THE CYCLE OF ACTION: ITS INTERPRETATION ON THE E- METER

A lecture given on
9 June 1964

Thank you. How are you?

Audience: Fine!

What's the date?

Audience: 9 June.

Nine June, 9 June AD 14. The year of the juggernaut. You look pretty good. You look numerous.

All right. Well, today is a very important lecture, very important lecture since it applies to the young and the old, new and the strained and various other categories, and applies very, very directly and instantly to the auditing procedure rather than to techniques; and that is "The cycle of action and its interpretations on the E—Meter." This sounds authoritative enough, doesn't it? 'Tis, too. I have never seen anybody get in as much trouble with as little an item as the auditor and the cycle of action. This easily is the most confused area, field, the most misunderstood, the most maligned, the most defined upside down and backwards type of thing anybody ever had anything to do with.

Well now, just why you're having trouble with this and just why organizations are having trouble with this and just why this is such a gruesome subject is because it's all over the GPMs. And that's why you have to pay attention to it. In the first place, it ain't natural, and you Scientologists, being a cut above the naturalness of normality, of course buck against and see something slightly wrong in the whole idea of time and its forward progress. You get some inkling very early on in the field of Scientology. You say, "Well, there's something wrong with time." A lot of you talk about it. A lot of you say, "Well, if I just had more time or less time." It takes that mild a form. And on the other side of it, you begin to look at time as some kind of a weird taskmaster that you wot not of and want to do less with.

And one of the most interesting recent cognitions I've had in processing, if you don't mind my mentioning something of that line, was to find myself looking at a zero or absence of

time. And I was in a very interesting state there for a while. And I took a look at this and I stared it straight in the eye, and it was about—at first I didn't know if I liked it, because if you don't have time, of course, you don't have a lot of other things. And then I took a look at this and I was trying to find out what was making a pressure on my face, and I found out there wasn't anything making a pressure on my face. There was just a nothingness making a pressure on my face, and the pressure on my face was being made because there wasn't anything there. Do you understand? A completely negative look.

Now, I, of course, immediately invalidated this and said I know some of the end words and some this sort of thing, and I know where these things live and therefore I've just gotten one of these into restimulation and so forth. And I promptly and instantly tried to run this down and get this thing pretty well squared around, and I was unable to spot it as any kind of GPM bric-a-brac.

What I had actually done was escape the time stream. And it was a very funny sensation. Very, very peculiar. But at the same time it was more natural than being in the time stream. You get so habituated to being in the time stream that a sudden cessation of it is uncomfortable. I can remember the old story of the little girl who hit herself over the head with a hammer continuously because it felt so good when she stopped, you know? Another case, a little girl also, that had a perpetual howling migraine headache and had had it for so long that she didn't know what it was. And an auditor turned if off and she felt awfully peculiar. This was life without a migraine headache, you see? And it was something brand—new that she was not used to at all.

Now time, of course, is something that one should be able to move into, out of, up into the forward of and back into, you know? You should be able to straighten out yesterday's goofs, in other words. And at one time or another you were quite capable of doing so. And then you slipped into the time stream and have been going down the line ever since. Now, therefore, I have somewhat of a natural antipathy to the idea that time is there or that something has a beginning, a middle and an end; the beginning, the middle and the end. Because that is a—that is an authoritative action laid on by time.

Well, let me show you something here. You are processing in the physical universe through and across the agreement of the physical universe. And you are making yourself a very good show of going along with the time stream, and if you do this, you are then processing a bank which lays the time stream in with an ax, and you are trying to resolve a subject which is, to a terrible degree, cycles of action. That is to say, the bank is just cycle of action with exclamation points. And you're trying to resolve this, and unless you pay attention to this, you j am the bank. Do you follow me? You j am the bank.

In other words—well, let me say it this way: the pc—the pc has got a sliver in his finger and you don't pull the sliver out. You say, "Well, there are no slivers," and you

convince him that it's actually because he has a lot of reactivity on the subject of pain and discomfort. And you sell him this bill of goods, you see? And you tell him the truth, see? You say, "Well, it's—the only reason you're experiencing this pain in your finger because of the sliver and so forth is you have some GPMs and so on, and that's the whole thing and so forth. And there you are! Now, do you feel better?" And he'll say, "No!" Well, why? Well, you just processed him a little too high. Now, maybe you could explain this to an OT, but then, of course, he wouldn't have a sliver in his finger. Or if he did, it—he could as—is it. See?

If you—probably the only thing wrong with the gropings of Mary Baker Eddy and so forth, is she was on cloud nine to the ninth, see? Well, maybe she could make some of that gap, but her articulation of it brought about the nonsense of "if you just not—is it and say it isn't there, it ain't." Let me point it out to you that it hasn't worked. That is not a broadly workable action. It has enough workability so that it retains people's interest. It's the little red flag hanging out. They say, "There's something there. We don't know quite what it is." Then they get it all mixed up with right thinking and power of prayer and living a good life and get into the wrong end of the GPMs and spin, see? Nothing more dangerous than handling something you don't know what it is, particularly anything with as much voltage as this stuff.

So therefore, you enter the wrong end of the line, don't you see? Try to go up too upscale and you say to the fellow, "Well, you obviously don't have a sliver in your finger because actually that's a manifestation which is created by compulsions forced off on you by the idea that *blah—blah—suh* and so on, and it's actually the hundred and ninety—fifth series and . . . " You know. Glib, you see? He's still got a sliver in his finger.

So you say to this fellow, "All right. You shouldn't have to pay any attention to time. You shouldn't pay any attention at all to the cycle of action because the cycle of action is just laid in by the bank, and it's your reactivity and has to do with the time stream and, of course, that's all above us people. Okay, evaporate!"

And by golly, he doesn't, you know? Well, there's no sense in feeling upset about it because he doesn't evaporate, you see?

Now particularly at lower levels, you're processing straight across this thing called a cycle of action. And boy, it's in there with an ax! The proper sequence and order of things.

The mind is a fiendishly orderly thing. Most of you think of the mind as a great Confusion It isn't. You're the one that's confused.

And the most orderly thing in the world is one of these reactive banks. It is the most precise thing. Some old lady, you know, some old lady, crotchety and so forth, been living by herself for ninety years and so on, and somebody comes down and puts a tea caddy, you know, just one sixteenth of an inch crosswise on the table. Boy! He has it! Well, that's the reactive bank. It reacts just about like that, see? It reacts terribly. You leave out a comma in it,

and it just gets very upset, you see? It's a fiendish precision of the thing. And it all follows the same patterns and so forth. And it's very interesting. Your pc, he's all very *bloooahh.*

Well, actually, the pc has to come up through an ability to confront that much order. He's below the ability to confront that much order. He's in an *awful* state of Confusion so he's got to come up through this state of order up to the other side of it. And one of the most dominant factors of the bank is the cycle of action—that things have a beginning, they continue and they end. And that is one of the keynotes of order. It has—really, the summation of the bank couldn't add up to anything more strenuously than that. The whole bank is put together on this basis. Things have a beginning, they continue and they end. So it's no wonder you have trouble with it.

Now, the auditor who is having trouble with it because he is below being able to face up to that much order; that's one thing. And the auditor who is having trouble with it because he can't get back down to that much order; that would be another thing. But equally, a failure to do so would produce no gain in the pc.

Now, where the cycle of action is violated in the pc, the order of his bank is violated and therefore it doesn't as—is. It's that succinct. It's that glib a statement can be made on the subject.

The situation then is that the road out is the road through, and the road through is paralleled by the cycle of action. So the road out follows the cycle of action. And you'll find this cycle of action manifested everywhere in processing. And where the auditor chronically and violently disobeys, turns sideways from and has nothing to do with the cycle of action, he's in trouble, because he's thrown the pc below the fiendish demands of the bank. In other words, the bank parallels this degree of order. And where the auditor does not follow through that much order, why, the auditor does not get the pc through the bank because it is not parallel with the requirements of the bank. It's like trying to process somebody on his father when the difficulty is with his mother. Do you see?

So what you have to do, what you have to do—and this we have proven over a long period of time—this is quite empirical, by the way, this was never derived. This was something that just grew like Topsy along with processing. What you have to do is parallel this thing called the cycle of action. And there is no harm in your doing so. There is no detriment—there is no detriment to you for doing so, and there's certainly no detriment to the pc for going into that agreement that time and a cycle of action exist. In other words, you don't get into trouble—you get out of trouble by agreeing that it exists.

So it's for the nonce and for now it exists. So therefore, you find the cycle of action raising its head everywhere in processing. And a person who cannot approximate this cycle of action as an auditor gets his pc into continuous trouble. And it's not slight trouble. It is enormous trouble. It is just catastrophic. Because, of course, he's gone right straight up against

the bank and run the bank wrong way to. Every time you don't process a pc with attention to the cycle of action, you're processing the pc against the bank. So as a result the bank will jam. And you see that manifestation with a high tone arm, with a badly acting needle and other such manifestations. A pc that is not running well has first and foremost had the cycle of action violated. That you can be absolutely certain was the case. Pc isn't running well; the first thing you can say about the pc is the cycle of action has been violated.

Now, you see, "Well, I'm not getting tone arm action on this pc." All right. The first thing we can say is the cycle of action has been violated. Of course, this is a rather broad, general statement. Unless we know what else we're talking about, it could be rather meaningless. Because it's almost, "Well, the sun isn't shining because there—it is a cloudy day," see? It's just the reverse of the coin. So that's what you know.

Now, don't let me hear of any of you back in an organization or in a private practice or something of this sort sending me a query about some pc—you can send me all the queries about pcs you want to—but don't send me a query about a pc with a blank, flat, staring look of "What's wrong with this pc" and accompany it with a hundred and seventy—five started processes, not one of them completed, and say, "Why does this pc have a high tone arm?"

I've exaggerated the hundred and seventy—five because I was too bored to count them, but I did estimate that was something like the number of processes on a case query which I just had last night. I'm not lecturing you out of that particular case because it's one of many. They come in quite routinely and regularly. So the first thing you know about a case—that's the first thing you know about a case that isn't running right, is that the cycle of action has been violated.

Now, we could go back a little earlier than this. We can say, "Why isn't the case not running right," but "Why isn't the case living right?" Well, the cycle of action is being violated.

Now, there's two ways a cycle of action can be violated. One is by—and this is true of life, not processing; true of life, not processing—one way it can be violated is too slavish an obedience to it. There one is out of agreement with the cycle of action in the first place and he is being forced by everything under the sun, moon and stars to follow this particular cycle of action and he practically gets up to the brain ventilation point, see?

He doesn't like it. The fellow who gets up and goes to a bum job, you know, that sort of thing. All of the blessings of the machine age actually lie almost exactly in that zone that I've just been talking about, you see? Well, there is because power of choice is being overthrown. Now, you must not really confuse a power of choice and a cycle of action. Now, if a cycle of action is being followed then, against the power of choice—against the power of choice, see, the person's power of choice is being overwhelmed and overthrown and he is following a cycle of action—we set up quite a conflict. Oddly enough, there is the one zone where the person's power of choice can be overthrown and he can be somewhat improved.

This gives you the idea of what value the cycle of action has. It is up there with power of choice!

Well that's a very high—that's a very high point, power of choice. The person's self—determinism, the pc at cause, don't you see? This is power of choice. And we're ranking right along with it, cycle of action, because for a while cycle of action will be fought by the individual and then—here's the trick—by following a cycle of action to a point where he or she is used to it, it will then begin to as—is enough bank to compensate for the power of choice which will then return. You see the trickiness of this, see?

Therefore, you sometimes could force a pc through 8—C against his power of choice but only so long as you repeated the cycle of action. If you were doing a sloppy job of repeating the cycle of action, processing the pc against—this is not a recommendation to process a pc against his power of choice. I'm just giving you order of magnitude. If you'd continued to use the cycle of action in orderly progress of commands, the pc's power of choice would have been more freed than it would have been impeded because you would have as—ised more bank than you were piling up. So it isn't the person's power of choice that gives him reactivity. Self—determinism is something that is imprisoned in reactivity. A cycle of action is the prison.

So therefore, following and using a cycle of action will bring about nothing but a freeing of power of choice, whether the pc consents to it or not. You follow how this goes? This is very intricate. Don't ever tell me now that I recommended to you that you overwhelm the pc's power of choice. I'm just telling you that the cycle of action is comparable.

So you have the determinism of the thetan practically versus—his power of choice and his self—determinism is versus the fiendish cycle of action precision of the bank and this universe. This is the way the thing turns. It's because having started here you inevitably get to there that makes this universe a trap. If you start in at five minutes of nine, you certainly will arrive at five minutes after nine. Wherever you land in space, you are certainly going to land at five minutes after nine in time. That's for certain, isn't it?

Well look, that is an overwhelm. Whichever way you want to look at it, that's an overwhelm. You don't have to do a thing about it, and as a matter of fact there isn't anything you can do about it. You take any human being and sit them down in a chair at five minutes of nine, and no matter what they say, no matter what they do, no matter how they protest, no matter how many books they read or anything else, they are inevitably going to arrive at five minutes after nine. Now, you want to look at the biggest overwhelm there is in the universe—that's it. You want to see what the total overthrow of power of choice must be—that's it. That's the one thing you can't do anything about.

Now, going from point A in space to point B in space is something you can do something about. You can kick like billy-o. You very often get dragged to point B willy-nilly.

But nevertheless you've said a—you've made an uproar about it, see? You've at least done that or kicked hell out of A or done something. Do you see? You've done something about it. So that space transfer from A to B in space is not necessarily the degree of overwhelm that time is. In fact, it's such an overwhelm that possibly one or two of you until this minute had never recognized the inevitability of arriving at five minutes after nine. It was just so natural. Well, oddly enough, there really isn't anything natural about it at all. It's the most unnatural proceeding anybody ever had anything to do with.

Therefore, that progress through time is paralleled by cycle of action, and you can approximate time with a cycle of action. It's very close to making time. It's very close to a process you might call "Make some time." And that's a very funny process. That's a very funny process. Now therefore, you can start the pc at A and move the pc through to B, and by distance confusion, he has the illusion of moving through time. Time and space are very easily interchanged, don't you see?

So sometimes you can move him from A to B and just from A to B or get him to move something from A to B, A to B, A to B, A to B—this is very elementary processing—and he all of a sudden differentiates between distance and time. Well look, that's a step in the right direction. Do you see what's got—when I say differentiates, what am I talking about but freeing his ability to see? Well, that must have something to do with power of choice. In other words, he must be able to perceive something new here. He must have a new freedom of observation or he wouldn't have a cognition.

Cognitions only come about on freed perception or freed self or renewed self—determinism or whatever else you want to put on it as a label, you see? The individual is be—is coming loose from the trap. He's that much looser from the trap than he was a moment ago when he can say, "Ah yeah! The third bar is rusty!" Well, he's so much been in the trap before he's never noticed that the third bar was rusty. Well, being able to notice that the third bar on the window is rusty is to that degree freeing yourself from the trap. See, you're just that much less the effect of the trap. Do you see that?

I found myself the other day being haunted by a GPM. I wondered if it was out of gear or had slid loose from its moorings or something of this sort. And this was all very important because if I missed on this one, as in any of them, why, I'll wrap you around the telegraph pole. And boy, did I resent that for a while, you know? Can't privately get myself snarled up anymore. If I snarl up, it becomes a big overt, see? And I freed that, and that was the end of that. But anyway, I was taking a look at the situation—I still feel that way but not so violently.

Anyhow, I was taking a look at this confounded GPM that was busy floating around and so forth. I couldn't place it anyplace, and I knew it belonged somewhere and so forth, but it didn't make any sense where it was going. And I suddenly realized that I was restimulating

it. This was something new. And I sat back and I said, "Well, what do you know. *Huh—huh—huh*. Bronx cheer. Get lost, you know?" Felt tough! Felt like Vixie out here chasing an imaginary burglar that she was sure wasn't one, you know?

Anyway, I was restimulating it. It was the effect of me—I wasn't the effect of it. Interesting, interesting view. Now, what am I saying in essence there? What am I stating in essence there? I was enough freed from its overwhelm that I could perceive what was happening to it instead of what was it doing to me. Now this is—you see this typically all the time in overt act—motivator sequence. If somebody walks in off the street, all he can talk to you about is overwhelm, overwhelm, overwhelm, overwhelm, you see? You know, "Oh, life has done me in, man. It's just kicked my *oh ayouho—o!* It's lying—oh it's terrible. It's—you know, I ... Look—look, broken neck, you know. Look—look at those hemp marks all around my neck and so. Well, did me in, you know. Ruined—I'm wrecked, you know." And as I was talking to you about obliquely, it—this is quite a mechanism for holding somebody down. You just tell him all the time he's overwhelmed, you see? And tell him he never can be free and he's really had it—wronged, you know. It's a trap!

Well, a lot of you when it first came out on O/W, flinched at invading the personal privacy of an individual to this degree. You thought, "Well, that's something." And some of you were too enthusiastic. But what in essence were you actually doing there? You were just turning the tide. You were saying to this fel—we didn't care what crime he was reporting. We were trying to find something he'd done on his own free will that he then had to restrain and couldn't own. Because this is the mechanism: One does things which he then can't own up to and therefore caved in on because of it, see? He can't take responsibility for his own acts, don't you see? And O/W in its purest essence has never really been well understood since all it is, is—it's not a lesson in morality. It's not a lesson in being good. It is simply a lesson in "What power of choice have you exerted in life?" And you probably could approach the fellow's worst crime just on that gradient and that understanding. You could say, "What have you caused?" But unfortunately, with a great many pcs you get a lot of gobbledygook.

How hard it is to get the individual to admit his first overt. The first time he ever admitted an overt. Not the first overt he ever did; that's lost in antiquity. But just to get him to admit for the first time that he did something that wasn't quite nice. Well, of course, you're striking into the middle of society's effort to get him to restrain admission of this, which is a big overwhelm. And you're getting him to own up to the fact that he's been cause. Now, you can do some interesting things with this because he owns up and says he was cause and then he immediately says he wasn't cause because it was justified. And then he comes around to a point eventually where he says it was cause because "I did it," but then it was justified. Of course, every time he says it's justified, he's saying that it's not power of choice. "Who have you shot for no reason at all?" See? Now, that auditing question would be a little bit too high but is actually the essence of the question.

The reason why you use an overt, of course, is you're going up against the social mores as the point of overwhelm. You just choose this as the point of overwhelm. So therefore at lower—level processing, you are choosing the society as the point of overwhelm when you're running O/W, and you want the individual's revolts against this overwhelm as an expression of his power of choice. Now, some point of agreement with society can be found somewhere in that, that will undo attention from society.

I'll scale it all down to lower IV processing. You could ask some question like this, "What social activity or what third dynamic activity have you gone along with?" You, oddly enough, would find that this is an auditing question which, weirdly enough, would eventually bring up overt acts. It would be quite magical. You say, "What—what social activities, what customs, what beliefs, have you gone along with?" He starts naming them off, and the next thing you know gives you an overt act! Well, that overt act is nothing more than freeing himself from the straitjacket that he's been following along the social plane.—Well, that's a fairly innocent one, but it does people a lot of good and is very good lower—level processing. O/W, agreements—not disagreements—agreements, communication, things that are real, subjective realities, these sort of things, they're all pretty terrific. You could put those into the same rationale.

But how is the individual getting free? Well, the individual is getting free to the degree that he can step back and look at it. The individual can look at the situation he is in and to that degree is free of it. When he can really look at it, he's really free of it.

Well, now let's apply all this to the sixth dynamic and we'll get a much more subtle level, much less easily perceived by the ordinary human being. And that is what I've been talking to you about: Time. Freedom from the time span and freedom from cycle of action. Now, this is so woven into the pc regardless at what level he is, that even your social addresses, you know "What social agreement have you had, what have you done to society, how have you exerted your self—determinism against society"—you know, getting him to admit himself as cause someplace or another.

Now all of that, by the way, is all very, very, very junior to the sixth dynamic. No matter who he's shooting, he's standing on MEST, firing across space, don't you see, and his action is measured against time. I don't care what act he's doing. I don't care what he's agreeing with. I don't care what's happening to him. If he's in this universe, that's what's going on. In other words, he's in total slavish agreement with the sixth dynamic. So when you're processing this person, if you violate that to an enormous degree, he won't know what it is that is being violated. It's being violated to such a degree that he can't tolerate it. His tolerance of that violation is terrible. Do you understand what I mean?

You're processing this individual maybe—let's take the social unit or something like that, that we're processing him about, is his family. Well, let's not even take society. Let's take his immediate family, see?

Well, "What family custom have you gone along with?" or something like this. We don't care what we're taking up. And if you violate the cycle of action on the sixth dynamic—it's clear up here at Level VI auditing, see—but if you violate it down there at Level I, it responds on the E—Meter. You violate the cycle of action.

Now, how could you violate the cycle of action? Well, you have to understand how many cycles of action there are. And there are quite a few of them. They categorize on an expanding perimeter. Let's take this as the first cycle of action is the auditing comm cycle. Why do you call it a comm cycle? Because it is a cycle of action. And that is the first one which you see badly expressed on the low—level pc on the meter. This is the first one that shows up on the meter.

You see, I don't care what you're processing this pc on. He's nowhere near Level VI, you see. He's not doing anything about time or something of this sort. You're trying to find out if the desk is real or something, you know, or if he's got an auditor. And yet this cycle of action is so insidious that it weaves itself straight into that question you're asking, and you won't be able to get away with it. It isn't something you can get away with. And that is what is so fiendish about it. It's a point in auditing that can't be violated. If it's violated, you get lack of success. That's your dirty needle.

You say to the fellow, "Well, what have you—what did you do to your father?" And he says, "Well, I uh—" And you say, "Well, we've been into all that. Tell me something about your mother." You have an instant needle manifestation, instant! It'll be right there staring you in the face.

The young and beginning auditor is always mystified why E—Meters have such nervous needles. He blames them for all sorts of things and so forth. And yet it is just this violation, continuous violation of the auditing comm cycle. And it gives him a dirty needle. And that dirty needle is expressing the jam—up of energy in the pc's bank by reason of the violation of the momentary cycle of action. That auditing comm cycle—when you violate the auditing comm cycle, it will jam up energy in the pc's mind and that registers on the needle as a little *bzzzt.* In other words, you don't have to go out and be very esoteric about this. You can grab anybody off the street, put him on a meter, say, "Well, what's your name?"

And he said, "Oh, my name, well, it's—"

"Well, I don't want that."

Dirty needle. See, you asked him a question and you didn't let him answer it, and you didn't acknowledge when he did. And right away you got a dirty needle.

This is pure tyranny and is something that many auditors shudder against, and when they are first presented with the facts of the case that *they* are making the dirty needle, you never saw so many flinches and winces in your life. They cut and run. "Oh, me? No! I couldn't be. It's just the quality of this pc." Oh, no, it's not the quality of the pc. It's that the auditor violated the auditing comm cycle and that produced a disagreement with that very powerful being called the reactive bank. And when it produced this, to this—just to this degree, a disagreement with its mandates concerning cycles of action, Section 1, paragraph, "And whoever shalt violate this will get one awful pain in his gut. Period!" You know? Real proclamation. All right, the auditor says, "Well, all right. Now, what is your name?" "Oh, that's all right. I'm sorry. I uh—I don't need it on this form." Dirty needle, see?

The meter measures energy manifestations taking place in the pc's bank. Of course, we know the bank is something the pc is making all by himself, unassisted, but this is not a popular theory with somebody who is being subjected to very heavy psychosomatic illnesses.

You say, "Well, you're doing it all yourself," and you're liable then to have violated many more things than a cycle of action.

His awareness, then, is not up to the point of recognition of the reality of things. In other words, you've given him eight thousand gallons of reality, and you've given him one erg of attention with which to perceive it. And I'm afraid they would have to be comparable. You'd have to have eight thousand units of reality, and you'd have to have eight thousand units of freed attention to perceive it with. Do you see? It's got to be comparable.

So you can't come along—it's a—the reverse, by the way, is true, just speaking in that line. You give somebody a hundred thousand units of attention, and you give him a thousandth of a unit of reality and he's liable to consider it unimportant. You process somebody up high enough and you say, "Now let's take this conflict between Russia and the United States, you know," and he'd say, "Yeah, well, what about it?"

"Well, it's a terrible problem."

"Well, who—huh?"

You have sort of taken him by storm, you see? You have said something is an enormous reality, but he has an enormous attention factor to put on it, don't you see? And he can't see it as an enormous reality. He can very easily be persuaded to discount its importance and think it is very unimportant. You got the idea? So you could actually get the reverse.

But when you get the amount of attention available and the amount of thing to be perceived comparable, why, then it is perceivable. But when you tip this thing wrongly, either way—well, this fellow can understand everything there is in the whole world of science and some little kid comes up to him and asks him why he can't tie a string to the end of the kite or something like this. This fellow's brains go really creak trying to get down to this point, you

see, where he can explain to the kid something about this kite, you know? And he's liable to become very esoteric about it before he gets through, and he's liable to miss it completely. In other words, he's got too much freed attention on the subject in order to regard or concentrate it. You see, so this thing can be in reverse.

But when you take the pc who has one—thousandth of an erg of attention and he's being overwhelmed by a hundred billion cubits to the hundred billionth power of reality, he's got no attention to confront it with, and you violate this one little thing that you can violate. See, there aren't a lot of things you can violate. There's this one little thing you can violate: violate this cycle of action. Bang! There it is, right straight on your meter.

Now, there are fantastic numbers of things, then, that you could violate that wouldn't express itself on the meter. It would just be beyond his level of reality. You wouldn't get those expressed. But cycle of action—if you ask a question, he's supposed to answer the question and you're supposed to acknowledge the question—is a built—in mechanism that is so solid it's like putting the engine in a Rolls—Royce, you know? It's just built—in. Instant response.

You say, "What is your name? Oh, I don't need your name,"—dirty needle. Do you follow this? Well, there it is in its most elementary and stupid form, see? I could make an appeal to some auditors who get dirty needles rather regularly to take it in its most elementary and stupid form and perceive it: that it is simply that they're causing a dirty needle by not following out a cycle of action. They don't even have to worry about why there's a cycle of action. If they just followed that out, they wouldn't have a dirty needle.

Let's take the next cycle of action. Next cycle of action: a process. I'm just giving you broad categories here. Let's take a process. By the way, we've been very successful—I've been very successful in teaching people this. I shouldn't be snarling about it at all because it isn't a point of loss as far as I'm concerned. As soon as I properly defined a cycle of action as something that began and continued and ended, that elementarily and so forth, people—people have been doing much, much better with it. And they're not now assigning all kinds of wild reasons to why their pc is misbehaving on a meter. But maybe this lecture will give you a little broader insight into it.

Now, the process cycle of action is not expressed on the needle. It is expressed on the tone arm. The tone arm is what is being expressed—expressing here. Your tone arm starts to move on a given subject: pigs. "Pigs?" Tone arm moves. "All right, what about pigs? Pigs?" "Pigs, they grunt." Tone arm moves. "Pigs?" "They are in sties." Tone arm moves. "Pigs?" "Farmers raise them." "Pigs?" "I don't like pork." "Pigs?" "Hey, what do you know, I was once Jewish. Hey, yeah, pigs. Yeah, what do you know!" No more tone arm action.

Well now, please plot exactly what happened here, because there is a nice example. The guy gets back and he sorts out, you'd think at first glance, cause. No, he just puts himself

at cause over pigs. He eventually moves up so he's got a cause on the subject of pigs, and he's not involved with pigs, and pigs are not overwhelming him and his tone arm action ceases. No more tone arm action. Well, you've started, continued and ended a cycle of action on the subject of pigs. That's the lot.

And when you get down to looking this thing over, you find out that any subject addressed has to be continued in its address to a point where the pc's on top of it. And at that moment, the tone arm will cease to move.

Now, if the pc can get on top of it at all, the tone will move. If slightly, it will move. Well, we've got the parity here. We've got the subject which has overwhelmed the pc and we've got the pc with enough attention to regard this subject—enough attention to regard the subject potentially. That's how—that's what you mean when you say, "I audited him over his head." In other words, he never under God's green earth could have gotten on top of this subject, and it wouldn't have given tone arm action either, see?

But it just so happens that if he's potentially got, at any given instant, enough attention or power of choice or self—determinism—whatever you want to call it—to get up on top of this subject with some processing, he will climb as long as the TA is in motion and will cease to climb the moment he has become free of it. And that is expressed on the tone arm. That's your tone arm talking.

I'll go over that again. If it's real to him at all, it will register on the tone arm. Even if slightly, it will still register on the tone arm. We're not really interested in processing things that only register on the needle. A pc has a tendency to become overwhelmed, because you very often have too slight a needle action. A Mark V is too powerful—well, actually, a needle—a needle action on the old—time Mathison was a tone arm action on the Mark V, don't you see? You'd already—the pc had to be hit with a truck to get this—the needle to move, don't you see?

It's not true, so it's—what's changed here is not your viewpoint or understanding of the subject. What's changed here is the quality of the meter you're using. And the Mark V and its equivalents, such as the Azimuth meter and so forth, give you a very, very fine point here. And if you start just following its needle, you find—will find yourself misgauging what the pc can get on top of because it will read things that he couldn't quite get on top of, don't you see? So you follow the tone arm. You don't follow the needle. The only precaution you want to take is follow the tone arm. You assess by tone arm.

You go down a long list of things to audit on this pc. You're checking off parts of his life or something like this, you want to look for one that moves that tone arm. Even if it's—only moves it 0.1, you want something that moved that tone arm while you were busy keeping your needle at Set, see? You wanted a motion there. Now, if you got that motion, the rule follows that the pc has potentially got enough attention to get on top of that overwhelm.

You have found something that is overwhelming the pc, and you have found that he potentially can get on top of it. He isn't on top of it, but he potentially can. In other words, you've found a wall that he can walk up. See, you're not—you're not sending him up the side of the Empire State Building with slippery leather shoes, see? You're giving him something he can climb. Therefore, he will process to wins, providing you don't leave him in a state of half—overwhelm with regard to this thing! Because if you leave him in a state of half—overwhelm in regard to this thing, it's got him half—overwhelmed.

You've only dug him half out, and then you go find a new subject and you dig him half out of this new subject! And then you go find a new subject and dig him half out of this subject, you've got three half—overwhelms multiplied, and they make a total overwhelmed pc. You see this?

Now, your cycle of action there is simply, basically expressed by—when you start to get the pc on top of something get him on top of it. And he will object seriously to not being brought on top of it. We're not interested in whether he objects or not at this particular moment, we're merely interested in the meter responses, and what is the meter response. Eventually, it will be a frozen meter. That meter will be frozen.

In other words, you found some subject he could have gotten on top of and you just raised him up to a point where he was still overwhelmed—you didn't flatten your tone arm action, in other words—and then you found another subject that he got half on top of. He's still overwhelmed by that one. Now you go find another subject that he could get—and get him half on top of that one where he's still overwhelmed. You've got three overwhelms, and three overwhelms don't make a right pc, man. You never bring him out to where he can say, "Hey, there's rust on the third bar," see? That's all you're trying to do. And at the moment when he says, "There's rust on the third bar," the high probability is you've lost your tone arm action at that point.

There is a limit to which you can carry a tone arm cycle beyond its point of flatness. Here's this very vivid—that if it took you ten minutes to flatten the tone arm action out of something and you then went for two hours to see if it were flat, something is liable to become impatient around here or upset. You see? Because you've misestimated the length of time of this tone arm action.

Now, that isn't the direction that people err, however, but I'm just putting it in as a fact in passing. The direction where the error takes place is it takes them an hour to get some good tone arm action on this subject and then they drop it. *Yaaaow!*

They got it in plain view where it was in good and properly and horribly and meanly and viciously overwhelming the pc, see. Where he had it in full view, you know. You sort of got him as if you had a stroboscopic picture of the thing, you know: The tiger is halfway through the air, you see, and he's standing there wondering whether he's going to be able to

grapple with the tiger or not, you see. We're just at this point of parity—who's going to win…?

Let's run another process. Let's leave another tiger jumped half through the air, see? You can only do a few of these and you'll run out of chips because you're going up against the cycle of action of the bank as well as the selfdeterminism of the pc. Pc's trying to win on this one and so forth—you're going up against that. But you're basically—what's causing—what makes the arm lock up, which is what we're interested in, is because you're going up against the cycle of action of the bank. In other words, you've violated the cycle of action of the bank.

An action was begun and it was not complete and he is hung in the middle of the action and that locks up the TA. And you can go down a line of auditors and just spot where this has happened, where it's happened, where it's happened, where it's happened. And some of those auditors will tell you that nothing is happening in the session. They will also tell you that nothing has happened with the pc. Ha! Ha! Ha! Well, if you're unlucky, it happened with his last auditor, and the auditor's reports were fragmentary and illegible; if you're unlucky. Could get pretty grim, in other words.

Now, the trick here is to find out when the tone arm action ceases. The trick is not even really to find out something that will move the tone arm. People bang their brains out over this: "How do we find something that moves the tone arm?" You had better find what has moved the tone arm. If you're having to ask yourself this question of, "What has moved the tone arm?" and the tone arm isn't moving and the person has been processed for a while, then you had jolly well better ask yourself the reverse question: "What has moved the tone arm?" And process out of nothing but the person's folder and auditor's reports. Don't ever start a new action on this pc.

I don't care if the tone arm action that you're flattening was noted in 1958, man, flatten it! Whatever it is that you can find that ever moved the tone arm, flatten it. And just keep this up and you'll move him out of all these unfinished cycles of action and the bank will unjam. It's as elementary as that. Every new action that you start without completing these old actions in auditing is liable to produce a greater jam. Your job—your job is very simple to this degree, but you ask yourself very often the wrong question when you face a pc on whom you're trying to get tone arm action.

You ask yourself, "What will get tone arm action on this pc?" and you respond accordingly. And you'd love some tests of some kind or another, you'd like some of this, you'd love assessments, you'd like a new process or so on. You're at the wrong end of the business. That's the simple one, that's the simple one. You can take anybody off the street and have them sit down and pick up the meter electrodes and talk, just let them talk for a few minutes, and you're going to get tone arm action of some kind or another. This would be a very peculiar human being that you didn't note some tone arm action. *"Rattledy—rov,*

goff—goff, woof—woof, vaol—vlaow blaow—blaow—blaow," somewhere along the line they're going to get tone arm action. You make a note of it: That's a subject you process. The trouble with it is it doesn't look—make you look very professional and it doesn't seem to be very adroit. It's not adroit. Is a car in motion, is it stopped? I mean it's just about as much judgment involved in it as that. The guy goes, *"Rattledy—bang rattledy—bang."* Somebody says, "Well, I really don't like to have to go down to—processing a person on itsa. I really wouldn't know how to—how to untangle some—some pc without just plain itsa. I wouldn't ask them any auditing questions. I don't know how to ask them any auditing questions. I haven't got anything to ask them."

Well, I'm not going to make the mistake of saying I know all about this pc. Even when I have a sixth sense along this line, I'm not still going to make that mistake. I'm going to make the pc hand me the first thing that is real to the pc. Because I can see a lot more wrong with the pc than the pc can see wrong with himself, man. Don't ever downgrade your observation. Pick it up. Say this is very interesting, that fellow's got a gobbledygookitis. He's got his rhombolis on backwards. Don't—don't—don't downgrade your ability to look. But you don't know which of those things is real to the pc. And what will tell you, what will tell you—all these things are perfectly true—but what will tell you is that tone arm, very nicely.

And how does it tell you? Well, it tells you with just plain itsa, and that's all the test you need. That's all the test you need. This—I'm talking about just casual practice of running pcs. And he says, *"Rattle—rattle bong—bong yowp—yowp—yowp—yowp—yowp,"* or something like that, and—or he says, "Well, I never do like to talk to people. I'm very sorry, and I've always been this way. I've just never liked to talk to anybody and so forth." Well, he's running a—he's running an out of communication process, and we mustn't let him go along very long that way because that's out of agreement and that's going to run him wrong way to after a while. And we can let it go along long enough to find something to dive in on. But then we dive, see? "Well, what part of your grandmother were you in favor of?" you know, you'll find very often will produce far more tone arm action than he has been getting on parts of his grandmother that he wasn't in favor of, you see?

There are all kinds of stunts along this line. You process in the direction of ARC, of course. You don't preconceive that you know all about the case before it's opened its yeep. And you let the—you take the easy course. See, you don't work at it so hard. What you get tone arm action on, flatten!

Well, how about unwillingness to flatten it? Ah well, I already—you've already have seen pcs recover on 8—C when they were being dragged across rooms and their fists planted against walls. In other words, this cycle of action is the only zone or area where you can overwhelm, to any degree, the preclear's power of choice. You mustn't overwhelm his power of choice in any other zone or area. See, don't evaluate for him. Don't do these other things to

overwhelm his power of choice, but finish that cycle of action, brother, over your dead body does it end, you know.

When he comes into session the next day, "Well, that's—that—process we were running yesterday. .."—we were getting tone arm action. It was traveling all over the dial, see—"process we were running yesterday, I don't know, I mean I had a headache and I had a headache all night and I didn't feel so good last night and I don't really think we ought to finish that process."

"All right. Good. Well, I'm sorry you felt that way and so forth. Say you felt bad and so forth. Now, exactly what agreement you had about your grandmother did we take up yesterday that made you feel that way?"

See, you don't have to finish the cycle of action with an ax. You can be pretty smooth about the whole thing. And you go right on and you run that until we've got the tone arm down here and it is 2.75 still and the needle starts to tighten a little bit and we say, "Good. Well, that cognition you had a little while ago made you feel a lot better, didn't it?"

"Yes, as a matter of fact it did."

We end the tone arm cycle of action, you see, five minutes before we finish the test. See, we spotted where it ended. Not where we stopped processing. See, there's a lot of little tricks involved in this sort of thing. Makes you—but they're just the tricks of a slippy auditor, see. It's how do you fit things into this cycle of action.

You goofed. You've been going all morning long and that tone arm hasn't moved a bit and that process is so flat, and you say, "You know this thing is not going to pick up any further. It hasn't got any more kick left in it. It's dead. And I've processed him all this time and so forth." I would not be beyond, "that process which we finished yesterday afternoon," I would not be beyond saying that, see? I'd say, "Well, I'm sorry we've been plugging away at this this morning here because apparently we finished that yesterday afternoon."

"Oh, we did? Oh, as a matter of fact, I had a feeling that we did! Oh, yeah! Yeah! And rah—ruh, mmmm, mmmm, yeah." He finished the cycle of action when it finished, with perfect truth. And your tone arm suddenly loosens up, and the pc's willing to talk about something else, see?

All right. Now there's the meter manifestation of a flat TA, and that's what the thing is registering and that's what the thing is supposed to do and that's where it's supposed to go and that's how you can handle it. Don't run things that don't give you TA. But if they're not giving you TA, then something must have been run that gave TA. What was it? "Oh, well, we don't have his auditor's reports because this is our first or second session in life." Well, something gave TA. Life does not keep good auditor's reports. I'd say he was in—had been in some other practice that gave him TA. Not some esoteric zone of livingness, see, I'd say it

was some other practice. I'd say it was right in here along the line of Scientology, see? See, we're culminating a long line of practices. There are plenty around, man.

Right away I'd be asking—I couldn't—couldn't get any TA motion off of this character, he could itsa like crazy and I didn't get any TA motion, there was no action. There was no action on this pc. I'd say, "What the hell, what the—excuse my French, but where we go from here? What's this, what's what?" I wouldn't be asking for a brand—new wonderful process. I'd be asking this other question.

If I don't get TA action on the pc, I don't ask what *will* get TA action on the pc, I ask what has gotten TA action on the pc. And I assume immediately that it is some analogous practice; some similar practice. Right away I start watching that needle, now—and this is where you use a meter manifestation—I start watching that needle like a hawk. Maybe I'm not going to get TA, but that needle's going to give me a clue, man. I'll crank that sensitivity right on up here, 128 and so forth, and sit right on top of this thing keeping it very nicely centered and watch it like a hawk. All right. "Now what other zones of mental practice have you been near, so on and so on. Have you ever been psychoanalyzed? You ever been to a psychiatrist? Have you ever been to a psychologist? Did you ever study graphology? You ever been in the field of phrenology? Have you ever had your horoscope read, so forth?" Clink! Horoscope. All right, all right, all right. Now we found out what gave TA action. It's a process unflat in horoscopy.

You see the rationale with which you can go, and by golly, you know, you can untangle more cases in less time if you're slippy this way than you can shake a stick at. You don't have to go upstairs and fly ten thousand feet up flat on your back in some wild pose. All you have to do is—if you don't get TA action on the pc, then all you have to do is find out what gave him TA action that wasn't completed.

You can trace that back ordinarily in his auditor reports because there's been some sort of a low—level goof, and that's your, usually, your standard action. Just go back through those auditor's reports. Choose objective—type processes as the first choice. When you've got—when you've got thirty processes that produced TA action, none of which were flat, all of which were left with lots of TA action on them, then you have to make some sort of a choice amongst all this mess as to where you pick up the threads of this case. Because it isn't necessarily the first one that will respond again, although that is the best possibility, but it isn't necessarily true.

So if you've got to make a power of choice and be right on the button every time such as in case advising—different than auditing. You're auditing, you're advising—there's a slightly different way to do it. If you were auditing, you'd simply pick up the first one and search it out and see if you could still get TA action on the first one that produced TA action,

see? But if you're advising some auditor to do this, you don't have then the continuing assessment of what you're doing.

See, there's a lot—there's a big difference between sitting there in the driver's seat as the auditor, see, and banging away and—well, you could shift gears very rapidly. You find out that is a blind alley, man, you know? So therefore you can cut a little bit closer to the edge of the road, you see? In other words, you can say, "Well now, look at there. That first process, that seems very unlikely, you see, that that would produce TA action because that process is six or seven years ago. Very unlikely. Well, let's take a—let's take a three—minute flier at it, see?" Which, because you've got the pc on the other end of the meter, you can say, "Well, how about this 'boiling eggs producing a headache?'" This meter doesn't do a thing, you see? Then you can say, "Well, I'm sorry I brought it up." See? You can go on to your next process, see?

But when you're advising auditors or advising cases and so forth, you can't do that. You have the disadvantage of the pc—you got no pc in front of you, you see? You've just got a folder or something like that, and you got the auditor's advice. So what you have to do then is play it surer. See? You play it more positively. You play it on a sure bet. You don't take a chance, in other words. You play it certain.

And you can be absolutely certain that any unfinished Objective Process which gave tone arm action will reproduce tone arm action if flattened. In other words, the Objective Process is the one that's most likely to have stuck the guy in tone arm action because it's right here in the physical universe, isn't it? And it's closest to the sixth dynamic. So therefore, tone arm actions not flattened on Objective Processes are the most likely to have been hung up, and therefore the most likely to complete their cycle of tone arm action if resumed.

Subjective processes are the least likely. In other words, you had a subjective process: "How about your father's screaming at you?" Or "From where could you scream at your father?" or something. You're playing a bet there that is just a little bit wider bet, see? You can't at all be sure that some other process didn't move in sideways on this one and knock it appetite over tin cup, see? Maybe it got covered in some other terminal run that was run the following year, see? And just in passing the pc cognited on it, and there it went as an earlier process and maybe that cycle of action finished in some other fashion or way, don't you see? Could've. So you're not quite so sure.

When you're—so when you're advising cases and so forth, you take the surer bets. You never play a doubtful one. You always give it the business, you know? You don't—you don't hand them a rifle and say, "Well, I hope this works." You don't play it that way. You handle them a mortar that any fool could handle, see? And you say, "You drop the cartridge in the barrel here, you know, and it fires." And you're—you know that mortar will fire, see?

In other words, you've got some guy who's having an awful time. You've got some auditor who's having an awful time with him, you say, "Well, run 8—C and make sure that you continue to finish every cycle of action which you begin on the pc as a command." Well, you know that's going to produce something. In other words, you just run your heavy, sure bets all the time, you know. You never—you never do any fringe effects over here. See? It's always brute certainty that you have to go on, and an auditor that will do that, and so forth, gets very soon an enviable reputation as an adviser of auditors. Of course, all he's really doing is advising the certainties and if those auditors are left to their own devices they might get themselves into trouble or out of trouble by handling a lot of fringe stuff. But they—somebody might delicately wander his way through something, you see, that he could never have been advised through, don't you see? So when you're advising auditors to do something, always tell them exactly what's right down the middle of the highway.

Never dream up some little process which goes *wiffawackle* and you *woffawockle,* see? Your best bet in doing that is just to take the pc's folder and find somewhere in it an unfinished cycle of action and tell the auditor to complete it.

And if you're dealing with very new auditors and so forth, always remember when they come back and tell you—as they almost inevitably will that it didn't work, that they didn't do it. That's a little maxim that goes along with this which is quite interesting to know and it saves any auditor advising auditors from a broken heart more times than you could count. And the way you pull that trick is you say, "Well, exactly what did you do?"

"Well, I did just like you said."

"All right. Good. What did I say and what did you do?"

"Oh, uh—I don't know. What did you say?"

Very embarrassing moment for the guy. You see—he just—he doesn't remember what you said, yet it didn't work. That's hard, bitter experience talking, you see? Never let yourself be boxed around into thinking that your advice is no good. Find out if it was taken. Make sure in the first place that the advice you give is very sound advice. And your best gag on any old cases around is to haul out any old fragment of a folder they've got anyplace from anywhere and find some unflat tone arm action and have that exact tone arm action flattened. That's your best advice.

Now that's, therefore, meter manifestations. Now, those are meter manifestations for Level IV. Now I'm going to give you meter manifestations additional for Level VI and how they compare at Level IV, because they are different.

You are accustomed to tone arm action requiring quite a little time to flatten. They require some time to flatten. Let's say the tone arm action on some process required two sessions to flatten, three sessions to flatten, something like this, you see. You get accustomed

to that at Level IV auditing and below. You don't realize at first with Level VI that you're looking at the exact same manifestation happening in the space of ten to fifteen seconds. You're flattening the tone arm action on an item. More broadly, you flatten all the tone arm action on a GPM.

Now, when you've finished an item, there isn't anything else there because that was the basic woof and warp of what was giving all the commotion anyhow, and you can flatten an item in ten or fifteen seconds. And that's all the tone arm action there is. And there isn't any more tone arm action to be had. That's it!

Now, you actually don't even really see all the tone arm action that happens on that. In the first place, it couldn't register on the tone arm or the needle. It's blowing out there in space. It isn't necessarily blowing up against the pc. I mean, you can thank your stars that it isn't blowing up against the pc. I see these Level VI co—auditors getting—have seen the elephant, from that laugh. But it flattens quick. And that's all the tone arm action there is there. And you spend any more time monkeying with that, and do you know, you're getting tone arm from elsewhere. Now possibly you hadn't recognized it, all of you, that you're getting tone arm action from the next bank or the next item, or you're getting tone arm action from someplace else.

And you sit there and let that pc cognite on endlessly, and yap—yap—yap, and finish, *ah—wah—wah—wah—wah—wah—wah.* All of a sudden you're going to get a higher and higher TA and it's going to get stickier and stickier and you're going to wonder what you're doing. Well, you finished the cycle of action, but then you started to drag in charge from something else. That's carrying that cycle of action beyond the point where it can be carried. And I warn you that it is very, very brief—ten to fifteen seconds. It can go up to a minute, but that's unlikely. That's very unlikely. For instance, I see all the tone arm action I could possibly see go out of an item—I mean, it just goes. I don't know, I say fifteen seconds—I'm being very generous. Very generous. I'm allowing for slow freight. It's gone!

Well, now, it's just as though, as you came in the front door with a dirty needle and, you see, you go out the back door with a dirty needle. In other words, it's the first manifestation observed in below Level IV auditing, but it happens to be the last manifestation observed at Level VI auditing. Because you overflatten TA action and it is not present, you get an exaggeration of the dirty needle called a tocky needle—a new one on you—and this crazy, tocky needle. A pc in the bank is so sensitive to invalidation that it will turn on a crazy, sharp—edged tickety—tock that it looks—looks like a small rock slam. Not a real dirty needle, but it looks like a small rock slam. And that's sort of the Level VI dirty needle, see? Call it a tocky needle.

And you try to take more tone arm action out of an item or out of a bank than is there, or you try to find something wrong in the bank that isn't wrong, and you'll see this great big,

dirty needle. Now, it's expressing tone arm *action completed.* The dirty needle expresses tone *arm action prevented from completion.* You got the difference? But this is not saying that. This is saying, "Hey, you idiot. The tone arm action is all finished in this area. How come you're still hanging around, bud?"

And it's just marvelous that the needle will tell you that on a meter. It's just marvelous that it will tell you that, but it will. It's just like a neon sign. It's a nice, great big reaction. It's not a little dinky reaction like a dirty needle because, of course, you're dealing with somebody whose bank is freeing up and who is much freer and in better case Condition. And it's a great big exaggerated action.

Now, you can drive that needle and the longer you go the more it will tockety—bock. And you can finally drive it to a stuck needle, stuck TA. Takes quite a little while to do so—you have to be quite a genius at it, you know. But it will tickety—tock and bop and bap and tock—tock, and it's just having a ball. And you say, "I wonder what all this commotion is about?" You'd better ask this pertinent question, "Am I invalidating the correct lineup?" Hooooh! Smooth, see? Just like that. Going *tock—tock bock—bock bagh—bich—bach, bich, bich, bah, bah, bah, gug, bah, baow, baow.* "Well, all right. Are there any items—any items I've left charged behind me? Did that bank—did that bank—was that really flat? Did it really join in at this point?" *Tick—tock tock, tock, bahg—bahg—bahg bigh—bagh—bagh bigh—bahg—bahg—buh bagh—bahg—bahg*—what the hell is going on here, you know? Whoa—whoa, whoa—whoa—whoa, Betsy! You see? What's going on?

You say, "Am I—am I knocking about a correct lineup?" Smooth. Yeah, well then, "Give me the next item." So that's—that's where you begin the next cycle of action. So if you—when you're dealing with the thing that enforces a cycle of action upon the pc and upon life, it then objects to one being overrun. The only objection you get then is insisting there is more cycle of action than is there. If you've got the cycle of action out of something, it raises hell that you're putting one in, and what it resists is a created cycle of action. You try to create any new cycles of action on this pc that aren't there to be created and, man, it just raises the living billy—o with the bank.

Now remember, you came in the front door, and that's when you failed to complete a cycle of action that was there. Remember this is a totally overwhelmed pc. And that immediately went *bzzzt bzz bzzz bzzz bzzz bzzz* dirty needle *drzzzzzzzzzzz.* See? Every time you said—this pc, his bank is now insisting, "There are cycles of action to be completed. At every turn, you must complete your cycle of action." See, we've got everything overwhelmed here with a cycle of action, you know. Okay.

All right. You get up to the other end of the thing when you're undoing the thing that creates the cycle of action, the only thing that raises the devil is making a new cycle of action or extending the existing cycle of action. And then that just raises the devil with the meter.

And you can see a meter like this—now, I can tell if an item has been left charged without ever asking a question about it. Because the new item called doesn't behave right. It doesn't behave well. The thing doesn't fall right and it just doesn't go. And you say, "Well, we left some 'bring about' wrong. Is it in the first pair? The second pair? The third pair? The third pair reads. That's good." Call the third pair, "Does the one that's there—oppterm bring about the terminal?" *Bzzzzt—bvoop,* falls and so forth. "All right. Let's take up this new item." And now you find it reads right.

You can get very alert to this without doing very much examination. Your items aren't reading, so you must have left something charged. Well, let's rapidly find out what we left charged, get the charge off and get back to what we're doing. All right. Now supposing—that's the best laid plans and that's what you would do, see?

Supposing now, you hadn't left anything charged. I'll give you the other thing, see? Give you the other manifestation, see? You just get a lousy read on something of this sort, and it itself has been suppressed or invalidated or you hung around too long before you said it, and you say—you say, "Oh, have I left an item charged? A little bit of a read on that. Was it the first. . *Tickety—tock, tickety—tock, boodibop—bzzzt—blurrp—blurrrp—blooop.* "All right. Would you please give me the next item." You understand? Handy little jimdandy meter mechanism then. God bless a meter.

Pc will get all kinds—he's always getting the idea that the bank he is running went in between two other banks earlier. He inevitably will get this kind of an idea. Why? Because the bank he is running is always the last bank in existence. So it, of course, appears to be where the present time bank was once. So therefore appears to be where—you see, where another bank was. Do you follow this? Now, he'll—always liable to get, "Well, I wonder what this is, you know. Huhhh. We're supposed to be down here at this one, and yet actually—and you know I feel like this one should have come between a couple of other banks. Hmmm."

And he comes into session, "You know, I feel. . ." *nckety—tock bock, bock!* And you say, "No, it—bank—bank was in the correct position. All right. Now give me the next item on the line."

"Oh, was it? So what do you know?"

That's the end of that. You just never saw a meter cool off so fast. Turns into a gorgeous flow.

You've got your BA steps in. You've got everything in. There isn't any charge left on it, you see. You couldn't get it with an electric shock machine, see? So you say, "All right now. Let's check this, and let's make sure this is flat. Now, this thing *wah wah twah twah twah."* *Tickety—tock bop—bop thud,* bing. That tells you right now that you have overridden the pin. It's no disgrace to have overridden the pin. It's only a disgrace if you see that

manifestation, not to unload right where you are because it's invariable: it means that you're invalidating a correct lineup. It means you're taking more charge than is there. It means that you're trying to extend the cycle of action beyond its logical conclusion. And that's all the bank now objects to, at Level VI, is the cycle of action being extended beyond its end.

Now, I don't want to do the same thing with this lecture, so thank you very much.