VI than it is at Class III. I think that it probably wouldn't be true if a person couldn't read a meter at all at Class III. He'd probably become very alarmed at the degree that meters read at Class VI. It's something to be alarmed about. You keep cranking it down and it still reads, you know. And you ... An inch read is probably questionable at Class VI. "Well, it wasn't a read. I don't know, equivocal," so forth. Two—inch read: "Ah, probably." Two—inch read with a blowdown: "Well, that's probably correct." "Did the meter explode? Well, it's probably the right item." You know, that's the sort of approach to it.

Now, this is an entirely different field of area at Level III. "You missed a read." "A read? Where was it? Where was it?" "It speeded on that rise. There was an acceleration there for a period of over a quarter of an inch. It went a little bit faster for that period of a quarter of an inch than it did just before and did just after. That was a speeded rise. What's the matter with you? Can't you read a meter?" "That's, oh my God, a speeded rise. What kind of thing ... Huuuuh! Ooh, horrors!"

Well, you get the difference of approach? So if a person can read a meter at Level III, he could do most anything, because I see even old—timers have trouble reading at III. But that is Auditing by List. When I tell you to straighten out a pc's ARC breaks, I really mean auditing—this is, you know, ARC breaky type pcs, not now in an ARC break, you understand. But he's had a lot of trouble and upset and he sort of feels poor. He will answer auditing questions. Everything's fine.

It's just L1—L4, alternately, Auditing by List. No fanciness to the question if—you know. Just alter the question so it's broader, you see. But don't say, "In this lifetime, if you

were...” or something. Just give it a broad answer. Clean that line by line, Ll. And then line by line, List 4, and L—line by line—1, L—line by line—4. This person will come up shining. I don't care what he—kind of Condition he's in. Sometimes they do even when they don't know the nomenclature, which is quite remarkable.

Anyway, there is Auditing by Lists, and there is, actually, a very full rundown on what is contained at Level III in Scientology. I hope it'll be of some assistance to you.

Thank you.