QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD: CCHs, NULLING GOALS

A lecture given on
28 June 1962

Okay. This is the second lecture, 28 June AD 12. Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

Questions. Any questions you have? Yes, Ian.

Male voice: Ron, if the—if a person is ready for 3GA when you've got a nice, clean, free needle—smooth needle, you can read instantly and directly, and if rudiments and havingness of the CCHs will do that, if you're auditing outside, not from the point of view of us training here, but if you're auditing someone outside, would you need to bother about the Prepchecking stage?

There is this possibility, Ian. Would you—would you need to do this outside if a person had a nice, free, clean needle? There's this possibility: that a person is at your mockery level, see? Reading at 2.0 for a girl, 3.0 for a man. Needle appears to be not really free but, you know, it's not jerky or anything. You've got the unfortunate fact in such a case of just nowhere. See, you— you've got just a big beautiful nowhere as far as this case is concerned. And this case is going to rise up into trouble. This case is described in E-Meter Essentials.

Now, if the case were not of that type, you would at least—you would at least have to run, some Model Sessions and Havingness sessions to give him some kind of an idea of what auditing was, you see? They would—they would need to have a little bit of certainty grooved here, because this factor of anxiety is going to rise in this case. And remember if auditing was a total unknown to this person, this person wouldn't have a clue.

It would be best policy on any case to run a rudiments-Havingness session on the case. Find his Havingness Process. Run a Prepcheck-type session even if it were only grooved in the direction of goals, don't you see? Give him some idea of that. And then get firing on his goals list, yes.

Does that answer your question?

Male voice: Yes.

Good. A certain sensibility is offered in this. But remember there can be this other case, this one that's described in E-Meter Essentials. The dead thetan case. And, boy, that one would blow up in your face. That one would really explode. You would have more trouble than you could shake a stick at if you started to do a 3GA on this case because the case is, of course, not even vaguely anywhere. They're merely calm. Okay? All right.

Yes, Jean?

Female voice: CCHs. Can you tell us something more about the method we had on CCHs?

CCHs. Can I tell you more about the what?

Female voice: The method we had on CCHs.

The method?

Female voice: The new method of not taking up physical originations but just asking the pc, "How are you doing?"

That's not a new method. Somebody invented a method. The CCHs are a fruitful source of invention. And they are what they are. And those of you that watched me do the demonstration that night when I was running the CCHs on Suzie, remember you didn't hear very much about calling off what she was supposed to notice, you just heard a lot of—of "How are you feeling How's it going?" and so forth, "How are you doing?" You know, this kind of comment. And then somebody came along, apparently—I don't know who it was around here, and I didn't find out about it till a couple of days ago—and they started asking—a person's eye would twitch and they would say, "Did you notice that eye twitch?" and so forth. And they were using this as a method and it got to be quite a method.

But actually, let's look at it compared with the Auditor's Code. Of course, it's an evaluation. We have noticed the eye twitch and we're forcing the person to notice an eye twitch. And the whole trick is, is let's get the guy to look; and we'll find that if he looks he will exteriorize from that particular somatic. That's what we're trying to do.

And this is a very deft, very, very delicate action that the auditor undertakes. And you start using mechanical sledgehammer type actions on it and it'll fold up. All of a sudden the pc doesn't get better. The pc does a physical origination, he starts going this way, you know, and you just ask him, "What's happening?" But that's as far as you can go with evaluation. You just say, "What's happening?"

And he says, "What's happening? Oh! Yeah, yeah, thanks, ha!" And he maybe doesn't even say anything more. He sort of notices that something is going on. Because they will walk along somnolently without noticing anything is going on unless you stay in two-way communication with them. They put it all on automatic, see? And they start walking into a wound-up doll proposition, see? And they just go through motions and they never look at anything and they just go through this and they hope they will finish up at the end of two hours without dying or something. And they just fall rapidly out of session.

So CCHs call for a physical origin—origination on the part of the pc because the CCHs are physical processes less than mental processes. See? And you count on the fact that he has originated something. Well, he does something, he makes a physical motion, he makes an error. He does this, he does that.

Now at this point, if you can bring him up to the point of observing as a live being not an automaton—see, you just get him to observe—why, he gradually will get better and better and better and better and better. It's quite— it's quite mysterious how rapidly he will improve.

But if you step over the borderline, see, an inch, and tell him he's got to observe—he won't. Then he feels bludgeoned. Then he feels banged around. And he just feels like he's picked on. Feels like he's being criticized for having an eye twitch and all that sort of thing. So it's a terribly delicate line and it's a very difficult one for an auditor to hew, actually. Sometimes the auditor finds that he has gone too far.

The old drill that best describes it is "Fishing a Cognition." And you just try to fish a cognition out of this fellow. And if you don't succeed, violà, you have not succeeded. And if you do succeed, merveilleux, we have succeeded. You just pays your money and takes your chance. And it's just on the basis of "Give me that hand. Thank you. Give me that hand. Thank you."

And the pc suddenly holds it back. And you just say, "What's the matter? What's going on?"

"Oh, I had a pain in the end of my hand."

And you say, "Good. Well, all right. All right now?"

"Oh, yeah, yeah. It's much better now." See.

And "Give me that hand. Thank you. Give me that hand. Thank you. Give me that hand. Thank you."

And he all of a sudden says, "B-z-z-z-z-z!"

And you say, "What's going on?"

"Ah," he says, "it stings."

And you say, "All right. Good. All right. Give me that hand. Thank you."

And then all of a sudden, why, he's giving you—he's giving you three, four of them and it's nice as purr and there's nothing going on of any kind whatsoever. Get the hell out of there, man. That's your—that's flat for all intents and purposes. That's actually everything that's going on.

Now an auditor, in his anxiety to make somebody well, often pushes somebody's teeth down his throat. And it all stems from just that fact; the auditor gets anxious to have a beneficial effect upon the pc and is liable to get impatient, see, and is liable to start pressing. And as soon as an auditor starts this he drives the pc out of session; he adds a note of anxiety to it all, a note of urgency, a note of impatience. And the pc is—attention has shifted over to the auditor.

Now, it's just those considerations which establish what you say. Actually it isn't any wording, see, it's just those considerations. You can say enough so as not to yank the pc's attention off onto the auditor, evaluate for the pc and tell the pc what is going on, you can do that. But basically, you want to keep the pc vaguely aware of an ARC condition with the auditor and also noticing what is happening. You can easily overstep that boundary. So there is no actual series of words which give this, because it'll vary from pc to pc.

I imagine some upstage character from Oxford would be terribly upset every time you said, "How you doing? How's it going" and that sort of thing. You'd have to say, "I hope it's—I hope it's quite all right there, old chap."

That answer your question?

Female voice: Yes, it does. Thank you.

All right. What other question do we have? Yes?

Female voice: In the sessions as we have them here, Ron, if two things go on with goals listing, you see sometimes on the meter . . .

Now, let me hear that again now. In the session?

Female voice: If two things go on in one room here, say in goals nulling

Yes.

Female voice: so you see sometimes an odd read on the meter you're working on because it's sort of listening in. What can one do then instead of middle rudiments, to ask whether you are at the goals you are reading the pc and not the other one?

She's talking about a pc hearing somebody else's goals and the meter responding to it.

Female voice: Maybe!

Well, I would say that your rudiments—your beginning rudiments, not your middle rudiments but your beginning rudiments—never went in.

Female voice: Uh-huh.

What are you doing having your pc respond to somebody else's voice?

Female voice: Yes.

Hey, you mustn't have your pc responding to somebody else's voice: That answers that.

Female voice: Uh-huh.

Now, of course, this demands of you much higher caliber in-sessionness than you would have out in the middle of the Sahara Desert in a soundproof room, see?

Female voice: Yeah?

Yeah. It demands much more in-sessionness.

Female voice: Uh-huh.

Now, if your pc's meter is going off reading on somebody else's goals, then your pc is not in-session to you.

Female voice: Reading odd, you see, it is sort of like picking up a word or something It's sort of—of an oddity.

That's just what I mean. You're right with me. I'm answering the exact question you're asking And that is to say, if your pc reads on a word mentioned by somebody else anywhere in the vicinity and isn't reading exclusively on his auditor's voice, then that pc is not in-session to that auditor.

Female voice: Uh-huh.

That pc is in some sort of an autosession. Or is in-session to this other person that has been auditing him three months ago, you see? Or something —something is wrong here.

Female voice: Yeah. What is it—what does one do then?

One gets the pc in-session. I'd wind that session up, b-z-z-z-t. And I'd give the pc a moment's break and I would start the next session and find out that four rudiments were well out.

Female voice: Ah.

Understand?

Female voice: Yes.

That is a very extreme condition that you're mentioning there. That is almost too extreme to be . . .

Female voice: It's only sometimes happening Then it comes back again. But there's sometimes a moment when one is not quite sure.

Ah, pc isn't in-session. He's not interested in his own case. He's not willing to talk to his auditor. So, of course, he wants auditing so he picks it up from somebody else's goals list.

I will comment on this, I will comment on this. Your in-sessionness at this particular moment here at this course is poor—is quite poor. I picked up pc after pc I've looked at in the last month or so and so forth, I have found them all floating on a sort of an auto-out-of-sessionness. And it used to show up in Sec Checking and Prepchecking. You ask them for a good, big overt, you know, well, they noticed a pin in their mother's boudoir or something

And we actually did have this as an overt which an auditor managed a chain on. This—this one: they had thought of stealing a paper clip from a Central Organization, and this was the depth of sin and crime that the pc was willing to go into with that auditor. It wouldn't be safe to go any deeper than this. This one was particularly humorous because we have often used this as the ne plus ultra of a light auditing, acceptable overt, don't you see? That would be the screamer to end them all, you see. And actually somebody did come up with this; thought— their pc thought of stealing a paper clip from a Central Organization.

Now, that is all symptomatic of out-of-sessionness. That is all symptomatic of no-confidence. That is symptomatic of rough or wobbly Model Session. You see? Going past rudiments when they are still out, leaving them, you see. For instance, one of you the other day had the very, very bad luck of having the pc on the TV the other day when I stepped in here and there was just rudiment after rudiment after rudiment were giving quarter-of-a-dial drops and half-a-dial drops. In other words, the rudiments in that session were so wildly out that how could anybody have ever called it a session or never noticed it. So I thought it was so bad that I got ahold of the student's E-Meter and checked his E-Meter. His E-Meter was all right.

But I had another pc in the last demonstration I gave you, Kay, and I noticed that she was pretty wildly out of session, and so forth, and finally had the auditor's meter checked and the meter was inoperative. I thought that was pretty interesting.

But this—you just have to learn to be so smooth and so predictable and have your pc under such control in a session that the pc just never would think of doing anything else than listening to and responding to what you were saying on your meter. Got it?

Female voice: Yes. Thank you very much.

You bet you. All right. Okay. Any other questions? Yes? All right.

Male voice: Ron, as a person nears Clear on 3GA, does the needle if it's—sorry, does the tone arm if it's down say at 2.0 and he's a male, will the needle free up and be a free needle and then go to 3.0 or will it gradually go towards the 3.0 and then go to free needle?

The latter.

Male voice: The latter.

Yes. Always the latter. Needles don't go free off Clear read.

Male voice: Thank you.

You bet. Next question. No questions? Goodness, gracious me. You know all about it, huh? Well, all right. Yes?

Male voice: on the CCHs, to get back to them, if you notice quite body— quite a lot of body action on a pc and you say, "What was that?" and they continually say, "Oh, nothing. . ."

You notice an awful lot of body action in the CCHs on a pc and they keep saying, "Oh, nothing. . ."

Male voice: Uh-huh.

Go on.

Male voice: And you just acknowledge, "Okay, fine," and go right on with it.

That's right. That's right. And then the next time you've got him in a Prepcheck session you get off suppression. You can remedy that sort of thing. The person is, by the way, giving you a social response, giving you a social response. And the person, by the way, would be rather convinced that you perhaps were being critical of them so they're making nothing out of it, and so on. And I myself would have varied the auditing question I kept asking there, until the pc didn't give me the, "Oh, nothing." You see? I wouldn't challenge the "Oh, nothing," I would just ask a different question next time.

Male voice: Uh-huh.

I would say, "How are you doing?" Now, let him answer, "Oh, nothing," to that. You see, he can't. Got it?

Male voice: Thank you very much.

You bet. All right. Yes?

Female voice: I've got a question following that on asking the pc, "How are you doing?" In view of the fact that it activates circuits and what have you, what about if he just sort of starts, going into a compulsive outflow there? That's a bit of a dangerous thing to ask that type of case—"How are you doing?" I mean, it just doesn't stop from then.

Well, I suppose you could walk into this. Let's see, you asked a case, "How are you doing?" and the case goes into a compulsive outflow that you find is very difficult. In the first place, the compulsive outflow isn't dangerous, particularly, until it goes on long enough to run their havingness out the bottom.

There's ways and means of handling that sort of thing And they come under TR 4. Now, he goes into an action of this character, well you want to—you want to return the pc back into session. Because only a part of that response was an answer to your question. He went into a compulsive outflow. All right, you say, "How are you doing?" And he says, "Well, pretty terrible just now. I have been . . ." Well, now, "pretty terrible just now," that answered your question, didn't it?

Female voice: Uh-huh.

Now, if you weren't in there with your acknowledgment, you, to some degree, drop the ball, see? Now, you've got TR 4 to contend with because he's now originating so, your trick is to understand what he's saying, acknowledge it and return him to session. And there are several methods by which this can be done. But one of the smoothest is he says, when he's busy— he's going on and on and originating, he's going yap-yap-yap-yap-yap, and my father and mother always beat me and that's why I hate to have you touching my arm this way, and so on. An awfully good method of handling this is, "When did that occur to you in this session?"

And he says, "Well, it was a little bit earlier," and so forth.

And you say, "Well, all right. Now here's the next command." You've got to be slippy this way.

The essence of CCHs, of course, is communication, control and havingness. And you're perfectly right in saying, yes, there's some danger in an obsessive outflow on the part of the pc because it'll run down his havingness. And therefore that violates part of the CCHs. But also you're violating the control if you don't handle that obsessive outflow, see.

Now, a pc properly acknowledged has found out that he has reached you. See? If you acknowledged him properly then he's found out now that he has reached you and he'll stop talking That's how the cycle ends.

So if you were to pick up his hand and put it on your shoulder as he was talking, he would shut up. Get the magic? He'd reached you.

I won't say the ways of handling this are unlimited, but there are several. And they depend, more or less, on the situation in which you are involved. There was one old lady, I remember, who was going on and on and on and on and on and on and on and on and on; and she was just talking to the blue, she'd just stopped talking to anybody, you know? And the auditor finally got around and got his face in front of her so that she actually couldn't look any other way than look at him, and gave her a Tone 40, "Good!" and she was so surprised she almost dropped the mock-up. And well, what do you know, you know? It startled her considerably, not because of the suddenness of it but she thought that was a pretty nice fellow after that. See? You're actually not trying to reach the pc, you're trying to convince the pc the pc has reached you. And if you can do that, why, any pc will shut up. As a matter of fact, you could probably stop a war if you could convince the other side that they had reached you already. Because what are they trying to do, you see? It wouldn't be a retreat proposition because that would show they hadn't reached you and you were still worrying about their reaching you. But if you notice all war propaganda is on the basis: you haven't reached us and you're not going to; but we're going to reach you and smash you, see? And war is something that grows up this way.

So your ARC break can get going on the pc by showing the pc that the pc can't reach you. And the pc will start getting berserk after a while if you keep retreating on this, and so on. If you just remain silent and courteous the pc talks and talks and talks and you remain silent and smile faintly, you see and talk—and he can't see you—and the pc talks and talks and talks and talks and talks. You sort of withdraw a little bit, sufferingly, inside yourself and the pc will talk and talk and talk and talk and talk. You get what's happening?

All right. So your action is to consider an answer to your auditing question requires an acknowledgment and if the pc goes any further than that, that the pc is originating. Then if the pc is originating he has an anxiety about reaching you. So all you've got to do is cure that anxiety right there in a couple of well-chosen words or gestures and there you are.

Now, in view of the fact that you're reaching a pc with great surety every time, while running the CCHs, you're liable to get a reverse flow on the line. Auditing kids, of course, as you probably know, is very amusing They turn around and run "Give me that hand," on you after a little while, you know? They kind of keep it balanced up. They're friendly that way. They—if you run 8-C on them they'll pretty soon run 8-C on you. And so forth.

Well, pcs will sometimes try to do that verbally. And try to do it some other way. That answer it?

Female voice: Yes, thank you.

You betcha. All right. Yes, Peter?

Male voice: on that, that reminded me of the question I wanted to ask before. And that is the use of CCH/Havingness that you used on the television. We haven't had any particular rundown on the use of that. Asking the preclear, "Touch me. Touch me. . ."

Uh-huh.

Male voice: . . . with the CCHs.

It's very simple. The CCH/Havingness Process is simply repetitively, "Touch my—blank." And then don't introduce any parts that he'd be diffident about touching. And it's, "Touch my right shoulder. Touch my left shoulder. Touch the top of my head. Touch my stomach. Touch my right elbow. Touch my left elbow. Touch my right knee. Touch my left knee." See? "Touch my right shoulder. Touch my left shoulder. Touch the top of my head."

And you'll find out the pc would go on and on this way. It's quite interesting. What's particularly amusing about that is once in a while an auditor had love turn on on the part of the pc. You know? Love. Love raises its—its embarrassing skull, and so on. And that is a reach-can't reach; weird situation. Well, this process has the liability of turning on that phenomenon. And you have to run it out. So you have to run that Havingness Process long enough to run out the misemotional connotations which the pc generates. Quite amusing That's the only thing wrong with it.

And as far as when you run it is concerned, it would be early on in auditing and once a session. It would have these limitations. It's something that goes a long way because you're going to have to run it quite a little bit to get it flat. Okay?

Male voice: Yes. I was wondering about its uses and to replace—instead of doing a model session rudiments, on the CCH session whether one could use that as sort of a havingness auditor . . .

Well, that's what it's for.

Male voice: Thank you.

That's what it's for. I don't know. Some auditors have pcs go out of session running the CCHs. And, let me tell you something, that is a mark of rough auditing That—that's a mark of not much comprehend. You could do the CCHs in Model Session, but, that's all very well except for this one little thing: it violates the basis of the CCHs. They are a physical process and you're busily introducing a mental process on top of a physical process and it's sort of, "What's this all about?" see?

The facts of the case are that an auditor ought to be so smooth, so lacking in Prussianism, so uninhibited on his comm line that he runs a nice, easy, comfortable set of CCHs. And you're not going to find anybody going out of session. A nice, easy, comfortable CCH run wouldn't need any rudiments. Because the guy's with you all the way, you're not overrunning everything, you're running it up just to a point of three-no-change, it's no great strain on him, you're checking up on him, you're—you're—you're showing him concern, you're acknowledging them well when they speak to you and all that sort of thing. It sort of runs off and it's sort of like—sort of like waltzing with a pretty girl, you know, it's—it doesn't tire you.

But I imagine that trying to fox-trot with an elephant, I imagine could be fairly exhausting and would require innumerable rudiments. You get the idea.

The thing—that, however, is not a mental Havingness Process and belongs with the CCHs. A little of it'd go a long way. But it's blood brother with the CCHs and it would—your thought is very good there—it would supplant all this anxiety about MS [Model Session] while doing the CCHs.

Yes?

Female voice: Ron, what you were saying, you know, about the CCH process being, "Touch the auditor." Is it not all right to touch the surrounding environment? I mean, if you have a male auditor and a female, and you want to CCH process . . .

Right.

Female voice: . . . can you just not touch the things around you?

No.

Female voice: Touch his own body.

No, that is strictly an auditor rudiment.

Female voice: I see.

It is a havingness of the auditor. It puts in the auditor and so forth. If you'll notice, the CCHs touch an awful lot of surrounding environment. See? CCH 2, you've got a lot of "Touch the walls," and that sort of thing, don't you see? No, this is—this is just a peculiar oddball method of getting the pc to find the auditor. And to run any other Havingness in the thing is probably risky because it very well may not be the pc's Havingness Process. The pc is not going to get a tightened up needle while doing 8-C because there's a lot more to 8-C than touching the walls. But if you were just to get a random touching of walls and pat-pat-pat, imagine your embarrassment when you were getting the pc's Havingness Process to find out that that tightened the needle, which it easily could do. Don't you see? You follow that?

Female voice: Uh-huh.

So this is mainly an ARC Havingness. And you find this pc is finding his auditor a little bit roughish and—and he's getting standoffish and he's doing thises and thats and so forth, and he starts snarling a little bit. You run some of this CCH/Havingness and this really just smooths right out. Of course the pc's liable to smack you hard occasionally, but, I'm sure your shoulders could stand that. Okay? All right.

Female voice: Thank you.

You bet.

Yes, Jim?

Male voice: Nulling goals.

Right. This—you're interested in this tonight?

Male voice: Rather. Sensitivity setting.

Yes?

Male voice: I'm wondering if we're absolutely bound to null at the sensitivity for a full dial drop or can we null at a sensitivity setting which is more convenient, which might be a higher setting than that?

No. You're—you're wasting time. Nulling goals. Here's exactly how you null goals. It's its own formula. One dial drop, sensitivity set for one dial drop. Null the whole list; null it down to a point where you've got 30 or 40 left in. Take those 30 or 40 that are still alive, copy them on a separate sheet of paper, crank your sensitivity up to 16 and fire down that list at sensitivity 16; you're going to find your goal every time—providing the rudiments are in and the meter is reading for the pc and the auditor, see? Providing these things.

Any other sensitivity setting or settings would be a waste of time because it'd be a compromise between these two things. And you don't want a compromise. In the first place, when you go down this goals list the first time, you're only going to find the goals that are going to stay in are going to be knocking hard when you first go by them.

Male voice: Uh-huh.

And after you've nulled the thing a couple of times, that knock is going to recede. And that's about the time you've got 30 or 40 left. And now, the eventual goal is only going to read at sensitivity 16, so you've actually shorted or scanted or shorthanded the nulling process. So you didn't have to knock the pc's brains out by erasing every goal, don't you see, as you went on down the line. In other words, you could do a light job of it this way. As long as your rudiments are in that is quite good. As long as you're getting ticks quite routinely on goals and so forth and your rudiments are in, that's fine.

Now. What gets in the road of this, Jim, and I think this is what you're talking about, is when this is not done from scratch in this particular way. You see, that has to be a package all by itself. You have to take the pc from scratch. So he wrote up a lot of goals himself and you finished off the list and you got the tone arm action out of the list. Then you went tearing down the list at one dial drop. And then you waited until you had 30 or 40 left and you copied those over and went to sensitivity 16 and then nulled those out at sensitivity 16. Then checked out—and then checked out against every one left on that list. All right, that's all stylized.

Well, we're continually running into people who have had old goals lists, who have had extended lists, who have had a goals list nulled out totally because it was not complete and had to be done again. All right, now we're running into random situations, see? That first one is the textbook solution and then when taken from scratch you'll find out it's terrifically workable.

But as soon as we move on and we've—the person's goal list nulled out, now what do we do? See? When it all went null? Now, how do we patch up this situation? How do we—how do we add some to it?

We've got people who have had a goals list, already before they came here, has already been nulled out. And then we've added to that goals list, you see, and then have nulled everything out on that goals list so that now we had to extend a goals list and we are now doing a new extensional line and that all nulled out. You get the idea? This thing is winding up in a ball here somehow or another.

And even there, even there, that is not going to help you. By the time you have had to add to a goals list—let's say you had something like seven or eight hundred and you had to add to that list—well, the reads are going. You've got it faded down now. It is no longer fitting within the framework of the textbook solution. All right, you have only one sensitivity setting that you can use in that case: 16. Somebody has missed the boat so, therefore, now we are dedicated to sensitivity 16, God help us all. Now, it all has to be done at sensitivity 16. There isn't any other choice. There's no intermediate goals setting for nulling that has any value at all. And that's for that reason.

Your first list, "a virgin" is sufficiently charged that it reads beautifully at a one dial drop. And you're going to get every goal that is significant is going to be reading there bright and shining, ready to be taken down to the last nub, you see? Once that situation has been overrun, spoiled, flubbed, now you're up against it.

It interests me why you were asking the question.

Male voice: Thank you. Because, Neal (if he doesn't mind my mentioning it) his needle is tight. Okay. And a higher sensitivity setting has been necessary for me not to need a magnifying glass to read accurately.

Well, he's not a stylized case here.

Male voice: No, he's not.

No. His goals list was nulled down while in Joburg and it's been renulled and nulled and renulled and so forth. Now, that's cranked all the way up to sensitivity 16, man. Rough as it is.

Male voice: Uh-huh.

That's the place to ride that one down. You'll have to ride the whole thing down at that to really get an accurate picture.

Male voice: Well, I've been doing that, hoping that was all right.

Yeah, well, you couldn't do anything else. Once the thing—once you have spoiled that basic picture, once the glory of that is departed into the sunset, you have the upper sensitivity and that's all you've got left. Okay?

Male voice: Thank you.

Right.

Male voice: How necessary is it to acknowledge after every goal? Instead of just the once after three.

Why?

Male voice: Well, it slows things down a bit.

Oh, it's rather microscopic in its slowdown. The original method of doing them was to acknowledge after three. And this acknowledging after each one is apparently—people have been doing it here recently. I don't know that it's mandatory.

Male voice: Uh-huh.

I'm afraid that I would much rather tear down a list. "To catch catfish. To catch catfish. To catch catfish. Thank you." I'm afraid I would. But then, I develop a considerable—I get up—I get up to planing speed on nulling goals and other people don't like this speed. They don't think a needle will travel that fast. They don't think the reactive mind (which has no time in it at all) can travel that fast. The reactive mind, of course, is at instant infinity, exclamation point! The reactive mind will respond to a needle as fast as you can read and the faster you can read, it will respond to the needle that much faster. But, frankly, getting a thank you in between doesn't add all that providing your thank you is right on the ball. Because, of course, your thank you starts the second you have stopped talking.

Male voice: Uh-huh.

See? "To catch catfish. Thank you. To catch catfish. Thank you." And you just use it for a filler. See, you put no pause in between, you just put a thank you. And if you could imagine the sentence, "To catch catfish, thank you. To catch catfish, thank you. To catch catfish, thank you," all with no spaces between the letters, see, there's no spaces left in the line and it's just all letters, you know, like Russian is written or Chinese or something like that, why, you'll get the same effect.

Male voice: Ron, if one did it that way, you wouldn't be able to glance at the pc on the intermediate thank you—on the say, the first or second thank you.

Why?

Male voice: Well, it's—because you're saying thank you the microsecond after the instant read should have occurred. You'd get the "you" in by the time you . . .

Female voice: You've got two eyes.

Male voice: I can't believe this.

Oh, I don't know. You guys can go on looking at pcs and having a ball, but I null goals myself. The speed with which you can null goals is—has a lot to do with this. And if you didn't find it very nice to get in the thank you or something like that, I should say offhand it was not necessary.

I've always nulled goals, "To catch catfish. Thank you." No. "To catch catfish. To catch catfish. To catch catfish. Thank you." And looked at the pc and gave him a thank you to see if he was still in the chair. And let it roar.

I don't know how many goals I can null a minute. But it is a lot. And I look at these pathetic attempts to null a hundred and fifty goals in a twohour session and so on, and I say, "Oh, let's all go to sleep. Let's let our arms and legs fall off." Because, frankly—because frankly, it's just wasting time. You're paying time to the reactive bank. What's the reactive bank, man? What is the reactive bank? Well, it is a timeless activity. It responds to minor and major thoughts. And why make it respond to any minor thoughts when you're trying to get it to respond to major thoughts? You know? And I don't think courtesy was ever heard of in the reactive mind. I know I've been in one for quite some time and I never found anything very polite about it. When it bit, it bit.

I'm not trying to break down any particular drill that you are being taught in this particular way. But you also are entitled to know that I don't have any particular patience with—with anything that gets in the road of auditing And when I do auditing I do the essentials and I don't do more than the essentials. And I get the job done. And you could really make it fly.

Speed, man, it's speed. It isn't courtesy. It isn't whether or not the auditor bites his fingernails. It's how many goals you get read per unit of time.

It's how many goals you get written per unit of time. How many goals you get read per unit of time and how many items you list per unit of time that totally regulates the length of time it takes to clear a human being. Nothing else regulates it.

Now, we start getting in the vagaries as, "Is the pc in-session?" trying to keep the pc from going out of session. All right, to a certain degree we can tolerate that. We had better pay attention to that to a certain degree. Because the meter will go null on a pc who is out of session. And if you don't get in your beginning rudiments you're liable to be going straight into it with roaring present time problems and everything else and your meter not operative and you've got a hundred and fifty, two hundred, three hundred goals you've nulled in that session and—oh hell, you didn't null them in the session, the pc nulled them before he came in, and that means the goal was in that bunch. Well, lord help us, man, you have now gotten yourself into beaucoup trouble.

So you want to make sure the pc is in a state of mind whereby he will read on the meter. Now, don't stretch that state of mind and push him so he won't read out of the meter while trying to make him read on the meter. You understand?

All right. Well, similarly, a pc who is being hit with machine gun fire is much less likely to have rudiments go out. My pcs don't have time to have rudiments, you know? They don't have time to have rudiments go out. They just don't have time, that's all. Keep them busy.

Male voice: . . . while you're nulling I've been asking Jack for some good recommended reading material . . .

You're out of session. That's why your list is slop. How do you like that!

Jack, wake up. Find that man's goal. Stop this nonsense. He has no interest in his session. Hah! Isn't that right?

Male voice: Every time I do something the middle rudiments go out.

Uh-huh. I just looked at it. The middle rudiments were put in, I think, fifteen to twenty times in one session. And I didn't think they had to be put in once.

Now here's what I talked to you about in the first lecture. I'm sorry to be rough on rats here. You understand? But, here's the way it is. Using middle rudiments to drive the pc out of session. Now, the pc says he is not interested in what's going on. Every time he says something the middle rudiments go out. See? You got that?

Male voice: Uh-huh.

Well, don't do that. Your middle rudiments are out when the meter's no longer reading. And that goal, then, is probably on the list. But I noticed that the list is 2.75 to 2.3 of tone arm action in 20 minutes, which also might speak of an incomplete list. Or it might speak of the fact that the middle rudiments—the middle rudiments, being rudiments, are knocking the pc in and out of session and you're getting rudiments action. I don't know which you're getting. You're getting tone arm action on rudiments?

Male voice: Occasionally. Not always. Usually it just goes straight through. Just say the questions, say the whole thing and that's it.

Well, 2.75 to 2.3 tone arm action says that the list is incomplete. That's too much. Furthermore, there are a few too many strikes on the list. A few too many. You know, it's nulling a little bit hard, and it could be listed a bit further, and you just lay off the middle ruds.

Male voice: Okay.

And pc starts to snore, kick him; and keep on going. He looks out the window, if you complain about his disinterest in session, say, "Get interested in this session," you know? Say, "Whose goals are these?" Got it, Jack?

Male voice: Yes, Ron. Thank you.

All right. Well, that is the—that is an example. Because I just looked at the folder in there. There was too much TA action and I said, "Well, there's a possibility the list is not complete." And then the other one thing I saw, too many middle ruds.

When your meter is no longer registering tick, tick, tick, you know, "To catch catfish. To catch catfish. To catch catfish," your meter hasn't read; not at all. I don't care whether it was at a one dial drop or sixteen, see, it hasn't read, not at all. Your ears should go up, flop! And then, "To eat gumdrops. To eat gumdrops. To eat gumdrops," not one single tick on that goal. Ooooh! This is probable that something weird has occurred. Don't make up your mind yet, however. "To run downhill. To run downhill. To run downhill." Not a single tick—except some random ones that you don't know quite where they are. You haul back at that point and get your middle rudiments in. And you'll find out if you do that that they only go out once in a blue moon—once every couple of sessions—something like this.

If you're suspicious of middle rudiments, put in your beginning rudiments and run right over into your middle rudiments. Put in your beginning rudiments, ta-ta-ta-ta-ta-tat, and put in your middle rudiments, ta-ta-ta-tatat, and then just leave them alone.

You actually can use middle rudiments to keep the pc from talking and make the pc disinterested in his session. That—he's just given us the perfect example.

Male voice: Did the same with me today, myself, I noticed it.

All right. Of course you would. It's happened to you as a pc. That make sense to you?

Male voice: Yes.

Yeah, have you ever felt all of a sudden like you were being punished for talking

Male voice: What do you mean all of a sudden? Don't blame Jack for this.

No.

Male voice: I was punishing myself.

Yeah.

Male voice: But certainly, that's true.

But there was a feeling of punishment. Pc will normally get that frame of mind, and after that you can't keep anything in.

No sir, just because a pc talks is not any reason to get middle rudiments in. And that is definite. See? And if a pc never says anything about any of his goals I start to worry about him. You know, pc's sitting there looking out the window; well, that's all right as long as the meter's reading. The meter stops reading, I get worried. One of the symptoms is the pc doesn't ever say anything, never does anything, so forth. You can't find a goal on a pc in that—in the frame of mind that the pc feels he is punished because his rudiments are out, he's ARC broken, the meter isn't reading well. Make sense?

Male voice: Yes.

All right. Okay. Right. I wasn't being hard on you, Jack. He thinks I was. All right. I was being hard on you, Jack. All right. Yes, Dale?

Male voice: on listing goals, what are the current tests of the completeness of the list?

No TA action on listing

Male voice: Well, how little is none?

There's a certain amount of drift. If you want to know how little there is—if you want to know how little there is . . .

Male voice: Uh-huh.

. . . supposing you were to sit there and say, "Do fish swim? Do fish swim? Do fish swim? Do fish swim?" to the pc. Or supposing the pc were simply—this—you understand this pc isn't Clear—was to sit there with his hands on the cans and have nothing happen.

Male voice: Uh-huh.

How much would the meter drift?

Male voice: Uh-huh.

That is how little.

Male voice: Okay.

All right?

Male voice: That answers my . . .

It's damn little. It's in the course of an hour it drifts from 2.75 up to 3.1. But that's just normal drift.

Male voice: Uh-huh.

See? Tone arm motion, lots of motion, is defined as .75 divisions of the TA every 20 minutes, within 20 minutes. A little motion is .25. No motion at all is what you're asking to be defined.

Male voice: Uh-huh.

Well, no motion at all is defined as the normal drift, if nothing were happening.

Male voice: All right. Thank you.

All right. Yes?

Male voice: Question on Prepchecking, Ron.

Right.

Male voice: In the new rundown, when you run the When, All, Appear, Who system, you run it several times.

Now, what's this now?

Male voice: When you're running the . . .

When you're running the . . .

Male voice: When you run the withhold system on the . . .

When you run the withhold system on the . . .

Male voice: . . . on the earliest incident . . . . . . of the . . .

Male voice: . . . of the pc . . .

 . . . earliest incident the . . .

Male voice: . . . and the pc . . .

 . . . the pc has now found . . .

Male voice: That's right.

Yes?

Male voice: When you run the When, All, Who . . .

Yeah.

Male voice: . . . When, All, Appear, Who, will he manifest something to indicate to you that everything in that incident has been cleared? Or do you run it several times?

You want to know how long to run this.

Male voice: That's right.

You want to know how long to run the withhold system on the earliest incident the pc has found. There are two questions to this. You want to—if it doesn't release and look like a toy balloon being punctured—you can tell when the basic goes because the rest of chain will go and the pc will usually manifest it emotionally. They say he-he, or they cognite or say, "Oh, well, yeah, hey, I never knew that!" See, there's a cognition goes along with it, there's a release of affect of some kind that goes along with it. They, "You know, I always thought that that tricycle was mine! 'Tisn't! I stole it!" You get that kind of thing. And it goes up the line and you find out that that's the end. There isn't any point in proceeding beyond that. As long as the What question nulls with it.

Now, you're talking about obnosis by the auditor. How long do you run this thing? Well, if it doesn't produce such an action, there is an earlier incident. So you don't run it very much. You run it just enough to open up the track to an earlier incident. See? You run it on the earliest until you can find an earlier. How many times is that? Well, on some pcs that will be three or four times. But on most pcs it'll only be once or twice. And then you're asking for the earliest, again. He's asking, you know, earlier incident. Oh, he says, he's really got the earliest now; it's at the age of forty.

You'll find some pcs go down this line sort of like a tent peg, you know, being driven into hard ground with a sledgehammer. You know, thud! thud! thud! you see? And other pcs, you didn't notice there was a crack in the ground and they went to the center of the earth. Swish! Where'd he go?

It depends to a large degree on how closely associated it is with the GPM. And if you're trying to pull something, right off the side of the GPM, you can expect it to go down awful hard. And the cognitions to be awfully tiny. And the number of times you use the withhold system to be numerous. But if it's a nice piece of free track, it goes boom! There's the earliest withhold system, once, twice. His tricycle all the time! Z-u-u-u-p. That's the end of stealing cars, see? And four minutes by the clock, see. The other's an hour and a half by the clock. You get the difference?

Male voice: Yes. Sure do.

So it's actually—varies. But it always winds up in a cognition. If it doesn't wind up in some kind of a cognition, the line never blows. Okay?

Male voice: One other—two other questions. If you say, "Is that all of that?" and he says, "Yeah, that's the lot," do you press for more?

No. That would be a double questioning and that would be a Q and A.

Male voice: I see.

He—you have asked him a question, he has answered it, that's a "give him a cheery aye-aye."

Male voice: Uh-huh.

Very often he'll give you these things out of sequence, see. He'll give them to you all out of sequence. He's already asked the question, at which time you're quite at liberty to omit the

one he has just answered. You say, "Well, when was that?" And he said, "Well, when George and I went down to the—(so on) and I didn't tell you about this, but there were three Fords there and they all had false bottoms," and so forth. Well, then you ask him, "What didn't appear?" because he just answered All.

This is a fluid system. It's very fluid in its application. You always ask them, When? And sometimes you don't get a chance to ask them, All? And sometimes they gratuitously tell you Who didn't find out about it. And you don't ask them right after they told you because that's an invalidation. And they—you say, "Well, what didn't appear?" "Well, Uncle George didn't appear and if he'd found out about it he would have killed me; fortunately he didn't." Your next question is When? See?

Male voice: Uh-huh.

It's a fluid system. And it depends to a large degree on the cognition in it.

Now, I will tell you this about Prepchecking. Once in a while an auditor gets unlucky. He just shouldn't have gotten up that morning at all and he asks this perfectly innocent question off of a form and finds out that he's going down through the middle of a coal mine that the pc observes nothing in. He has just unfortunately hit bing-gong-bang-thud, into the middle of the GPM. He's not about to clear any What question that he has anything to do with. See? It'll just slug, slug How far south is this thing going to go?

Well, actually, he can carry it back. He can carry it back. He can get the thing to release. He just shouldn't have ever asked that question. He just knows that. It's too rough.

And once in a while when you're in private practice, you'll skip one. You'll wish you hadn't, but you'll skip one and say, "Well, there wasn't any reason to have really flattened it because it was impossible to have flattened it." You'll say to yourself, "Well, I'll come back to it later after we've cleared him," or something of this sort. And your pc then, after that, will get sort of nattery. And you can expect the pc now to develop into sort of a nattery pc and the needle will get a little dirtier.

Well, when you do this trick—because everybody will do it sooner or later—I've done it— just remember that's what you did, and go back and grind it out. Grind it out.

But occasionally it's just lowering one down through the dark maw of the coal mine. The pc sees nothing, he cognites on nothing, he can remember nothing about it, the needle is still firing, there must be something there, he is terribly occluded, you have to run the withhold system five times on making a telephone call to find out if he could commit an overt. You know, I mean, it's just gruesome, see. Grind, grind, grind, grind. Because, of course, these— some of these chains have—are free and they're on parts of free track, you see? And some of these chains are right down the GPM line, du-du-du-du.

If there was any way of forecasting a chain being in the middle of the GPM line, you'd never ask the question in the first place. But, of course, you have to ask the question to find out that it is. And then you've had it! That's the liability of Prepchecking You should recognize that.

In answer to your question, it's a variable number of times. It depends on how arduous it is for the pc to get back earlier and blow the chain and that's it. Okay?

Male voice: Yes.

All right.

Male voice: There was one other question.

All right.

Male voice: If the What question is still reacting, can that be one of two things, either you haven't got the basic or the incident you were working on is not yet cleaned up?

You could have a tiny, tiny, little forerunner to the incident which you are trying to clear up that the pc hasn't seen yet. It's always—the answer's always a former incident.

Male voice: It's always . . .

It's always an earlier incident. But that earlier incident can be five minutes ahead of the earliest one you've found, see? So we don't say how much earlier this thing is. See, it could be a thousand years or five minutes. But if it doesn't blow you haven't got the earliest.

Now, there's one little exception to this rule: Is sometimes the pc thinks there's an earlier incident because he's been told so, when there isn't.

Male voice: Uh-huh.

And you saw such a case on a demonstration. Pc was convinced there was an incident at age four. There was no incident there. Simply checked it out on the meter and told the pc so. After that, why, the incident at the age of six blew and we didn't have any more trouble with that one. Okay? Answer the question?

Male voice: Yes.

All right. Well, that's it. We've crucified enough for tonight. Don't anybody commit suicide over this. Because, let me tell you, you can't put E-Meter cans in the hands of a corpse. Therefore, suicide isn't indicated. You understand. As long—as long as the person can still handle cans and still talk and we still have E-Meters, the situation can be saved. That's something for you to remember in years to come.

Thank you.