

SEMINAR: AUDITING SPEED

A lecture given on
21 June 1961

Thank you. Thank you.

Well, your auditing has improved, so I'll wear a jacket.

All right, what is this? The 21st, or what?

Audience: 21st.

Yeah. June, 1961, Saint Hill. Saint Hill, Sussex, UK, England, Earth, solar system, this place. All right.

Well, I haven't anything bright to tell you today. I've shot the bolt now. Now you know everything there is to know. And I'm certainly glad of that! I'm certainly glad of that. Certainly you know everything there is to know, because I don't.

There's a couple of bugs kicking around of one character or another. And I don't know yet if you've got them totally licked or not. They're basically just slow assessment, slow, slow, slow assessment, slow, slow, slow security checking, slow, slow, slow SOP Goals. And nobody's trying to make you unthorough, and nobody's telling you that you should uniformly and routinely rush your auditing through, but there's a difference between getting something done and wasting time. And that's all I've got my eye on. And I think I've spotted the bugs of what's making it go slow, but I actually haven't got all the returns back. That is to say, I don't know if it's going faster for you now or not.

But it wouldn't make any difference to me if it took seventy-five hours to get somebody's goal. That, you'll find, is the slowest haul. I think we speeded that up with instant needle read. I wouldn't care if it took that long, but it's kind of nonsense. But for it to take very long to do a Security Check, this is what's weird. Because all you do is read the question, and then don't wait for the strains of "Dixie". Make sure that that thing is-didn't fall when you read the question. And then go tearing off to the next question. And when they fall, you probe them by compartmentation of the question.

Something that Frank Aloysius George Q. Sullivan should have done, before he started blasting around about PDH. He, by the way, has got me very suspicious now, because there's now been a big to-do on the part of the California mounties. I think that's what they call the police in California, isn't it? Mounties? Well, they're always on everybody's back. And they have corralled some poor guy up in Eureka. And they're accusing him, because he's a Scientologist, of practicing brainwashing and PDH on people. So it doesn't look like Mr. Sullivan was quite as innocent as it seems, because he forecasted attack which was also duplicated on the-oh, practically the same day in Detroit. Interesting, isn't it?

Of course, according to you . . . according to you in general . . . everybody is reasonable, and all actions are good, and there's nothing you've ever plotted. But we hear about "Scientologists are PDHing people in Australia," then we hear about it in South Africa, then we get a magazine that he cannot afford to publish, being published, saying so in the United States. And then simultaneously in two different parts of the country two thousand miles apart, the police suddenly swoop down on a Scientologist and accuse him of PDHing people.

And then simultaneously Pinkerton swoops down on the police, sent by the organization, and it all blows over. But it's hard on the people when it's happening.

And you can say it's all for the best in this best of all possible worlds, but the Panglossism doesn't go down with me, and I usually say, "Well, ready on the right, ready on the left, ready on the firing line . . . Fire!" Somebody at the other end says, "Goddamn, we can't fool this guy!" That's a fact.

So don't feel surrounded, because you're the only people that have the weapons. But please, for the sake of my morale, don't be so reasonable. Don't leave me standing there all by myself, you know? Don't start telling me, "Well, Ron, it's just human nature." Yeah, it's human nature to get itself in such a stew, but that's no reason. There's also some political nature back of it, too.

You see, we're actually not just stewing around in the bullpen, you know, because we are so happy about people's aberrations, you know, and "It's not their fault," and "People are leading unhappy lives," and so on. That's really not what we're doing. We're also doing that. And that is fine.

But let me tell you something: that if we weren't here, the lights of Earth's civilization would be out in another twenty-five years . . if we weren't here. And people know who is sitting, baying at them. But you see the great ease it would be to scoop me up, or shoot me down or do something to me. You might ask, why is it that this has never really happened?

It's come close to happening a couple of times. There's been an airplane out on a landing field warming up, waiting to kidnap me, and a couple of hoods standing by, real tough mugs. Only they couldn't handle a .45, and I could. This in the confines of Los Angeles.

The war cooled off, as far as I was concerned, many, many years ago, and I don't expect it to hot up at all. I don't even bother to lock the doors.

And it's not case as far as I'm concerned. I'm just pointing that out to you as a matter of record. Because if I had a men . . number of overts here, or if I had a bugginess going here, the attack on you and the attack on me would be fantastic. But you see, if you haven't got tremendous motivators, they can't get a big enough overt going against you, because you just don't suck it in, that's all. You see? And that mechanism alone is why we're still alive.

And there isn't anything going to happen to us. Just around the fringes . . just around the fringes . . here and there, why, there'll be a little popgun. Down in Perth all of a sudden, why, somebody swoops down and picks up some auditor, they . . . And it works out this way: He himself has got some kind of a wild series of motivators that has nothing to do with us. And listen . . we can't even help him. In this Perth affair, we tried hard to help this person. And they wouldn't even accept an attorney from us. Nothing much happened to them, they went down and paid a small fine and that was it. But wouldn't even permit an investigation.

We've got a backflash going right now in Australia which is . . actually, it went. We've been on the winning side of this picture in Australia now for many months. We've had tremendously effective people there. These people are awful fast on the draw. They remind you of what the Western movies would like to believe the old Western bad men were all about, or the police marshals. Because, boy, those guys are awful quick on the draw in Australia. You shoot in their direction and, the enemy, long before the trigger actually gets pulled, the air just begins to hum all around their ears.

There's a guy down there who wishes to God he'd never been elected as the head of the BMA of Australia. Every night when he goes to bed at night he says, "And Dear Lord . . ." and all of a sudden, why, the wolves came off, and there hasn't been anything happening down there since.

And now the other day, one of the leading trade union papers published a very congratulatory article on the E-Meter, and that sort of thing. Well, that's gaining ground.

Well, the Australian knows he's under fire, so he cooperates. In the United States they don't know they're under fire. They think it's all for the best in this best of all possible worlds. And it's all so reasonable, and Ron is . . "You know, got . . well, he's a little bit aberrated on this subject," and so on. "He's fighting a shadow," you know, and "it doesn't work," and so forth. "Actually it's Ron that's PDHing everybody, and. . ." You know, reasonable, stupid kind of action. And it's getting knocked off.

One of these days, one of these days, people, more and more, month by month . . you'll watch it . . will start coming up and backing us up, and backing us up more and more. And backing us up more and more and more. And all of a sudden, there'll be a splash in the Pacific and a splash in the Atlantic, and

that will be the end of subversion in the United States. You watch it happen. I promise you it's going to happen.

But it's only going to happen because I'm quick on the trigger, keep my eye open, and everybody in HCO is very, very fast on the ball along this line. When you want them to act, they act. Consequently, within hours private detectives will be swarming around Eureka, asking questions. We have only one weapon. We investigate loudly. Investigate very loudly. That's the only weapon. But we'll make it to the degree that our technology is good, sound and fast.

We're on a wave of the future. And if anything, we are the wave of the future. There is no technology that can approach anything we are doing. And you'll find if you study great civilizations that they roll forward with new technology. The sweep of the Romans resounded with the clash of arms. But basically England was conquered by Rome as much as a century before the first Roman soldier ever put his foot on English soil. Look up history and you'll find out it's true.

Roman culture and know-how had invaded England. It was coming over from the Channel ports. And everybody thought it was very nice to be able to grow a crop. That was pretty good. And instead of finding out about this (the Roman military intelligence didn't find out that they probably would have got roses in the street), they landed an expeditionary force. That's something like you, after you've cleared a pc, decide he's aberrated and attack him. Not quite as extreme as this, but that was kind of what happened. But every new civilization is forecast and is a new technology, and that is all it is. And philosophic technologies are far more prone to the founding of new civilizations than otherwise.

So you're working on more than you know, and the eyes of the future upon you, and all that. So you better find out something about it, huh?

The caliber of what you are doing improves with such rapidity, as soon as you land here, that you can almost tell how many days you've been here. This is from the reports I get. So there is a right way to do things, and nothing actually does better than knowing just exactly how it is done, being able to ask questions immediately and directly to find out if you're doing something wrong about it, because it develops a certainty. And I want you to develop this certainty. I want you to, whenever you think up a dumb question or think you're astraddle of some kind of a riddle-raddle or something of the sort, well, for heaven's sakes speak up.

Now, Jan has been speaking up quite interestingly . . . last night asked me, "On this Prehav 13, do you ask all of the names over and over, or do you do Assessment by Elimination?" She brings up a point there which very well might go terribly crosswise somewhere. On your terminal assessment for Prehav 13, you're not doing an Assessment by Elimination. You are doing simply a runover. And as a person gets his overts off, of course, against all the people that he knows, the people you have already passed over and found null on your scale all of a sudden live up.

It actually doesn't matter much who you choose to get the overt off, as long as there was some immediate action on the E-Meter. So what you do is make a terminal assessment sort of thing. You collect all the guy's terminals that he . . . everybody he knows in present time, you see. And you write all these people down on a piece of paper. And you start down the list. And every time you get a fall, well, you see if you can't clear the fall by two-way comm. And if you can't clear the fall by two-way comm, you run the action out of the needle. And then go on to the next person and see if you can't do that. And it's more a Security Check than an assessment. Have you got it?

Now you find somebody you don't clear with . . . you say, "Well, how do you feel about that person? What have you done to that person?" or something like that. And it doesn't clear. The needle keeps reacting. All right. Assess the person on that terminal on the Prehav Scale, and run enough two-way commands to clean the needle.

Now, you're not going to get too many of them to the Prehav Scale, probably. Most of these terminals are going to clear just on a glance. Now, you go back to the beginning of the list. And you can keep adding new people; he keeps thinking of new people and so forth. Well, just put them down and go on about your orderly affair. But now go back to the beginning of this long list of terminals and go over the

thing again, and you're all of a . . . going to . . . sudden find that terminals that weren't hot are now hot. See, you're raising his responsibility for the people in his environment, and as you do this, of course, you raise his ability to see what he has done.

It's just a list that you go over and over. This is not necessarily something you would have to do as a full-time activity. You could do this for half a session and run whatever else you're running for another half of the session.

I call to your attention that the girl who went Clear on the South African ACC had . . . here's a missing item for you . . . had fifty hours of Formula 13 immediately before that ACC. It was almost impossible, you see, for her to have ARC breaks, so forth. She had all these people in her environment pretty well cleaned up. And in view of the fact that they were pretty well cleaned up, what did this leave? This left the fact that most of her auditing session was devoted to getting Clear, not to patching up the environment. And rudiments didn't suddenly go out on her all the time. You understand?

All right, now, that is a somewhat imperfect statement of how you do Prehav 13. I see it still leaves you just a little bit puzzled about it. But I will go over these steps just rapidly here, now, very rapidly.

The way you do it is in a Model Session form. You clean your rudiments, and then you . . . clean them rather indifferently because you're certainly going to do nothing but clean rudiments on this Prehav 13, you see. And you just take a list, you say to the person, "Now, I'm going to make a list of everybody that you know" . . . you can say, "intimately," or something like this, or "everybody that you're associated with"; whatever wording- "in present time. Everybody that you know in present time." They'll ring in a lot of dead people on you and stuff like this. Well, put them down. Who cares. It's not a precision activity anyhow.

And you make this long list, see, and it'll go two, three pages. Well, while they're thinking about this, they're actually exteriorizing and they're getting their bank straightened out. So that, itself, is auditing, because they're doing differentiation. It's a differentiation exercise. And if you just did it as a differentiation exercise you'd find it was quite unusually therapeutic for people. Because they have all these people crossed up with people. And you'll find out as they're doing this they'll separate these people out, and they become individuals instead of masses, and so forth.

All right, you get this long list. All right. Now, you go over this thing, and I frankly don't care what approach you use in order to straighten this up or ask this. Ask the person, "Well what have you done to . . . ?" "What have you withheld from these people?" But I'd say "done to" is probably more productive than anything else, because they often add up "done to" as "withheld from."

And you say, "Well now, all right. Now we're going to take these people, and we're going to cover your relationships with them." And this is all right with the pc. And you start in at the beginning of the list, and you say, "All right. Now here's Joe. And here's Bill." You know, you're watching for that instant reaction, see? "And here's Pete. And here's Oswald" . . . pang! Of course, a fellow with a name like Oswald should get a pang! And so . . . any similarity to persons living or dead is purely intentional.

So anyhow, bang! This word goes "Oswald." All right, your next approach is "Well, what have you done to Oswald!"

And the person says, "Well . . . I . . . oh, so-and-so, and so on, and so on," and you get a big rocking needle on the thing.

And you pull an overt, and you say, "Well, how do you feel about Oswald now?" And you get a big rock on the needle again, and you say, "Well, we've had it. Now, we are going to take this person," and we take out our . . . remove it from its Lawrence leather scabbard . . . the Prehav Scale, and lay it out here on the E-Meter board, and say, "Now, is Oswald . . . ?"

Now, don't be surprised if by the time you start to run the thing that Oswald has vanished from the face of Earth. Because you say, "Is Oswald faith?" Or "Would you have faith in Oswald?" And just go on down the line, and find the Prehav Scale as applied to Oswald, see? And you're trying to find the level

to run Oswald. That is your intention. You want to find a level, and you honestly and sincerely are not sitting there hoping he will just vanish, you'd like to find a level for Oswald. And this isn't going to happen very often.

It'll take somebody like . . oh, I don't know . . they've been married to somebody and in business with them, and eventually wound up with a law suit with them, and so forth, that reminds them of everything on their own rock chain. Now, that's that person. All right. Now, all of a sudden we find as we're assessing the Prehav Scale, which we're reading on down the line . . we find that several levels are live. We go back and try to pick up these levels that have livened up on Oswald, and we find out that one does still react.

All right, put up a command like this. Let's say the level that's still reacting is Failed Withhold. All right. "Now, what have you failed to withhold from Oswald?" And, "What has Oswald failed to withhold from you?" Those are the commands, see. "What have you failed to withhold from Oswald?" "Yap, yap," he says. And you say, "Thank you. What has Oswald failed to withhold from you? Thank you." And that's all there is to it. And you do those a few times, and that's the end of Oswald, even then, see.

You watch the needle. There is no twenty-minute test on this. You just watch the needle, and you say, "How do you feel about Oswald now?" And you don't get any instant reaction on the E-Meter, you instantly and immediately say, "Well, all right. Thank you very much. Now, is it all right with you if we return to this list?"

And he says, "Yes."

And you say, "All right." And you do so. You can close the end of the process out, as far as that's concerned.

All right. Down we go, down the list here, and we've got the next person now, and we've got the next person, we've got the next person, we've got the next person. They're all null. And then we hit one, and we say, "All right. Well, what have you done to this person?"

And he says, "Wow, row, row, row and yeow."

And you say, "Well, how do you feel about this name?" and you read the name again, you get no reaction. And so you say, "That's dandy," and you read the next name and the next name and the next name and the next name.

And he says, "Just a minute. I just remembered . . I just remembered . . I knew a girl by the name of Bessie Ann. Bessie Ann. Just remembered this."

And you say, "Well, all right. That's good. Thank you very, very much."

Now, if you go ahead and Q-and-A, you of course will say, "All right, what have you done to Bessie Ann?" And we won't have anything more to do with the list, but we'll move it all over here in the next county and only assess new names and forget the list and get all confused.

No, the pc responds to an orderly progress. So we put Bessie Ann down at the bottom end of the list and say, "Thank you very much," and take the next name which was under our thumb up here, which we were clearing, and we will find that it's that name that has the association with Bessie Ann.

All right. So we go down, and we're now twenty names down the list, or twenty-five names down the list. Here we are. And we say, "And then there's Mr. Stiffwhistle." And the E-Meter goes clang on an instant read, you know. And you say, "Well, all right, what have you done to Mr. Stiffwhistle?"

"Well, 'tisn't so much what I've done to Mr. Stiffwhistle. Actually, it's what he'd done . . ."

“Well,” you say, “that’s good. Thank you very much. It’s what he... Thank you very much. Now, we’re going to assess Mr. Stiffwhistle over here on the Prehav Scale,” and so forth.

And now . . . “Would you have faith in Mr. Stiffwhistle?” You get the idea? And we can even vary this around. You can actually run “Faith in Mr. Stiffwhistle,” “Would Mr. Stiffwhistle have caused anything for you?” see? You could just take your opposite sides of the thing and read them crisscrossed. You got the idea? You read your odd-numbered levels with “you Mr. Stiffwhistles” and the even-numbered levels “Mr. Stiffwhistle you.” You got the idea? Keeps you from developing a stuck flow on “Stiffwhistle.” You see how?

You can do a lot of tricky things like this but you can keep a flow from getting stuck, and you’ll get a better assessment. Well, by the time you’ve gone over the list once, you’ve knocked off four levels where Mr. Stiffwhistle fell.

Now, you’ve gone over the list wholly once. You only go back, just as you do in any assessment, to these four levels that you’ve made a dot after, and you read that one, and you read that one, and you read that one, and you read that one. And if they’re all null, don’t be surprised. Don’t do anything further if they’re all null. If one stays alive, form the command for it. Still ask, “What about Mr. Stiffwhistle?” and only if Mr. Stiffwhistle still falls do you actually run the command. You got the idea? Because he’s evaporating here at a great rate of speed.

All right. You make sure that he’s flat, and you go to your next consecutive name on the list. You go on, clear on down to the end of the list in this fashion, paying attention only to those that fall, and paying attention to them only so long as they fall.

You don’t go overshooting the thing with great enthusiasm here, and spending a half an hour on Aunt Betsy Crocker just because she made such horrible cakes. Let’s get into something else here that’s more important. Let’s find out periodically if Betsy Crocker still falls. See, you can overshoot this kind of running madly. You know? It’s like . . . in the first place, you’re shooting . . . you know these little water bugs that scoot around on top of the water, you know, and walk on the water tension very amazingly, so forth? Well, you’re just the same as shooting water bugs with a sixteen-inch gun. If you’re not very adroit about it, man, do you get splashed. Because you can go too far. You can overrun this level, just madly, you see? And the pc’s bored and upset and so forth. Of course, this guy’s evaporated. He’s not interested in this anymore.

All right. Now you go back to the beginning, the first beginning of the whole list when you have finished it. Every time he has thought of anything you added another person at the bottom of the list. Of course, you covered those too eventually in their turn. You go back to the beginning of the whole list and assess it once more. And in a relatively short time . . . not anything ghastly in terms of auditing . . . in a relatively short time you’ve got a clean list. You can go over everybody this person knows in present time without getting a needle disturbance. And the person begins to feel wonderful about these people, and begins to feel wonderful about everything. You got it?

All right. Now, that’s how you run Prehav 13. Did that straighten it out for you a little bit better?

Male voice: Yes.

You see what I meant by saying I had to give you an accurate idea of exactly how you did it.

My basics . . . I’m telling you how to run this. And the way to adjudicate just how to run this, is . . . I know the behavior of the Prehav Scale. I know the behavior of present time terminals on the Prehav Scale. And please be advised, I want to repeat just one more time: if a terminal continues to fall, which is a present time terminal, or continues to react badly on the present time list of this character, I don’t know, you’re running the pc with the rudiments out, or you’re doing something else that hasn’t got much to do with it. Don’t you see? Something else is going on.

And we had a case here of somebody . . . well, I’d written a sniffish note to the D of P of London, actually. Pushed in her anchor points a little bit more violently than she deserved, to tell you the truth.

Auditor started auditing me on her. Now, I think I've only seen her about, oh, I don't know, not more than two or three dozen times in my lifetime.

He started to run her, and he started to settle into a profession of running me out of this one person. Now, that wouldn't be right. So there's something else going on. He probably has done this. He probably said, "Now, look. She's gotten a bad despatch, and this has upset her, because she says so. All right, very good."

Now, he's made up his mind that this is what is wrong with the pc, and he hasn't consulted Mr. E-Meter. See? So he starts running something that isn't particularly wrong with the pc. You get this? And runs it with the rudiments ignored because he is so certain this must be what's wrong with the pc.

Of course, he's now running on a completely sour assessment. It wasn't determined at all. See, he didn't try to do anything about it. So constantly . . . he actually, I think, tried to run two whole sessions on this thing. That was impossible. It was frankly impossible. He just couldn't have done this. And yet he did it. But that was how he would go about this. He'd say, "Obviously, because she received a rough despatch, see, that says, 'Pull up your socks, to the knees if necessary,' and so on, obviously then this is what is wrong with this pc."

So he takes off and says . . . doesn't assess a terminal; says "Well, this is the terminal." Then assesses the terminal on the Prehav Scale, gets some random and wild falls here and there on the Prehav Scale, picks one up at random, forms up a five-way bracket and starts in a profession. And goes, of course, for five hours of run without even vaguely flattening it. Well, what do you mean "flatten it or non flatten it"? Well, the tone arm kept being different, and things kept being different, and they kept being different. The pc wasn't changing, things were just different. You got the idea?

If you want to see this happen, by the way, do this with SOP Goals or Routine 2. Just make up your mind that the pc's level is "grapeshot." "Yes, 'grapeshot.' That's the proper level we ought to be running on this pc because the pc is always spitting grape pits out while I'm auditing, and so, therefore, 'grapeshot' is the right one." And we start running "grapeshot." And we start getting tone arm reaction on the annoyance of the pc, see? And we get tone arm action on the ARC break of it all. We get tone arm action on the unreliability, and the unreality of the whole thing, don't you see? The mystery in the person's mind. "Why is he running 'grapeshot'?" "Have you ever shot any grapes?" And the person gets very, very puzzled.

And of course, what does this do? It pulls in all the "not-knows" on the track. So the "not-knows" give you an action on the tone arm as they naturally would. But the pc isn't running. Now, if you were to . . . have . . . go at this right, you don't ever make up your mind this is what is wrong with the pc and run it.

It's perfectly all right for you to make up your mind there's something . . . "this is what's wrong with the pc." But don't feel so invalidated when you put him on the E-Meter and find it isn't so. Always have nerve enough to test your theory on the E-Meter. And instead of shooting grapes, you find out what's trouble with the fellow is cellar doors. He goes around cellar-dooring all the time. He just can't leave cellar doors alone. And way up the line someplace you run into some weird computation that if you cellar-door enough on the right side, it makes you spit grapes. You know, it'll be something utterly incredible. You say, "How in the name of God did he ever arrive at that?"

Well, if you're auditing at the reactive mind, this question won't enter your mind, "How did he ever arrive at that?" That's what's wrong with him. It's the held-down five. The thing isn't connected right, and it doesn't make sense. It doesn't make sense to him; it doesn't make sense to you. And your trying to outguess the reactive mind is, of course, an heroic activity, because you'd have to be as crazy as he is. So don't be at all surprised if you're all set to drive down Center Street, and you step into this Hispano-Suiza, and you're all ready to tear down Center Street at a 120 miles an hour and clear this case up like mad; and you suddenly find yourself driving a Buick in Chula Vista.

Don't be so heartbroken about it! Because that's what's the matter with the pc. He gets into the Hispano-Suiza on Center Street and has always wound up driving an old, broken-down 1922 Buick in Chula Vista. And this is what's upsetting him. You get the idea?

Actually he tries to do this: He tries to get into old, broken-down 1922 Buicks in Chula Vista, hoping someday he'll wind up in the Hispano-Suiza on Center Street. And it's one of the heartbreaks of his life that he never does. His method of realizing his goals is quite often to run them backwards.

The goal is to enliven and make wonderful and beautiful every woman you meet. That's his goal. Now, obviously every time he does this, something happens, intervenes, and he finds this poor girl winds up being a knocked-apart old bat. Get the idea? And he . . . this upsets him, see? You know, his intentions are pure. And yet he just seems to just practically knock any girl he ever had anything to do with right out of the . . . right out of the firmament. And he can't understand this. So he will eventually start going about his goal something like this: "All right, if you take some knocked-apart old bat . . ." You see?

And yet, that is almost logical for the reactive mind. That's almost too logical for it. He's much more likely to start piling up stones on the beach, and this has something very definitely to do with realizing this goal of making all women beautiful. "If you just pile up enough stones on the beach. . ." And you say, "What the hell?" But of course, that's what's the matter with the fellow. It's a case of "What the hell?"

I tell you, life is never dull when you have the reactive mind for a target. So as a consequence, when you make up your mind as to what the level or action or the pc's regard in a certain direction should be, don't feel so whip-curred, see, because it's something else. It isn't an invalidation of you. It's an invalidation of him. If he was perfectly sane, your computation would undoubtedly be absolutely right. But of course, the reactive mind is not sane. Anybody that's walking around that has a long line of reactivity, know that they're sort of walking with just their eyes out of the water, and there might be a little splashing wave any minute, you know? Just . . . they're liable to trip themselves up any second. Have to walk pretty careful, because somewhere from the depths, some long fangs are liable to all of a sudden appear from nowhere, see?

So it's no invalidation of somebody. As a matter of fact, it's a validation of somebody to try to do something about it. You see, the bulk of people that have gone around the bend and are being "normal" . . . these characters not only don't think there's anything you can do about it, they don't think there is anything else. They think that is it, and that is life, and that's the way you live it. Absolutely screaming messes. They're not living any kind of a life that anybody would want to live, much less them. And they tell you so, you see. But there isn't anything you can do about it. You might say they have totally surrendered to the disorderliness of existence.

All right. So much for all that. Have you got a question before we end this? Yes?

Female voice: Is there any difference . . . I mean, apart from the fact that their goals aren't different . . . between one case who expresses his goal in terms of beingness and another who expresses it in terms of doingness, and another who expresses it in terms of a havingness? Does it tell you anything additional about the case? The fact that they choose to express it, or that it is expressed in these.. .?

If you had three cases that had more or less the same goal, but one of those cases expressed the goal as beingness, another expressed it as doingness and another expressed it as havingness?

Female voice: Yeah.

Would it tell you anything different about the cases. No, actually not, at first glance. Because be-do-have harmonics. You could pick it up on any harmonic. You could pick up an excessive . . . obsessive beingness on the part of a person and move him up to havingness, and then you could move him up to beingness, and then you could move him up another one and he goes into doingness. But that's reversed, isn't it? So you push him up a little bit higher and you would now find him in beingness again. And now you find him in beingness for some time, and all of a sudden he'd go totally into havingness. You got the idea? So it's a disorderly progress.

Female voice: Yeah.

So you're liable to pick up a case at any level of disintegration, and you can't adjudicate too much about it. You could say on the upper strata that the be-do-have level . . . on its first levels, before they start inverting and harmonizing, and so forth . . . you could say that the beingness is higher than the doingness is higher than the havingness. It is easier for somebody to run on those higher levels on havingness, and it's a little less easy to run on the doingness, and it's pretty rough for most people to run on the beingness. But you're talking now about the upper harmonics of it.

Female voice: Hm.

Okay?

Female voice: Yeah, thanks.

Any other question? Yes?

Female voice: This is just a casual observation that I noticed for myself, that if my sensitivity was at 1.75, say, very often the tone arm would be 3.0 or above. If it were at 2.0, sensitivity would be at 3 or 4.

Yeah.

Female voice: Why?

No, there is no coordination between the sensitivity. But there is an awful lot of error being made on can squeezes, and I'm glad you brought it up. There is no coordination on that. You're saying, well, it's . . . if your tone arm is at one place your sensitivity is at a coordinated place for that. In other words, as your sensitivity rises your tone arm rises, or your tone arm rises, your sensitivity rises. Not necessarily. Doesn't hold true.

Female voice: Didn't seem to me it ought to be that way, except I observed in . . .

No, well . . .

Female voice: . . . people's sessions that it did that sort of thing.

. . . it isn't, it isn't true. And it doesn't follow. You don't get a coordination between sensitivity reading and tone arm reading.

I'd like to bring up this, however. The way you're doing can squeezes is probably why I took sensitivity knob out of diagnosis, having put it in . . . diagnosing by the sensitivity setting. I've taken it out of the lineup. Because, boy, the way you let pcs hold cans varies so fantastically as to hardly have any comparison from one case to the other, and I just found it out the other day in doing some observation. You can make the sensitivity knob do almost anything by holding the cans in different ways.

Now, the proper way, and what we mean by a third-of-a-dial drop, is to have the pc . . . and this is one of the things you say to him . . . "Now, holding the cans, put your hands comfortably in your lap." And the pc does this. He stops waving them around and directing, "God Save the Queen" with the cans. And drops them down comfortably in his lap.

Now, you say, "Gently now, squeeze the cans." And you get a proper fall, that we mean third-of-a-dial drop. The way you've been regulating this gives you all manner of wild reads. The pc has the cans terribly tightly gripped. They are just gripped, gripped, gripped. And as soon as you get a . . . See if I can make this do this now. Well, here you are, more or less. The meter isn't even tuned in. Now let's do this properly. Now, hold the cans lightly, in your hands, or comfortably. Now squeeze them. Squeeze them with a jerk, see? You get this jerk? Now, I'm even going to exaggerate this now. All right. We're going to exaggerate this now. Didn't see the squeeze at all, did you? What am I doing? I'm sure squeezing the cans! And you don't see that needle move at all, do you? There's a zero move to it. And look, your sensitivity knob is set up there almost at 2.0. I'll do that again. There we go. I made it do a reverse squeeze. How do you like that, huh?

All right, now let's set this thing up so that it makes some sense, shall we? All right. Now we're going to set the cans relaxedly in my lap. Well, if you're going to do that! Somebody has a passion for . . you want me to do the first one again? Did everybody see that? All right. Here we go now. See? Unmoving needle. Got that? All right. Now I'm going to put the . . now, tune it down below set; this side of set. All right. Now we're going to put the cans comfortably in my lap. I'm going to sit here relaxedly. See? I don't know what it's doing.

Female voice: We have here pong, pong, pong.

Which is my normal drop. Get that? In other words, when the cans are held relaxedly in the lap . . you know, you just hold them, you know, relaxedly and then simply squeeze them with the hand itself, not clear on up to the shoulder! That's the way you test a third-of-a-dial drop, see?

But you actually . . this other trick is to hold the cans, wrap your hands very hard around the cans, very carefully around the cans. You get the idea? Now increase the pressure enormously. Now, I'm holding them very hard right now, see. And then try to squeeze them right from the shoulder down. And of course there's not a thing going to happen. You got it? Because you've already got the things utterly locked in as tight a squeeze as you're going to get. This thing is . . all the squeeze end is already registering. You got that?

So there's no sense in making a diagnosis out of something that is going to be done randomly. It's . . the proper thing . . what we're talking about when we talk about a third-of-a-dial drop, then, has to have this additional data: that you put the hands relaxedly in the lap. Hold those electrodes relaxedly in the lap, and then squeeze the cans. You can even say, "Gently now, squeeze the cans." And you will get your third-of-a-dial drop, see? And you notice that my proper third-of-a-dial drop is not obtainable on this meter.

This is another thing There is no sense in backing off sensitivity and backing off sensitivity, and backing off sensitivity and backing off sensitivity, hoping that you can keep it down to a third-of-a-dial drop, because as a person starts getting Clear, what do you eventually run into? Their needle gets so loose, charge is less and less registering. And you've done the same as back the sensitivity knob off the read. And as a person is halfway Clear, if you could set it to a third-of-a-dial drop, by some electronic mechanism inside the thing, you would get no registry of any kind on the needle.

So another factor is visible here. And that is the factor that as a person approaches the state of Clear, their mental charges have less and less reaction on the meter. Not more and more reaction on the meter, as somebody thought once. Their needle gets looser and looser and looser and looser, and the charge as that happens, of course, is less and less expressed. They do not get anywhere near as upset as they used to, even though they can be more volatily upset. You see?

So you could easily back this sort of a thing off with . . electronically, you could put a new rheostat underneath this sensitivity knob that would back it off so that much pressure, to give a third-of-a-dial drop, was all the reading you could get on the thing. And if you did that, as a person was about halfway Clear, they would no longer read in any way, shape or form on the meter.

And in order to finish up clearing, you will find out that you have exactly reversed the whole activity that you did in the beginning Your person at the beginning was reading down here at a very dead-body 2.0, and you said, "Have you ever killed your grandmother?" and actually they're doing time for it right now.

And the fellow says, "Well, no," and you don't get any reaction.

And you say, "Well could you help anybody?"

And the person says, "Well, I often do, you know. I often do help somebody.>"

And you say, "Well, what do you do?"

And they say, "Well, I just often do help somebody."

"Yeah, but what do you do that helps somebody?"

"Well, I just do. I just help somebody. I wouldn't tell you," or something weird like this, you see.

And . . . "Well, name something that would be helpful."

"Well, let's see. I could hold the door open . . . well, no, that wouldn't be helpful. I could give you some money . . . no, that wouldn't do any good. I could . . . I could buy you a din no, no, that wouldn't be helpful. No, I guess there just isn't anything you could do that would be helpful. People just really pretend there is such a thing," or some kind of a weak, oddball, weird answer accompanies this. Which is, by the way, your most positive test.

All right. Now, this thing starts acting up, goes all over the place. A person that is reading anywhere over the dial here now . . . you ask him, "Did you ever kill your grandmother?" and it falls off the pin. You got the idea? That's the first time you've ever run into it, and just, bang, you know.

You say, "Do you have a present time problem?" . . . bang! "Well what is your present time problem?"

"Well, I've eaten all my candy."

See, it's a little tiny microscopic problem . . . this tremendous read, you see?

Guy gets toward Clear, and your needle is going bong-bong, bong-bong, you know, every time he squeezes the cans once. And you find out . . . "Do you have a present time problem?"

The fellow says, "Yes, I have a present time problem."

You say, "What's the matter?"

"Well," he says, "I've lost fifty thousand dollars today," and you got a two division fall. He says, "That's all right. I'll get it back tomorrow, one way or the other."

"Is that bothering you now?"

And the fellow says, "No. It isn't."

You say, "Do you have a present time problem?" There's no fall on it now. You say, what's happened here? Well, it's just that the actions of life are not having just this much disastrous effect upon this guy anymore, that's all.

All right. Now, to clean up this case toward the end of the clear run . . . this is something that I might forget to tell you and you certainly had better know. At the end of the run, in spite of the fact that it's almost impossible to read, in spite of this, you have got to set this floating needle up here with a sensitivity 16 to stabilize your Clear.

It's almost impossible to read. You'll be here dancing around with your E-Meter all the time. You spend most of your time adjusting the E-Meter. And you say, "Let's see now. Whoa, let's see now . . . all right, all right. Faith. Do you have faith in Uncle Joe? Has Uncle Joe caused anything?" And you say, "Okay, what was that?" And good, that's pretty good. The guy thought of something that got a reaction on it. "All right. Fine. Now let's see if we can't get a command worked out here. What has Uncle Joe caused?" Look at the meter. "What has Uncle Joe caused?"

"Well," the fellow says, "I guess he caused quite a few things." There's no reaction on the meter. Uncle Joe has blown. And that was it. But you have to crank that sensitivity up here to 16 to read these last few charges on the bank. And when you're stabilizing a Clear, you're doing an SOP Goals Assessment

the same old way, over and over and over. You're trying to assess for new goals, trying to assess for new terminals. You do find a new goal, it does fall. Now, hold your breath; hold your breath. Now let's find a terminal for it. Let's find a terminal for it now. "All right, you've always wanted to fly to the moon on a washboard. Very good. All right.

"Now, is it washboard? Is it washboard? Is it washboard? Is it washboard? Washboard? Washboard. Moon? Moon? Moon? Moon, moon? Moon, moon, moon? All right, now, fly to the moon on a washboard. Now, see, what's the terminal for this? Fly to the moon. Fly to the moon on a washboard! Fly to the . . . You always wanted to fly to the moon on a washboard. Now, what would fly to the moon on a washboard?"

It's gone, you see! You blew it! Because you've got somebody who can blow these things by inspection. Instead of the loss of his candy hanging around for the next two months and driving him into dementia praecox, you get an entirely different meter reaction. And you actually have to read the last stages of Clear with your sensitivity enormously advanced, which is a great oddity.

In other words, there is a point of insanity, called "normal," at which you get an optimum meter read. It's optimum. Everything falls. The fall lasts. Everything's just wonderful. It's all smooth, not difficult. You get the goal and it just stays there for weeks, you know. And you get the terminal, and it hangs around forever. Everything is just dandy here. And you run it. You can assess it. Everything we've been saying, you see. Form commands for it. You can assess it on new levels. You can assess it on new levels. Boy, you can have a ball, you see.

And then, by the time you've got your next goal -selected, just about from there on, you're in trouble, trying to get SOP Goals in a completed cycle. Find the goal. Find the terminal. Assess the terminal on the Prehav Scale. Find an auditing command. Get the auditing command run, you see. And all of a sudden this whole cycle as an action starts to foreshorten, just as the individual with higher and higher increased sensitivity on a floating needle is getting less and less charge, and it's less and less lasting. And so, you eventually are just short handing it. "Well, do you have any more goals? Thank you. Do you have any more goals? Thank you," you see. It'll actually beat you down to a point where you say, "Well, there's no sense in getting to a terminal or anything like that."

Well, there's a danger point. You could become unalert. He might still have a sticky one. He might have one that'll last for an hour's auditing, you see. And it's that one that you've got to look for. And the end of SOP Goals, Routine 3, is just search, search, search, search, search, search, search. Search it, find it, lose it. Search it, find it, lose it. Search it, find it, lose it. And it happens faster, it happens faster, it happens faster, and pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa. Then there isn't anything else you can do with the case. Not in the framework of "think" auditing or reactive minds.

Yes, there are other things you can do with a case, but until you've got that one totally stabilized out, the person is not going to be stable 100 percent. There are other things now you can do with a case. We've invented them in the past, they already exist in the past. He'll, oddly enough, be able to do some of these things.

Oh, what do you mean? You know, Route 1. You mean "Copy, copy, copy, copy, copy."

"Oh yeah, sure, sure, okay. All right."

"Good. Copy, copy, copy."

"Yeah, fine, fine, fine, fine."

"Go outside of it, inside of it, play hopscotch with it."

"Oh, you want an ashtray?"

Okay. Now, if you do have any questions that suddenly rise up and smite you in the face during the course of the day's auditing, and you don't get them answered by the end of the day, why, remember to ask me, okay? All right?

Thank you very much.