

NEW TRs

A lecture given on
15 May 1962

Thank you.

Now, this is 15 May, lecture 2, 1962, Special Briefing Course, HCO WW. And we are taking up HCO Policy Letter of 3 May, 1962.

This is a fairly important lecture because I'm going to give you the first data on some of these TRs and this data will have to be used by you, because there isn't any written data on the more advanced TRs. And I will also shorthand this and get this stuff out in a mimeographed form. But you won't have the pat TRs yet, either. They have to be developed and you can normally describe an auditing action and then you have to work with it a little bit before you can erect a TR around it and say that's it, set in concrete. Otherwise, why, you've got some people learning something that is a bit false here and there, you know? And it doesn't agree with the reality of the situation.

So, I'm just giving you here a shorthand account of what I expect of an auditor, from my experience, in these various given reactions or situations.

Now, we look over this May 3rd, which was first released as a self-appreciation chart so that an auditor could take this and check off these various columns as to whether he was sure or unsure on it, but you still notice that accidentally we left lots of space over here on the extreme right for check marks to be made as to whether you could do them or not.

Now, there's no use going in TR 0 to 4. There's just no point in going into those. They have been terrifically well-covered in lectures; you have TRs concerning them, and none of you can do them. But—I mean, that after awhile is the—is the sort of feeling you get about these after you've been drilled on them forever. Nobody can do these things, you know? But nevertheless auditors do that surprisingly—do them surprisingly well.

Now, let's take off above this point. And let's not bother to put TR numbers in, although TR numbers will be filled in. There is another TR which is "Auditor query." Now, this comes clear down—and also, we're not going to take up the CCHs for the same reason, as they've been terrifically well covered. Also Op Pro by Dup has been the subject of many bulletins, and so on, and written materials, and no point in wasting time on that. And we get to this first item which is actually a TR which is probably TR 5T or some such number. I won't even say that is its number. But it's the Two-way Comm TR.

And it's Two-way Comm in CCHs and oddly enough it's the same Two-way Comm, but will have a different number for use in Model Session. There isn't any difference between these TRs except one—the one we're—we have under discussion here—Two-way Comm and CCHs, considers a physical reaction on the part of the pc to be a pc's origin. And then of course we do TR 4—with this exception: The pc has originated. The auditor asks him what that was. See, the pc jerks his head and the auditor says to him, "What happened then?" or "What was that?"

And the pc says, "Oh, what?"

And he says, "That jerk of your head that you just did."

"Oh, that." Pc, "Oh, well, well I just had a—had a somatic."

And the auditor goes on and simply acknowledges that fact and he doesn't go any further than that. The whole object is to get the pc to notice that he jerked his head. And that is the only comm used in the CCHs.

Now, one of you the other day was running on and on and on and calling it Two-way Comm in the CCHs. And of course, there was no gain. The auditor—here's the fault. Here's the faulty one. The auditor says, "Well, what happened—." Well, actually one auditor had reduced it to a system so that every time they did the drill the auditor says, "What happened that time?" The pc said something The auditor said, "That's fine," or something like that. That is dead wrong. That is just wronger than wrong, you see? It's not a system; it's a specific pc origin.

Now, here's another example of a wrong one: The pc says, "I've got a terrible burning sensation in my stomach." Now, that's handled with TR 4. So we don't care what the pc said. We just acknowledge it. That's just TR 4. That isn't—that has nothing to do with this Two-way Comm in the CCHs.

Pc says, "Oh, I had a terrible burning in my stomach that time." And you say, "Good. Thank you." you understand that he had a burning in his stomach and you tell him so. And that's all that happens and that's just TR 4, see? No, no, that is not your CCH Two-way Comm. The pc actually originates with a physical action. You see their eyes start going. You see their—something happening. It's his shoulder—you see, shoulder goes suddenly, you know. Well, one of the questions—the only question about this TR is do you ask them then or do you complete the cycle? Well, actually by asking them then, you tend to put the pc in charge of the session, which would be wrong.

Pc is permitted then to interrupt your cycle of command, see, and that would be wrong so you wait till after the cycle of command is finished and then you ask him about it. But unfortunately, a large percentage of the time he will have forgotten about it. But that is not unusual because he usually didn't know he did it. So if he doesn't have any recollection of having gone—well, that's—that's it. Just let it go by. Just let it go by.

Now, your two-way comm is a funny two-way comm in the CCHs—it's very funny, because the pc doesn't say anything; the pc does something we don't care whether he does it painfully—it's a painfully slow reaction. It's a questionable fumbling on the duplication. We don't care what it was. We don't care whether it was a quiver of his nose or a twitch of his cheek or the wiggle of his right ear or the hitch of his shoulder, but he did something. Now, remember this: CCHs are physical processes, not thinkingness processes, and our two-way comm is calculated to do only one thing with the pc, and that is exteriorize him from that somatic. And by getting him to look at it, we will exteriorize him from it in most cases.

And the usual reaction is he didn't know he did it. The only two-way comm you engage in then is to ask him what happened—and if he doesn't immediately tell you—you know, the origin was the twitch of the shoulder—if he doesn't immediately tell you about the twitch of the shoulder—he says, "My ear burned," Uh-huh. You say, "All right, thanks."

"But what . . . ?"

"Thank you. Thank you. Good. Now, what happened to your shoulder there?"

"Oh, my shoulder. I don't know. Oh, my shoulder. It's—yeah. Yeah. Yeah, my shoulder. Well it's—funny, feels numb."

And you say, "Good."

Now there's the basic outline of that CCH. And you'll find out that it has only one purpose. And that is not to establish two-way comm with the pc particularly, but to get the pc—one: to keep the pc in session with you and to get the pc basically, however, to exteriorize from and

notice what's going on and notice what he is doing, instead of dumbly grinding on through. Now, if the pc can actually dumbly grind on through and never notice what he's doing, then you'll make very, very slow progress.

Now, that is one specific drill and the most important one. That is the most important one. It is allowable, it is allowable to whistle the pc back into session or encourage him a little bit or something like that. you see, you're not a—you're not a dummy sitting there auditing him. Pc—he doesn't want to do it again and you say, "Oh, come on, come on." you know, cheer him up; push him on. "That's better," something like that. That is after, however, you finished a command cycle. Those comments, those statements, the "how's it going," cheerily, that sort of thing, can go on.

But the basic two-way comm in the CCHs is the origin by physical action on the part of the pc, the query of it by the auditor, and the action of the auditor to make him view it. If he can possibly get him to view it, he does so. That's all.

All right. Now we take up the E-Meter. The E-Meter is written up in all ways from the middle in E-Meter Essentials. There are certain drills by which the coach sits behind the auditor, (quote) (unquote) "auditor" and gets him to study body motion, which is at the bottom of the page there. Now, there's one point I'd like to make on that particular point which is not in E-Meter Essentials and I'd like to add the data to it. you must—give him all kinds of body motions, yeah, let them accustom themselves to seeing what a needle looks like with all kinds of body motions, just as given in E-Meter Essentials—but since E-Meter Essentials was written we have had brought to notice, "the selling pc." The pc that sells you things. The pc that influences the meter and you should learn those tricks. And those are the specialist tricks. You can—those things should be hit heavily—very, very heavily.

There is lifting one little finger off the can and replacing it to get a twitch on a certain item. Well, you say, pcs never do this. No, only twenty-five percent of them. They'll sell you a goal by lifting their little finger off the can and putting it back on. And if they're holding their cans this way, you can't see their fingers, you see. Hold the cans with their palm—with the palms up, you know, toward the can—the can up. you can actually—they can actually make the thing read. Twitch. And frankly, it looks like a finger-twitch. It does not look like a tick on a goal or an item or anything like that. It looks like what it is. It looks like a finger being lifted and putting back on the can.

Another one is the way some pcs keep you from finding out anything in the rudiments is to gradually loosen their grip on the cans. And they can actually do a beautiful needle rise. Beautiful! You never even see their hands move. It's absolutely—all you have to do is just lift some of the skin surface of your hand off of the can at a very gradient scale and you get the most beautiful needle rise you ever saw. And any reaction to the rudiments is smothered in that rising needle. Pretty good.

Also, you can squeeze the cans—putting a little more and a little more skin on the cans—and get a gradual falling needle. They're unmistakable for what they are, once you know what they are and you've seen them. But those are selling techniques. There may be more of them, but those are the ones which have come to view.

One pc's rudiments was always in, except they were always wildly out. And the pc always had a rising needle whenever the rudiments were touched. One day Mary Sue got tired of this because she knew the pc's rudiments must be out by just looking at the pc, and detected the fact that this had been going on for a long time. This pc also responded to embarrassing Prep-check questions with a constantly rising needle. It was the most beautifully masked thing you ever wanted to see. why a man would want to cut his throat by falsifying E-Meter reads is—well, that's a subject for the Catholic church. We're not interested in it.

Now, as far as the rest of these things are concerned, they're rather easy. When I say on-off switch, and that sort of thing, it's almost being sarcastic, isn't it? But, do you know that nearly

every auditor I've ever seen monkeying around with it early on, fumbles for the on-off switch? And me, I've been auditing between a Mark III and a Mark IV. I've got the prototype Mark IV which is actually a Mark III. And it's different than the Mark IV; it turns on in a different place. I always turn each one on in the wrong place. You'd think fifty percent of the time I would get the right one, but somehow or another it's always a hundred percent.

When the—you say on-off switch—in trimming, we want a smart setup of the E-Meter. On those two, see—whether they're in correct order there or not—this is trimming and on-off switch. We want a smart setup of the meter. In other words we want this person actually to be able to set up an E-Meter without bad, you know, knocking his brains out trying to find the plug, or whether the plug is in or out, or half in or half out, you know? Let's let him get used to this and find out where the controls are and how you hook it up and so forth, so that he can do it just brrrrr, and his E-Meter is set up and ready to roar.

Sounds like an elementary thing. It makes a hell of an impression on the pc. I'll tell you, a pc who watches an auditor say, "Heh-heh—I haven't got any leads here at the moment but..." It does something to his confidence. He doesn't at that moment feel in an outpouring state toward this auditor. He catches the uncertainty of this moment. And actually an auditor may know his meter perfectly as far as operating a meter's concerned and just be very unpracticed in setting one up. you get the idea?

Another thing is—another thing to watch on this, is learn to set up a meter quietly—not with a snap. Don't set up a meter noisily. One of the ways you do that is let one of your fingernails grow long and snap the jack with the plugs, down on your fingernail, and then ease it down. But you would be surprised. I myself have been knocked half out of session by a very, very loud and boisterous setup of a meter.

You know, you're sitting there all ready and you've got some data, and you're all—you're just—you know, waiting for—to get into session and all of a sudden there's these wild explosions going on in front of your face and your attention comes out on the auditor. And if you want to start a session with all the rudiments in, you will know how to get an E-Meter into action smoothly and quietly and very effectively and efficiently, so the pc doesn't even realize you've started to use an E-Meter—he's just sitting there with the cans in his hands. How did they get there? He wouldn't know. see what I mean? It actually has a—there's a purpose that you might neglect.

Now, we say sensitivity knob—you'd be amazed how much difficulty people have getting the sensitivity knob up for the rudiments and down for the can squeeze, and all of that sort of thing And then they'll start with a third-of-a-dial drop on the can squeeze which they have run the person's Havingness Process on and tested it, you see. And then they'll run the next rudiment with the sensitivity knob set at the third-of-a-dial drop setting, don't you see? And then say, "Oh, excuse me." And then move it on up. A drill could be done to make that much more smoothly. I myself have made the mistake. You have made the mistake. Why make the mistake?

Tone arm handling: Well, at least know that you can handle it with your thumb. You don't have to cover up the whole meter with your paw and juggle it around and wave red flags in front of the pc's face and everything else just to set the tone arm. Actually, this whole tone arm can be handled with the thumb, with the hand underneath the E-Meter. Pc never notices that you're handling a tone arm. can be done very quietly. Can be done very smoothly. You always ought to be able to handle an E-Meter in that particular fashion.

This—not so good, see? See? Get the difference? See, you don't even know whether I'm doing—what I'm doing with the tone arm. Because if you start doing this—the pc will come right out of session. He'll say, "What did the tone arm do?" And you say, "How did you know it did anything? I must be wearing a mirror in my tie."

Now, needle pattern reading is kind of new. We talk about a needle pattern in E-Meter Essentials but we don't talk about what a pattern is. Because at the time E-Meter Essentials was written we didn't know what a pattern is. A pattern is a series of missed withholds culminating in a constantly active needle.

A pattern can be a big dirty needle or a little dirty needle. In other words a wide-dial dirty needle, or a small-dial dirty needle. And you sure better know what a dirty needle looks like and what a pattern looks like for the excellent reason that if a goal comes up—whenever you say the goal, “to catch catfish,” and you get a bzzzz. “To catch catfish,” bzzzz. “To catch catfish,” bzzzz. And it's a dirty needle, that goal isn't in. That goal is kicking simply because there's a missed withhold in connection with it. you get the missed withhold off and that goal is deader than a mackerel.

Now, if you're good at this you can tell whether or not the pc has a missed withhold or an invalidation. You can read it straight off the meter. Missed withhold always gives a dirty needle. And that's needle pattern. The pc's needle that goes—the stage four needle—the—any other needle pattern— constantly moving needle and so forth, is a missed withhold, one or more. It's actually the net product of too many missed withholds if the thing is wide and chronic, don't you see?

But you can correct that needle pattern. And you'd better get used to a needle pattern being correctable. Because the person's got missed withholds, they're going to be hard to audit. You know then when you've got your Prepchecking up to a point where everything can go along rambunctiously with Routine 3's, when the pc no longer has a needle pattern. Hasn't got a needle pattern—well, all right, you must have the bulk of his missed withholds. Therefore you've got a chance of keeping his rudiments in.

Don't you see, it is going to be very difficult to keep somebody's rudiments in whose rudiments are perpetually out. In other words, you never have a chance at current rudiments because the rudiments have been out for ages. And you'll find your Routine 3 sessions on such a pc are constantly and continually carried into Prepcheck sessions. You never really get a chance to do any Routine 3, because you're always correcting the pc. And that will always happen when you have a needle pattern. So you better get used to what needle patterns are and spot them for what they are, because, the— well, not the bulk of people that you audit—but, I don't know what the percentage would be, I'd say just at a wild guess about 50 percent of the people that you suddenly put on a meter have a needle pattern.

There are various types of needle patterns. There's the little tiny, bzzz, dirty needle. And there's the—it's not a nice tick, see, it's not a nice little clip. Pop-pop-pop—that's not a needle pattern. It's a—it's an instant read needle pattern. it's fantastic. But you say, “To catch catfish,” bzzz. “To catch catfish,” bzzz. “To catch catfish,” bzzz. And you say, “Boy, that's really something We've really got a goal, yeah. We got a goal. who should have found out about this goal and didn't?”

“Heh-heh. My father. Heh-heh heh-heh. Heh. Heh-heh. He should have found out about it.”

You say “All right, very good. To catch catfish.” Where did it go? It's released that easily. That's very rare that you will find an instant read on a goal or an item. Very rare. But when it does happen, you're in trouble. And it can cause so much trouble that you sure better know all about it no matter how rare it is.

Now, you can sometimes get a goal on the list of goals reading on a missed withhold, that you missed. Or an invalidation that you missed. And the goal actually isn't in. The invalidation reads with a nice tick.

And you ask, “Any invalidations on this goal?”

And the pc says, “Oh, well yes, last night I was sitting up and I said that a man would be a fool to have such a goal.”

“Is that so?” And you say “Good, to catch catfish?” All right. You say, “Were there any suppressions on this goal?”

“Oh, yes, I’d rather not have it. I can remember saying that to myself”

“All right. Is there a missed withhold on this?”

“Well, yes, you didn’t find the goal originally when you were nulling.”

“All right. Good. To catch catfish,” tick. “To catch catfish,” tick. “To catch catf .” Happened just as often as it vanishes forever.

Now, you get the test question, “Is there an invalidation on this goal?” Tick. You get it off. You either have a goal or you don’t have a goal. But you certainly don’t have an invalidation.

In other words, goals and items can be held in and made to look like goals and items from suppressions, invalidations and missed withholds. And this all comes under the heading of needle reads in general, but needle pattern is the wildest of these. That is the most interesting. Because you can get good enough that you sit right down, this person’s got a wide swing and a tick-tick. And a wide swing and a tick-tick. And a wide swing and a tick-tick. Any time you ask him, you say, “Cows.” And you get a wide swing and a tick-tick. And you say, “Well, do you ever comb your hair?” And a wide swing and a tick-tick. You say what’s going on here? Missed withholds is what’s going on here. who missed it? It’s probably been going that way for a long time. Maybe his mamma missed it, or his schoolteacher, or somebody else. It’s past. It’ll be well back.

All right. It’s the dirty needle that has given Routine 3 the most single amounts of trouble—the dirty needle. So I’ve already found out what the dirty needle is, so therefore it gets included in here. It’s always a missed withhold.

All right and we come down the line here on a null needle. And that is horrible that all the auditors that were consulted on this in southern California were able to describe a null needle. I think that was the greatest achievement I have ever heard of. Everybody down there could describe a null needle.

Saint Hill graduate went back there and gave a lecture. Tremendous lot of data in this thing. How to run all the Routines, how to prepcheck, sec check, how to tear pc’s upside down—one thing registered with the auditors who came to the lecture. “So that is a null needle!” Everybody came around afterwards and they were very intrigued. And that was a starting point of a reality on what needle reads are.

I’ve seen people sit in here when they first arrived from someplace. And you say, “All right, what’s a null needle?” Mike would say. And they’d say, “Well, a null needle is—that.” Give you a pattern, you know? Wave their arm around in the air like they’re sending semaphore signals to somebody. That’s a null needle. Interesting. Interesting

And of course, null needles, theta bops, rock slams, falls, rises, speeded rise, speeded fall, slowed rises and slowed falls, are the new ones that you normally don’t see too much of. But here at Saint Hill, why, the older class that was here, my God, could those fellows read speeded rises and speeded falls and slowed rises and slowed falls. And before people were—people who were—just been here for a short time, you know, they would watch these guys doing Sec Checking The needle flying around at sensitivity 16, you know? And it just looked like the same needle, you know? It looked exactly like— just a fast flying needle. They—unable to detect the fact that at one little point the rise speeded on an instant reaction. And it’s that degree of skill we’re asking from a Saint Hill graduate. That—it’s swinging up—it’s swinging up like sixties, you know, it’s coming right on up. But at what point did it suddenly

move faster as the instant read? Reading a flying needle—it's quite tricky reading one of these things.

We're not doing as much Sec Checking as we were and I don't see so many people doing that. Furthermore, because we haven't been doing a heavily effective Routine 3 Process, sensitivity is not as loose as it was a few months ago. It will be shortly. And you'll have this problem where at sensitivity 16 you actually have to keep the needle moving yourself. You have to keep the needle moving yourself while it reads because, you see, you can't get the whole sentence out before it's traversed the entire dial. So of course you have to read—move your tone arm—I'm joking now; almost that bad though.

So, that's real—real postgraduate needle reading, when we get into speeded rises and speeded falls and so forth. And the darned thing flying through the air like sputniks.

And then tiny reads: How tiny can a read be and still be a read? Break out your microscope Sherlock Holmes, because you—this is the way it's going to be sometimes. Sometimes it's this way the whole session. And sometimes you get enough invalidations off and get the reads so that people can see it.

And then testing for a clean needle: And there we get into a TR. And this TR is already described in HCO Bulletin—no, it's the H—it's an HCOB that just came out—it's a—TR is actually in there complete. It asks if something is free and then repeats the same action. It's around someplace. I haven't got a file of them here.

I will describe this one to you. It is going out by the same door you came in. And this is not one little TR that it only applies to this TR. This applies to all auditing. You go in the same door you came out. Otherwise you never leave there. I'll make this practical experiment. Find a room that has one door and windows which are not passable. Go into the room, close the door behind you, and don't leave by that door. And look around and you will find you're still in the room.

By “door” in this case, we mean the exact phrase you used must be the exact phrase you leave with. you want an invalidation. You say, “Has this goal been invalidated?” Not too good but, “Has this goal been invalidated?” Tick.

Pc says, “Yeah, well I think it has.”

And you say, “That, that, that.”

“Oh ye—oh yeah. Yeah, it has been. It has been. I invalidated it.”

“All right. Thank you. I will check that. Has this goal been invalidated? Thank you, that is clean.”

Now, let me show you the errors of your ways. This is how to get into endless trouble. This is you find this one room and it has one door, see. And so you enter by that door. you say, “Has this goal been invalidated?” That's the door you entered by. And then you leave with the phrase, “Are there any more invalidations on this goal?” Don't blame me if your pc gets ARC breaky and starts to blow session, and you can't find the goal, and so forth because you're still in a room. you never left that room. You're still there—as far as the bank is concerned. You never acknowledged the pc; you never found out if it was clean.

“Has this goal been invalidated?”

The pc says, “Oh yes, I invalidated it last night.”

You say, “Good. Are there any more invalidations on this goal?” You’re going to be still in that first room. Oddly enough, you’re going to be still there. “Any more?” How the hell do you know if that one cleared? What are you doing asking for any more?

The pc goes berserk under these. Now, if you don’t believe it try this one sometime, as far as the acknowledgment is concerned. You can almost make a pc go round the bend.

You say, “How are you today?” You can even do this and tell him it’s a stunt. And he’ll still go right down the chute on it.

You say, “How are you today?”

And he says, “Fine.”

I—you say, “I asked you how you were today.” And he’ll say, “Oh, I said I’m fine.”

“Yes, but how are you?”

Now that isn’t quite as bad as this:

“How are you today?”

“I’m fine.”

“Yes, but, how’s your wife?”

“Well, she’s fine too.”

“But, your boss, how’s he?”

And the person gets a weird idea of, “It’s going to go on forever.” It’s pretty weird. The pc will ARC break on that lack of duplication. That’s true of anything you ask the pc that you’re—that is up against a meter, see. You’re trying to find out if this goal is suppressed or invalidated, or if in this session there’s a missed withhold. This applies to rudiments. This applies to anything that you’re trying to find out about. You always enter by the same door you—leave by the same door you entered by. And let me give you this as a little tip here. When you check something, tell the pc you’re checking it. See? Don’t tell him you’re disputing with him. And this is a terrific acknowledgment, you know? “Oh, well, that was really it.”

This is the kind of illusion he gets:

You say, “Well, has this goal been invalidated?”

And he said, “Yeah. You know, well, I thought last night, something or other about it and I thought it wasn’t quite right.”

“Good. I’ll check that now. Has this goal been invalidated? All right, that’s clean.”

Well, the immediate reaction of the pc, “Heh. Oh good! Heh-heh! Oh, good. What do you know. Heh-heh. Good.” See. What he’s saying is he had some attention paid to him.

So that is that type of drill. And any TR that compares with this would just be something that made the guy say the same thing twice. Which people almost never do. Particularly on this.

“Have I missed a withhold on you?” is followed by “Are there any other withholds I missed on you?”

And the fellow says, “Well, no.”

And you say, “Yes, but has anybody else missed a withhold on you today? Well, how about yesterday? How about tomorrow?” And pc just feels like he’s nowhere. He’s moving in the nothingness of nowhere. And you never find out, and you just lose more withholds, and you miss more invalidation, you miss more meter data on that one single trick. That’s just—that is an invariable. If you’re asking something against the meter, you always ask it again exactly the same way that you asked it the first time.

So you can get yourself very easily into trouble. You will say, “When Bill and I were outside talking about your case just now and Mary Ann was in the room too, did Mary Ann miss a withhold on Bill?” “Yeah, that—that—that—that.”

And pc says, “Well, yes he did.”

“Now let’s see, when Mary Ann was in the—Bill was outside—uh, that’s it. I’ll get it in a minute. Let’s see, when Bill and I were outside and Mary Ann was left in the room, did Bill miss . . . No, that’s not right.”

And you know, you’ll get some—it—you won’t look positive to the pc.

So it’s very easy to get yourself all in foot tangles, you know. Get bird snares all over the big toe, you know, just by being too—too sloppily something or other, because it’s just unrepeatable.

You get yourselves into the same tricks when you’re handling old CCH 4 or something like that. And you take a book and you throw it up in the air and you sit on it, and you pound yourself on the back of the head and then open and close it three times, and then hand it to the pc, and he says, “But what did you do?” You’ve had it, you see. Can’t duplicate yourself. You can get caught the same way on one of these verbal clearings, see. Very important. Testing for a clean needle. It’s always done the same way. And you’ll find out that most—a lot of your ARC breaks, a lot of your pc restiveness in session stems from that one single error.

Now, as far as beginning rudiments are concerned and end—and in body of session, end rudiments, two-way comm—of course, these things are basically just drills on Model Session, done with TRs 1 to 4, but also done with this clean needle test. you see?

And then there are ways to make these things a little more effective, such as, “Since the last session, did you do anything you are now withholding from me?” or something like that. Don’t you see? And it—narrow your rudiments down. Get your rudiments—to get the pc into present time. In other words there’s ways—things you can do with these rudiments to make these rudiments more effective and keep yourself from running a full Prepcheck session in the beginning ruds. And then get onto the body of the session.

It’s sometimes embarrassing when you intended to do Routine 3 in the first place. One hour and fifty-five minutes later you’ve just finished prepchecking the pc. Pc gets very uncomfortable because you didn’t do any listing in that session. In fact I’ve heard pcs say so. You’ve helped them out endlessly, you’ve done marvelous things for their cases and all this sort of thing, but they just never seem to appreciate it. Because you didn’t do any real auditing in the session. You got yourself tangle-footed with the ruds.

Now, getting out of the rudiments the other way with the end rudiments, there’s ways of narrowing the withhold question. “In this session, have I missed a withhold on you?” Tick. “In this session have I missed a withhold on you?” No tick. Oh, what do you know? And you say, “Good.” And finish off. Yeah, you’ve missed withholds on him, but that was Prepcheck session, and you’re going to take that up tomorrow, and you could go on till three-thirty and the auditing session’s supposed to end at one. you know?

But, there's—these nice drills of getting in to the session rapidly, getting out of the session are basically based on the fact that auditors mustn't get tangle-footed in the rudiments. The rudiments are something you grease over and get into the session on so the pc can be audited. They're not something that you spend a session on in order to flub.

So as far as the auditing part of the Model Session is concerned, as far as just learning it parrotwise is concerned, yes, and then there's the other thing of actually using it. How do you use this Model Session?

Now, as far as handling the pc is concerned, we get this section— detecting missed withholds, we again have the same type of drill of course, as we had in the—testing for the clean needle. We used the same type of drill on this thing but there are other ways that you can indicate missed withholds— such as a dirty needle. Pc is getting restive, pc stops listing, pc boils off. Well, that whole missed withhold bulletin comes in here. And that could be driven home on a practical basis, you see. you could have the coach sitting there and the coach could do a number of things, see—all of which are in a doingness sector, and the auditor's merely supposed to look for a missed withhold, that's all. That's all. It's all very simple, you see. The coach could boil off, and the coach could get mad, and the coach could refuse to go on, and this is the triggering mechanism, see.

All right. Now, the ARC breaky pc, of course that's the same thing. Getting off missed withholds. How do you get a missed withhold off? All right, there'd be two ways of getting off a missed withhold. They're both dependent on testing for a clean needle. That's the same TR, you see. There would be two ways—one is right and one is wrong.

“In this session, have I missed a withhold on you?”

Pc says, “Well, yes, as a matter of fact, I had a small headache at the beginning of the session and you missed that on me.”

And the auditor says, “Well, how is it now?” Now, he's just laid in more than he took off. See, he took off one wagonload and brought back two and dumped it on the pc. And actually, most sessions, when they start miring down, just mired down on that one weird button.

“Do you have a present time problem?” This is all under the same—same type of action. They're all classified as the same thing—the auditor makes the same mistake, see.

“Got a present time problem?”

“Yes, I had a fight with my wife last night.”

“Well, all right. Did you patch it up with her?”

See, you've had it. The—and the drill is, you just mustn't ask a second question. See, the discipline is, is don't ask a second question. Only ask one question. You ask one question and find out if it's clean, is what you do. That's the correct way of proceeding with any of these things. Ask one question, then find out if that one question is clean. And it better not be a question, something on the order of, “When Bill and I were out in the hall and Mary Ann was . . .” Better be something that can be cleaned, you see.

Now, getting off invalidations—that's—depends on this other—there's a specific way to ask for invalidations. And of course you get invalidations on Scientology, on auditing, on auditors, on listing, on processing, on nulling, on goals, former goals. You can have invalidations on a whole lot of things. And the odd part of it is they translate into the—they look like goals, and they look like everything, and it was that factor that made it so difficult for people to find goals a year or two ago. That was very difficult for people to find these things, because their invalidations and missed withholds were sliding all over the place. And

something was reading and it was just reading because of an invalidation. Got the invalidation off and so forth.

Well, the drill is to get the invalidation off and find out if it reads. That's the way that TR would more or less go at the present planning. In other words, let's get the invalidation off and find if the original reads. That's the drill. We're interested in getting something to read, not just getting invalidations off. The stress of it is to get something to read. Read or not read, that is the question. Not whether it was invalidated or not invalidated, see. So you've got to get the invalidations off to find out if it'd read. Makes a slightly different type of drill.

Q-and-Aing with the pc: Now, the basic Q and A with the pc—I've just given you the example of. you say, "Do you have a present time problem?" and the pc says, "Yes, I had a fight with my wife last night." "Well how is she now?" See, that is the most elementary form of Q and A. Pc's worried about something so the auditor worries about it.

We had an old Q and A drill but it wasn't basic—it wasn't that basic. I think a coach in this particular line could have a lot of fun baiting the student into actually detouring, by being terribly interesting on the subject of the buttons that the student might have. Something the student just couldn't help but ask something more about. You know, just try to make the student ask twice. Just try to make him ask twice. Do anything to get the student to ask twice, you know? "But this is still worrying me." See? The coach, you see, "But this is still worrying me. I still feel dreadful about this." What is the student supposed to do? Well, he's supposed to clear the exact rudiment that he is clearing. That is what he's supposed to do. In other words, we're going to face him with the usual.

Now we get into practical process; we get PTP processes. And the best PTP process is, well, frankly, there are a whole lot of them. The best of the PTP processes and so on, as a process, is simply Responsibility Process—the old one. It's fine, perfectly fine—works.

There's a slippery one, asking for the missed withhold on the other person. Auditors try to move in on this thing, however, and find out that it's nothing but liquid asphalt underneath their feet—they're stuck there for the rest of the session. So we kind of stopped monkeying with this thing. But I can sure get out from under it. Because if you're going to clear one that way, it better be a Prepcheck type of session. And as a matter of fact, just two weeks ago you saw me give a demonstration of the use of the missed withhold in handling a chronic present time problem—present time problem of long duration on a pc. That's the way you do it, but not in a rudiment. The rudiment PTP process is simply well, "What part of that problem could you be responsible for?" until it's been—don't go stating the problem. Ask the first question. That's the door you're leaving by, except you're leaving just a little later.

See, your first checkout it didn't disappear. So you're going to have—you run the process and then you leave by the same door. And it isn't, "Do you have a present time problem now?" That is wrong, you see. It is "Do you have a present time problem?" And the second that is null, no matter if the pc screams, no matter if the pc says yes he does have, doesn't matter, anything else. If the meter says he doesn't have, that's it. you stop running it right there. That's how long you run it. And that's all the length of time you run it. Various wordings have been on that old process; I don't know which the favorite one was. "What part of that problem have you been responsible for?" is the one that I've been using lately.

ARC break action: What do you do with an ARC break? Now, this is—we're getting practical here, see. What do you do with an ARC break? Well, of course, you run all kind of things don't you? Not today, you don't. You get off the missed withhold, check it and get out of there.

Finding overts: This is a whole drill. Now, you get it on this basis: The coach says—the pc says, "Do you have an overt?" or any kind of a leading "Do fish swim" type of question, see. "Do you have an overt?"

And the coach could say, “Well, I thought . . .” And of course the correction there is, “What did you do?” See, it’s—that—the whole purpose of that would be a TR which steered the pc into giving you a doingness whenever a think was offered. A criticism, a think, an evaluation—you need that one very badly. There was a session going on today—in which what—a person was actually getting and there were four things that you mustn’t do in Prepchecking and all four of them were being bought by the auditor. You know what they are—you know: mustn’t take somebody else’s withholds, mustn’t take another person’s thinkingness, mustn’t . . . No, these things were all in full bloom in that particular session.

And yet at no time was the auditor saying, “What did you do to that person?” See, at no time. This person bought thought and—had other—there was explanation, the person was explaining why, you see. All of the various clues were there. They were all present, and so on. And that drill would be formed up to get around that.

Forming What questions: Now we’ve already seen something of that drill. We give an overt, “My sister ran away—I—scolded my sister, and scolded her and scolded her until she ran away with a policeman.” And we just give that as the overt, as the coach gives it. And the student says—forms the What question. “What about running away with policemen?” or whatever it is. See, you don’t know it very well or you would’ve laughed. Proper What question is “What about scolding people?” See, the person’s got to be able to form the What question out of the overt given. So we get a whole list of very involved overts. And the person’s got to give the proper What question, or none of them. See?

We have—also this goes into this other drill of finding overts, because we have think replies in there, don’t you see. And, “What have you done?” is the basic question.

The student says, “What have you done?” and just to—to say something

And the coach says, “Well, I thought about chasing my sister one time around the house so that she would run away with a policeman.”

And the student is supposed to form the What question. So, “What about chasing women?”

“Flunk!”

See, I mean that’s—you get how that is done so that you get—he gets practice in forming these What questions, right now, right now, right now. What we need is a long list of involved overts from which you could form the proper What question.

You see, a What question can be too general, it can be too specific and it can be asked. Something else can be wrong with a What question. It can actually be asked. He actually did ask a What question. Flunk! See.

“I thought—I thought one time, about closing the door so that my sister would have to walk around to the backdoor.”

And he’s supposed to form the What question. So he says, “What about closing. . . ?”

“Flunk!”

See. Let him have it, good and echoing, you know. Really drive that one in.

The proper response—there’s no What question about it and you never write it down at all.

And you say, “Come on. I want something you did to your sister.” We’re already working on familial Zero or something, you see. ‘I want something you did, did, did.’ &c. And then these things would be so arranged that you got the proper “did” immediately afterwards. The coach furnishes actually a did.

“Well, I just beat her a few times.”

“All right, what about beating a . . .?”

“Flunk!! You didn’t get a specific overt.” Get the idea?

“Oh.”

See the type of drill it is? Eventually the auditor can sit there, and he says to the pc, “All right, we’re trying to find out what withholds your family didn’t find out about you,” or whatever the Zero is, you know.

And, “Well, I was often very critical of my family.”

And the auditor, “I got a reaction there. What did you do to your family?”

“Oh, I was often very critical, terribly critical. Used to go around the neighborhood being very critical.”

“Yeah, what did you do to your family? Good. I know you went around the neighborhood being critical. What did you do?”

“Well, I denied them money lots of times.”

And the auditor doesn’t fall into that, you see. He says, “All right—one time there, one time. one time?”

“Well, it actually wasn’t denying the money so much; it was stealing it.”

“All right. But, what did you do there? One time, now.”

“Nothing I never did anything to my family, except of course, I was very cruel to them. Very cruel to them.”

“Look, I’m sitting here to find out what you’ve done to your family. I’m getting a reaction on something Now, what have you done to your family?”

“All right. If you must know, I took them out for a ride in the car and I was drunk and I wrecked the car, and I killed three of them.”

“Good! Good. What about . . .”

And what is the What question? What is it? Come on, what is it? Come on, what is it?

Audience: “What about killing people in cars?” “What about drunkenly killing people?” “What about drunken driving?”

Male voice: “What about killing the members of your family?”

That’s the biggest overt. And then you can move over in the margin, “What about drunk driving? What about this, what about that.” But actually the chains you go back on you’ll probably run all those chains back before you blew that because that’s such a hell of an overt. But you at least are working on something.

You know, I think the dock strike, and everything else points in the direction of refusing to work. But I don’t think auditors should go that far and ask the What questions I sometimes see on reports, just in an effort to not work, you know? We found—somebody here the other

day asked the classic What question about paper clips. Somebody thought about stealing a paper clip. Actually was asked by an auditor—horrible.

You see what that's—what these—what these forming the What question, you see how that would be designed? You see?

All right. Now, the drill, just the basic drill, of the When-All-Appear-Who system—just getting that drill down, till the person knows what to ask on that. Easy one. Finding the bottom of the chain rather than trying to find the later incidents on the chain. You know, the “go earlier” routine. Perhaps no TR, but we certainly ought to have an understanding of it and do it well.

Finding the Hav Process: Now we're off into another field. This is quite an activity—finding a Hav Process, covered by bulletins of a couple of years ago, and very involved and interesting bulletins they were. Exactly how you go about finding a Hav Process. There's no point in going over it, but a person has to be able to do that whole drill. And the best way to do it, of course, is to check out these various processes on pcs and find the one that works.

Of course, you actually can do this on a coach because the coach usually has a Hav Process. Some auditor has found his Hav Process already, you know. He knows what it is and what it isn't. Somebody's trying to find other Hav Processes and he knows that this better be checked into by the Instructor. You know, his Hav Process is, “Spit in that corner,” or something of this sort. And the pc comes up with—I mean the student comes up with a Hav Process, “Look around this room and find everybody that's in it,” you know. He's turning around—it's not even on the list.

Prehav Assessment, of course, is a very specific drill and is also covered by very specific bulletins and surprisingly few people can do these. You never know when one's going to come up and so forth. Prehav keeps fading away and dying and coming back to life again. So I'm beginning to consider that is one of the basic tools of an auditor.

Listing: How do you list? How do you test completenesses of a list? These are all doingness actions. That's very easy, by the way. you just take the pc's folder and read—take the coach's folder and read a few items to him, and you can tell whether the list is complete or not complete. Tone arm moves or it doesn't. Of course, the Instructor probably would rather not go into that case that level, but that is one way to do it.

Then nulling: How do you null? And then this comes—the doggonedest, mixed up, most impossible and difficult one of the whole lot—how do you check an item? And of course, it's composited of getting withholds off and invalidations, and going in the same—going out the same door you went in and everything else. I mean, if you do a good check off, that's a real good check off, and auditors are poorest at that single action right now in Routine 3 Process—not finding goals, because they do find goals—but by golly, they have trouble checking out things. And they very often won't believe them when they are checked out. Had a case of that myself the other day. Auditor wouldn't believe it.

Checking: checking something out. How do you do it? It's a specific, direct drill. Very easy, but my God you'd think it was difficult, the number of checkouts that are wrong

Get

ting off missed withholds is in here actually twice. And probably should be struck at that level. Getting item invalidations off—well, that means goal and item invalidations. There's a specific way to do this. you have to give somebody the idea of what it looks like. Actually an item will read, because it's been invalidated and an item will read because it is reading. You see? And sometimes when an item has been invalidated it reads and sometimes when an item has been invalidated it doesn't read. It's nice and constant.

And then we get into the next one here: getting suppressions off. Done the same way, but they're a special breed of cat—then cleaning a needle reaction—of course, that's a whole Prepcheck, pardon me—no, cleaning a needle reaction is very simple. That's just the same one that we had up here at the top. But cleaning a dirty needle, that is a whole Prepcheck. I was reading one line ahead of myself here. A script I'm carrying in the back of my head.

Getting more goals or items: How do you do that? Of course, you get off the missed withholds. You get off the invalidations on the subject of Scientology and listing And you have to get off the invalidations sometimes on the subject of goals, listing goals, or listing in general. Get the missed withholds off on these things and you can always get a fellow rolling again. A specific drill, very specific.

Getting the pc into session: Now we get into something terribly, terribly, terribly fundamental. How do you get a pc into session. And you just do. you just do and you start the session. But how do you get the pc into session? What is used to do this? There's no trickery here, but people have trouble with it mostly because they think there's a lot more to it than there is. Getting a pc out of session, almost nobody knows how to do that. Hardly anybody will work end rudiments until the pc is actually out of the session. Most pcs leave sessions grogged, not cleaned. You can have a pc flying at the end of a session if you do your end rudiments well.

Controlling the pc's attention: This is a specific drill—a specific drill of controlling attention, that is all. you want the pc to look at a bottle and he won't look at the bottle. You get the idea? The coach won't look at the bottle. The student wants him to look at the bottle. Coach wants him to look at the bottle. Has to do it verbally. Coach sits there and gives him every reason under the sun, moon and stars why he won't look at the bottle. And the student has actually got to get the coach to look at the bottle. Got the idea?

And creating the R-factor: Hardly anybody does that. You've heard me do it practically every session that I've ever demonstrated. And yet I don't know how many of you are doing it yet. Creating the R-factor is telling him what the session is going to be all about or any ramifications to the session—describing the whole thing from your particular viewpoint. Even what you yourself are going to try to do regardless of what goals they're going to have later. They all—you create an R-factor before you begin the session.

You can also create an R-factor in the CCHs every time you start a new CCH. But create the reality of the situation for the pc—quite an important step.

Handling the p—holding up against pc suggestions: Now, doesn't that have a marvelous field of TRs? You know, the vista just opens before you there. Creatingness can run wild when it comes to a TR on that particular level. Holding up against the pc's suggestions. "Let's leave the room." What the pc—what the student is supposed to ask is, "Do fish swim?" And the coach is suggesting they do other things first. And I'm sure that a coach could be very good at this and could get to a point where he actually could trip the student into doing something else besides asking, do this. "Do fish swim?" "Could I adjust my chair slightly?"

You know. It's very funny, if you do this well, you can disarm—you can disarm a student in one of these TRs very, very easily. But this is again a beautiful contest there. You could figure out tons of TRs around that particular thing. Holding up against the pc's suggestions. Of course, the coach is there making suggestions and the pc—the student is trying to get something done. And of course the TR is that the student must get it done and not follow the coach's suggestion. A very wily coach using his tone modulations properly and so forth, can get anybody who is inclined to not hold up, to not hold up. This is quite amazingly easy, to get an auditor to do something else.

Now, holding a constant against adversity is learning to answer with the usual when the unusual is being demanded of you. And that is all there is to that one.

So you got an unusual situation—an unusual situation such as, “Well actually, to meet anything at all I have to list my goals in Sanskrit.”

“Heh-heh. Sorry, you can’t write Sanskrit.” “As a matter of fact I can. So I’ll sit here and write some of these goals down. I will write down these goals in Sanskrit, you see, and then I’ll tell you what they are and then of course, you can null them out.”

And that sort of thing How does an auditor get out of that situation? Well, leaving you with that puzzle see, because if you invalidate him obviously, you invalidated all of his goals, haven’t you?

Well, leaving you with that puzzle, as to how you get that done—well, we’ve already shot over my time.

Thank you for your extra time. Good night.