CASE REPAIR

A lecture given on
8 January 1963

Thank you.

Lecture two, 8 Jan. AD 13. Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. This is about case repair.

Now, I've given you a very pure rundown in the first lecture on the exact plot of what you can do with a case with listing and opposing and so forth. And if you were to do that – succeed in doing that and so forth – you would get a very miraculous gain on a case. This would be less mass as opposed to more mass.

Now, if you goof you will get more mass and things will become more solid and the first symptom of goofing is actually more mass. More mass has shown up on the case than was there before and consequently more R/S than was there before. Those are the things that you know you are going wrong with. You know you're losing with the case if on Tuesday you have more rock slams on the case than you had last Wednesday.

Let's say you went over the Scientology List originally and it had no rock slams on it, but from some other sources – 1A or some of the other list headings that we had like "What are you upset about?" – and you did a lot of that and you got a lot of packages, and then you go back to the Scientology List and you'll find out Scientology and Central Orgs and things like that are now rock slamming. The case is not improved up to a point where it can rock slam. The case actually has become massier and that is reflected in more rock slams than previously.

Now, you get these two symptoms of case worsening. These cases – case bettering, case worsening. You get these two aspects then – more mass and more rock slam – as being a worsening symptom.

Now, along with this is your best indicator for visual inspection of the pc is tone of the skin. Pcs get discolored skin tones. They go gray or green or yellow or black and this happens sufficiently rapidly to be noted in a session. Actually you can list a list wrong way to and sit right there and watch the mass close in on the pc and the pc gets blacker and blacker and blacker and at the end of the session the pc is more black than they were at the beginning of the session. Well, something is very wrong.

2-12 does not work that way, or Routine 2 does not work that way. They should be lighter. Their skin tone should be better. And actually it's about this – you should be able to tell halfway through a session whether or not their skin tone is better than at the beginning of the session.

Now, you can also tell with the eyes. And the eyes look like they have more sen on them halfway through a session than at the beginning of the session, I would check over what I was doing. I couldn't necessarily abandon it because it merely means they're running through a sen period or something like this. So the eye is not as reliable as skin tone.

Skin tone – inevitably, invariable a darkening or worse – off skin tone halfway through a session than at the beginning of a session shows that you're doing something very wrong. So you should learn to spot a pc's skin tone at the beginning of a session – at the beginning of auditing and get a fixed idea of what it is so that you could use that as a point of comparison. Beginning of the session take a look at your pc. Pc a light shade of yellow? Well, at least at the end of the session they should be a lighter shade of yellow not a darker shade of yellow, do you see that? So remember to pick up a point of reference by which you can compare what you are doing.

Now, the other symptom here is age and that is very easy to look at. Does the pc look older or younger? And that is also progressively easy to compare. It isn't whether the pc looks older at the end of an intensive than at the beginning of an intensive. It's not that gross. It's whether or not the pc looks older halfway through a session. See? And it's quite gross as a yardstick. You should be able to sit there and see the pc look slightly younger halfway through the session than at the beginning of the session if you're doing Routine 2 right. And the pc will look slightly older halfway through the session.

Now, this goes down to such a thing, and don't laugh now, but it goes down to such a thing as gray hair. Suzie used to be very amused at me on this because my hair would turn gray and turn red and turn gray almost at will. And this is quite easy to tell, but you see that a pc's hair is grayer at the end of an intensive than it was at the beginning of an intensive, why, something really went wrong.

Now, this also refers to mass. Now, that is a fairly – that is a less gross – age itself is very gross. That has big differences that you can see. But I'm just talking about this – it's just a little part of age, see? Weight is another factor and that goes – that's not quite as gross a yardstick – but weight goes something on the order of two, three sessions you should be able to markedly tell a weight improvement.

Now, the pc actually should weigh less. How much less can a pc weigh? Well, on some pcs who are obsessively thin and too light, actually a little more weight is an improvement, but you have to use your head on that one. But ordinarily, why, an increase of weight means an increase of mass.

Now, these are the things you tell by, because the graph is not available to the auditor midway in the session and midway in the intensive and so forth, so these are very precise mechanisms by which to tell improvement. But I'm talking about the auditor's mechanisms to tell improvement and they fall into just those categories, no others. Don't bother with any other categories. You can usually look over charts. You can usually look over the pc's auditor reports and find out if he made his goals. Well, if the pc has consistently made his goals in the session, why, you can conceive the pc is getting better, so forth. Those are indicators. But the things I have just told you about, such as skin tone and age, they're exclamation point. See?

They're right. They're clean-on. And mass, to a slightly lesser degree but very positively, is an indicator.

Now, all of these things add up to an auditor's observation of the pc.

Now, a meter should behave better. I don't say that a meter – a meter has a good way of behaving on a pc. I'm not trying to set that up as some hidden standard to you. But when you ask the pc for a withhold you get a response when the pc has one, you understand? Whereas last week when you asked them for a withhold you couldn't tell. In other words, it's simply a matter of the meter doing better by the auditor. This meter is easier to use, that's all.

Now, the needle's cleaner. Just – it's the meter is better for the auditor and it's always *for* the auditor. Meter behaves better. You don't have any meter trouble with this pc. See? You used to have meter trouble. Three sessions ago we had more meter trouble than we have now.

Now, height of tone arm or obsessive lowness of tone arm are alike indicators, but in actual fact Routine 2 doesn't give us a perfect score on the tone arm. The tone arm can almost be neglected. We're more interested in needle behavior than we are tone arm positions to show bettering in Routine 2. This tone arm can actually consistently ride at 5 with the pc getting better and better and better. That's interesting, isn't it? Not even tone arm motion means anything in Routine 2. So you list and get no tone arm motion; so you list and get tone arm motion. There is no adjudication can be made out of that. But sometimes you'll find an item that rock slams on the tone arm but that is so rare that we're not particularly worried about it.

But if, after a while, our E-Meter has not changed in its position we begin to worry about what's going on here, you understand? After a while. At the end of a – the pc has consistently ridden at 6 and we've gotten three packages and it's still at 6. Well, we conceive, then, that we must have been plucking things out of the air. Something here is not fundamental on this case. We conceive this pc still must have the PT problem the pc has. It isn't the pc isn't getting better. Yes, the pc looks better, the pc acts better, the pc does better, but he still must have some kind of a present time problem here or that mass that's giving that 6.0 wouldn't be that visible, you understand?

About that time we go back and review the living daylights out of the case. What would we review? We'd look for a wrong source on a list that should be completed. Now, the only one I'd worry about is the fellow that rode at 1.5 and we found two packages on the pc. Two packages, that's four items, and the pc still riding at 1.5, I'd sure review the living daylights out of that case and find out what earlier item because there's something here that's real weird. And if I didn't find anything and the pc is feeling better, and his skin tone was better and he looked younger, I'd go on and find another package. But I would treat the case with considerable *"hu-hu-hu-hu-hu-hu,"* you know? And sooner or later this pc's going to go *bzzzzt* and go up through 7 and around down the line. But if I didn't make it happen after a while I'd start worrying, you understand? That's all the tone arm means.

That the tone arm doesn't pump madly up and down while you're listing, that's nothing to worry about. It remains motionless while you're listing, that's nothing to worry

about, see. We don't care what the tone arm does. Needle, on the other hand, when we are listing wrong way to, the needle invariable is stiff and jerky and the longer we list the more jerky and active and *rrrrrerr* the needle gets, and that's wrong way to or wrong source. There's something really going on wrong here. Your needle behavior should soften up, loosen up and eventually when the list is complete and for some little time after that… You shouldn't just stop a list the moment it gets clean, by the way, it should go about, well, I don't know, as many as fifty items beyond that point.

A list will go clean before the item will get on the list. That will happen. So just because the needle stopped going dirty and so forth is no reason that the list is complete. I'd let it sit there and flow for a while. Not beating the pc up to a point where the pc goes into a super protest, but I'd get as many items on the list as I could. I would avoid short lists and after the list was complete avoid listing. When is the list complete? Well, when it can be nulled to one R/Sing item seen on the first nulling through that stays in and that's that, and the pc is happy with it and knows it's it. That's how long the list is.

These lists that go to twenty-two pages, twenty-five pages, forty-two pages are wrong source or wrong way to, either one or the other. They are just too long. Lists that run four pages should be quite adequate. Lists that run – I'm talking now about your big double pages where you have your – lot of them. My pages have about – only about twenty items on a page. I list five, six of those pages, that's plenty. If it goes much beyond this there's something wrong. The source is wrong or the list is wrong way to.

Now, don't go on listing forever on something and butchering up the pc. Your case repair should be done in time to avoid this sort of thing because you'll waste more time on a case running wrong on Routine 2 than you will on scrapping the lot. You can waste – the only time you really have a long time of it is when you're doing something wrong. And the funny part of it is, the wronger you are, the longer you'll take.

The right way is fast. The wrong way is long and slow. 2-12 being done right just goes swish, swish, thud, thud, *list-list-list-list-list-list-list-list-list-list. Pow! Pow! Pow!* Thing rock slams. *Pow, pow!* There's another rock slam. *List-list-list-list-list. Pow, pow!* There's another rock slam. *List-list-list-list-list-list.* Blang! There's one isolated rock slam! Blang! Whole page without any rock slams on it! Pc says, "I've just run out." You say, "All right, let's take a crack at it." Down the list *pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa.* All those items that rock slammed when you wrote them down no longer rock slam and you get to one toward the end of the list and it rock slams like crazy! *Bang-bang-bang-bang-bang-bang-bang.* You say it again, Bang-bang! You didn't Tiger Drill it, just *bang-bang-bang-bang!* And you take a look at it, and you say… I'll tell you what to do wrong at this time, I'll tell you what to do wrong. You say, "Well, that item R/Sed," to the pc and then call the next item. You just about knock the pc's head off every time. You finish nulling before you tell the pc anything. After you know for sure, tell him, and then keep your attention on the pc. Don't do anything else to find out if it's massier or less massy or what is going on, but don't shift the pc's attention after you've told him the item. Don't! There's the source of more ARC breaks and upsets. Pc is going to ARC break if it's the wrong item so stand by – stand by for boarders! Get your boarding nets out right there. Just prepare to say, "That's fine, thank you very much!"

He says, "Well, I don't know. I guess it's a great big item," and so forth. "I don't know what these lightning bolts are that are going. Yes, it must be the item because of these light – ," and so forth.

And you say, "Well, all right. That's fine. That's good. Thank you very much! All right. All right. All right. Well, just come to notice here this thing, this list appears to me to be just a little bit strong. Do you mind if I prove the item out by listing a bit further?"

"Oh, well, ha! Yes."

As a matter of fact every time you get "Oh, yes! Yeah, that's fine," see, it's a wrong item. You're going to list further when it is the item? *Pow!* Pc's skull all over the ceiling! Do you know what I mean? Pc knows it's his item.

All right. Now, what are these various manifestations? What do they amount to? They amount to auditor observation of the pc and auditor observation of the meter. If it is hard to do, you are probably doing something wrong. And if you're doing something wrong with Routine 2, you're not going to put it right with auditing. Just make up your mind to that. Make it up now! Because there just isn't any auditing process run in present time that can overcome the strength and power of one of these items in Routine 2. He's just not going to be able to make it. You can smooth the pc out, you can make it feel better, you can groom up Routine 2 with auditing and good auditing – there is no substitute for good auditing – but something goes wrong with Routine 2 it won't heal with auditing. So you better have your Routine 2 right. So if your sessions are just going all wrong don't look at the auditing. I don't care if you think the auditing was lousy. Don't look at the auditing. Look at the Routine 2!

So when do you repair a case? When it won't run right. Don't try to – don't try to make this case something new and strange and peculiar with auditing. You're not going to do it. Why, I'll give you an example! Last night I patched up an incomplete list with auditing to make the pc feel better – didn't know quite – quite know what to do about this thing. Pc completely unwilling to go on listing on it and yet obviously it's an incomplete list. *Hehheh.* What do you know about that? So I patched it all up – I got all – you just – very rapid Tiger Drill. It didn't take me any time and so forth, but I got the list question beautifully clean; big, beautiful, flowing needle. Pc today ARC broke. Didn't know about what; just ARC broke! Pc ARC broke. I said, "Well, obviously we didn't have the item on the list!" Pc brightened up at once, but last night was saying, "Well, it's a complete list and I can't think of any more." You know? Pc brightened up right now. Do you get the difference there?

All right. What is the commonest source of error in Routine 2? Wrong source is the commonest source. And what is the commonest source of wrong source? It is an incomplete list.

All right, does that mean a list you took from source? No. No. It means the source list was incomplete. Always regard, always regard any rock slamming item as having come from a list. There are no prime movers unmoved. You got that? The big worry of the Greek was how did God build the universe if nobody built God, see? Well, we haven't got that thing in lists. Lists inevitably and invariable are built. And even though they've never been listed, any item is viewed as having come from a list. You got it? Any item is viewed as having come

from a list. And that gives us one of the most imponderable pieces of nonsense anybody ever heard of, because you are inevitably and invariable starting a case, then, from a case that has somehow been started. Now do you see why you have trouble with the source?

But the three areas where the pc can be in trouble is in his life and livingness, in his parts of existence or in his session. Well, his session is a part of Scientology, and his life and livingness is a part of his life and his associations in present time, and parts of existence are what he has considered existence to be composed of.

So they give you three different areas. One is more backtrack than the others and that's the parts of existence – that's more backtrack. What's his life and livingness composed of? In other words, what is he associating with? What does he connect with in present time? What does he bang up against in his life and livingness present time? This is different than when is he banging up against in a session?

So you've got your present time of his life and livingness and you've got the present time of the session, do you see, and there's where you are at.

Then, of course, you've got all the parts of existence and that goes back on the whole track.

Now, there's all of your zones that are immediately available. There's present time life and livingness, there's session connections and that goes out to organizations and books and auditors and all that sort of thing, and then there's your third one of what is existence all composed of in his estimation for everybody.

Now, the one that is most intimate to the pc and will most prevent him is sort of a tossup between one and two. If he rock slams on auditors or an auditor, but is every day being invalidated by his wife and rock slams on a wife so in session he catches hell from the auditor and out of session he catches hell from the wife, which hot brick are you going to be pick – is going to be picked up first, because oddly enough both hot bricks have to be theoretically picked up at once, but that's impossible.

Well, let's at least let him get some help from the auditor. Now, you see why the arbitrary stress on List One existed. But see, equally, that somebody who rock slammed on three portions of List One was listing from a wrong source. Somebody had three rock slams on List One – obviously he's listing from a wrong source.

Now, to List One has also been adjoined parts of existence. So if he had three rock slams on parts of existence and two rock slams on List One he now has two incomplete lists. So your sources are being taken from two incomplete lists and those sources are not complete. The odd part of it is, is they might be mixed. That is to say it might be two lists under the heading of what you're calling List One but in the pc's estimation they should be two. They should be the technical aspects of Scientology and the administrative or organizational aspects of Scientology. See he might have them subdivided in some fashion. Well, how are you going to tell?

Well, this is the old Greek problem of the prime mover unmoved. All source item – you're taking one source as an item – that has to be regarded as having come from a list. That has to be regarded as having come from a list.

See, it's a list that never got written, but it's still regarded as having come from a list. So you're always starting from a list that has never been written.

There is always a list on the pc that has never been composed by the pc. The auditor's responsibility in this merely goes this far: He makes sure that the list source question does not rock slam because if it rock slams that means it's obviously part of a list and he can't use it.

I'm talking now about doing pure Routine 12 – Routine 2, that is absolutely grooved in that you'll never make a mistake with, see, have no trouble with. Let's say – let's say, offhand, that you're going to pick up, "What does present time consist of?" You've got to test present time. That's a source, isn't it? Present time actually belongs on the parts of existence list. But if it doesn't rock slam you're all right; you can represent present time. Therefore all lists start with a represent.

Your first list is always a represent list, but how do you find out what to represent? Well, sometimes you're going to lay an egg on this. You're going to say, "What does present time consist of?" and you're not going to get a rock slamming list. Whereas as you say, "In present time, do you have any problems?" and you do get a rock slamming list.

Now, let me give you a real imponderable imponderable. This is a real interesting imponderable. We say – we're going to assess now those little Zero Ones and we find one of them slamming. What does this mean? The slamming one is part of an incomplete list and we don't have any way of knowing whether or not it is the final item on the list or not, so we avoid it like a plague or we run a list. How many list headings could there be?

Then after a while we check "list" and find out it's slamming. We're wrong. That's wrong. Got more slams than you started with. You did something wrong. You missed. You always wind up with slams but they shouldn't be as frequent, they should be getting less frequent. Do you see the problem?

So "reasonable about" slams. You say, "Aha!" – the way we were thinking before, see, I'm trying to make life comfortable and livable for you, which I think you'll have put your vote in for – those of you who aren't rock slamming on yourselves will vote for this.

We find "Reasonable about" slams like crazy, so what do we do with it? *Ho, ho.* We get out of there, man. We've two things we could do, theoretical: One, we could complete the list of what is a list – what is a list heading; but the best thing to do is to take something that is not in its immediate vicinity or instantly and immediately associated with. "What would you be reasonable about?" You wouldn't ask that question at all. You don't dare pose it because you see you don't know that it's the item on the last list.

All right, let's supposing that you found out that this character slams like mad on Scientology. Well, obviously if he slams on Scientology there is something wrong with the session. There is something going to be wrong with this session, obviously. So, therefore, it's very much in your interest to put together the session list. But can you say at this stage of the

game, "What does Scientology – who or what does Scientology consist of?" Oh, no, because you're doing a represent on a rock slamming item, you see, there's your enigma. So what kind of a question are you going to use to get a Scientology list from? Well, you could ask this, you could say, "What question, if I ask it to you, would cause you to answer it 'Scientology'?" That at least gives you an anatomy of how you would go about it, you see. You've got to work the problem out backwards. You've got to have some other thing. You just can't say, "What does Scientology consist of?"

Now, once in a while you've got to check your source. So you ask your source once in a while and watch your meter and that's the best way to do it. Don't get so TR0ed that you ignore the meter, see. There's no sense in saying, "Who or what does present time consist of?" see, with good TR0, you know? No good at all, see? "Who or what does present time consist of?" with your meter centered up there to see whether or not you get a slam. This thing starts to slam, you're in trouble. "Present time" slams.

Well, I'll tell you a mistake you could make. Saying, "Aha, 'present time' slams, let's oppose it." Cut your throat, man. That's prime mover unmoved that you're looking for and it doesn't exist. Present time must be coming from a list.

Now, you could chase this thing backwards, of course, and say, "What question would I have to ask you for you to answer 'present time' to?" and get a list on which "present time" would occur. You may find yourself doing that some time or another because the pc keeps laying dead horses, see?

But this is your – this is the enigma. "Present time" began to slam, you'd better get out of there man, you'd just better just quit that right now because you're getting more rock slams than you had before. Didn't slam, now it does slam equals wrong source. Bank must be beefing up. See, you can work your way through that one rather easily. Didn't slam, now it does slam; something's wrong. It isn't that the pc unsuppressed, so what you've got to do is find a negative question that will produce rock slams – a negative rock slam question that produces rock slams – that's the whole trick and that, sometime or another, is going to be found to be quite a trick to you.

Now, you go back on the dynamics of existence of the pc and you find an arbitrary – this is case repair now – you go back and you find an arbitrary assessment of the dynamics and somebody took a "whiffinpoof" as parts of existence, you see, under living things there were "whiffinpoofs." Aw, more than that, let's say the pc rock slammed on groups and the pc rock slammed on mankind. You've had it. Two R/Ses on that third type of list, and you'd better say, "What are the parts of existence?" son, and you'd better complete that list and again it's "What question would I have to ask you for you to write all the dynamics down on?" And maybe the pc also slams on the second category, which is "session material" and "dynamic slams," so you have to get the session straightened out before you can straighten out the parts of existence.

You might find yourself in some silly circumstances here of some kind or another but you'd be able to work them out if you just realize that you had to have a virgin negative slam item to proceed from which if it began to slam tells you that you are wrong. In view of the fact

you've got three zones from which these things could come, there it is. There's the present time life and livingness of the individual, the session present time and sessions in general and Scientology and all its ramifications and then there's parts of existence as a whole which tends to give us bank and whole track. You've got three sources to work on. You've got positive and negative for these three sources and you should be able to turn yourself out quite a bunch of packages.

If you found some raw meat out on the street that was in trouble all you would have to say to that person is, "Present time, present time." And they'd say, "What? Well, what about present time?" And you didn't get a rock slam on it, you see? And you'd say, "Well, I just wanted to know what present time consists of." No rock slam, it's okay. And you write a big, cracking, long list about what does present time consist of and you carry it out, but when you null it you only get one R/S and you get one and continue it until you only get one R/S on nulling and, just like I gave you before, and you find out that a package is a terminal or oppterm, list it both ways to find out if you get a loose needle, and what have you got? You wind up with a perfect package. It'll go *whizz!* No mass. What happened? Where did it go? Where'd they go?

Actually, the fellow will improve and get an awful lot of ideas and so forth even if you miss, which is kind of wonderful. But why miss? Why not get the full gain the first time. I'm just talking what you do to a raw meat person.

All right, supposing present time consists of, and "consists of" was *brrrrrr.* You'd say, "What did you just think of?" "Oh, nothing; what you're saying." You say, "Consists of," *brrrrrrrr.* You'd better find some other question to ask.

"Present time – what do you connect with?"

"Present time – what do you connect with?" No R/S.

There we go. Do you understand? Or you could go back and say, "What would be the list heading of a list on which the word 'consists of' would appear?"

You might be able to actually, to figure out some way to work it out.

You've got a slamming item so you know you'd have a slamming list. Either way to, you'd wind up with a complete list and that's what you want.

Now, that's raw meat.

Now, supposing somebody is – absolutely will not under any circumstances get an R/S on parts of existence. Well, you've still got the negative side to try. "What isn't part of existence?"

Supposing he just having an awful time, oh, he – it's nothing but dead horses and he doesn't get anyplace in session and he's crying all the time about it and he's chop-chopping the auditor 100 percent and you haven't even started anything so how could you have missed anything on him, you know? And it's all this and that and he's had a terrible bad history and he had some 8-C run on him back in 1949 before it was invented and… I'd assume about this

time that he was a rock slammer on List One, see, and that he isn't going to get anyplace until we do a List One type of list.

Now, the job is how do we work out a List One type of list heading that itself doesn't rock slam. And that's going to change from pc to pc, so I just hand it to you as a problem.

Now, let's say he doesn't rock slam on that list. Oh! Well, let's shift it slightly and ask the negative. See?

"What isn't part of the activity us guys are engaged in?" Slam, slam, slam, slam, *slams* all the way down. You find Scientology isn't part of Scientology. Now, you've got your item, whatever it was. But it's still the last item on that list – the last R/Sing item on the list.

These are your methods of introduction into cases. Now, remember that a case has got to be able to answer an auditing question for Routine 2 to run on. The interest is usually so great that even an untrained pc usually falls right into it and answers up very, very well. However, sooner or later you're going to run into somebody who wont answer any questions at all and sooner or later, I don't say under what conditions they'd be under, or why, because I've seen it run on, now, little kids and everything else, and people who wanted nothing to do with processing and all that sort of thing. I've seen all the stylized cases, the types of cases that couldn't have been run on earlier processing, running on this. But I just say in fun, let's say we – supposing we have this person and they can't give you a list and they can't list anything and they can't do this and they can't do that. I think they'd be booby-hatch types, you know, strictly booby-hatch, or perhaps members of the government or something like that, see? You know, utterly unreal dogs, and you've still got all of your – you've still got all of your background music on your CCH type processes and all that sort of thing. You'd be surprised what that stuff can do. So you've still got a case entrance – see, we're still talking about case entrances – you've still got a case entrance.

All right. Now, how about a case that's been run for a long time with wrong sources, wrong way to, and every time anybody said this was the item, a four-foot-thick block of concrete showed up and knocked out their front teeth. Is there any hope for this person? It's pretty sad. Actually, the funny part of it is that even a random slam taken amongst five slams and opposed just as a list, would have cured somebody from being so edgy in sessions as long as that list was complete, see. But it would have given them a bit more mass and it would have made them unhappy but it might have made them auditable.

You understand? We're very far from invalidating what we have been doing.

How about this guy who already has six packages? All right, so he's got six packages. Fine. Probably doing better than he was. Everything's fine. So he's got six packages. Nobody's – I'm trying to show you now how you can undercut it. And every place it went wrong it will wipe out with a *bzzz*. And that's simply find the first incomplete list. You understand, even though it's a suppositional list that appeared on the case. Now that could be 3D Criss Cross. See? What didn't he agree with or something, see? Could have been. Could have been. But it's much more likely to be these arbitrary lists – the Dynamics or List One – and you treat those as incomplete lists. Look them over. So one of them had two slams on it, must have been an incomplete list. In other words, just start from there.

Get some kind of a list question that itself doesn't rock slam, test it and complete that thing. Now, what do you have to do? Do you have to go back and null it all? Well, no, usually, if things that were marked in that R/Sed on it before. So you only have to take those – so you just add to it and null what you've added and then try to tiger drill alive afterwards what was there originally. So you don't null all the way through everything and so forth. But look, it's a simpler test than that. If, while adding to it, you get a rock slam, you have two choices: That was either the item that just went by or you're getting more rock slams than you had before.

Well, one of the ways to test it very thoroughly is to keep on listing, and let's list a page on which we get two rock slams, then we list the next page on which we get three. *Di-di-di-di-di-di.* Something wrong. It's either wrong source or wrong way to. Got that?

Well, you again take a grip on the situation and turn it around the other way and list it the other way and your needle goes loose. So that meant it was just wrong way to and your source is probably all right. But let's turn it around the other way and have the needle misbehave just as thoroughly. Brother, that's really wrong source. When it won't list right either way and your needle is just raising hell with you and it isn't cleaning up and so forth, that's wrong source.

So *in extremis* you've even got a test for wrong source – is: either way to, it won't list. You only have to list a page or so to find that out. You don't have to list forever to find this out.

All right. Now, as we examine the – as we examine the case, then, for case repair, we want to get rid of all of the dust and nonsense, all of the bric-a-brac, all of the items that are solid and all of the bad auditing and all of the mid ruds and all of the this's and all of the thats that has occurred on the case so far. All we've got to do is to go back and find the earliest list and complete it, that can be completed. That's all we have to do. And find the right item for that list – find the last, single one R/Sing item, oppose it and take off and go ahead and do a package. And you'll find a lot of bric-a-brac will drop off the case if that thing was really completed as a package. See? Both lists were nicely completed.

You find this bric-a-brac that the pc had been complaining about on some of that later stuff that came from that wrong source. Well, let's say it was a List One and they'd gotten a lot solider stuff on opposing Scientology. And you went ahead and completed List One in the pc's own words and found something else, and that was rock slamming and then you opposed that, Scientology, and any list proceeding from Scientology, drops out. They become null. Simple?

In other words, it eradicates itself. So if any of the pc's packages are wrong why bother to check up whether the packages are right or wrong? Just find your earliest list – your earliest incomplete list that can be completed and complete it and proceed right from there.

Now, you'll find that lists have genus, they generate from something, and you only examine the generators of lists. This is the easiest way to repair a case. You don't go over endless lists that have been listed on the pc. You only look where the list came from – where did the item come from. And you're usually examining and completing understood lists, lists

that have never been listed. See? Like List One, he never listed List One. Parts of existence, he never listed the parts of existence. He took a canned package of dynamics, don't you see? So you've got to complete that dynamic list. You've got to complete List One. Or you've got a 3D Criss Cross list of some kind or another and he was busy listing what didn't he like. Gosh, there are a lot of rock slamming items. And after that the pc got on it "judges" and the pc still talks about this one. Well, if the pc still seems interested in this one is no indicator whatsoever that it was right. That's no index. Because if it's still slamming after all this time, even though it was opposed at that time, it must have been an item which was on an incomplete list.

So all you've got to do is complete the list from which "judges" came, get it properly opposed, and the package goes *bzzz,* and you'll never hear him open his yeep about judges again.

So where the pc's interest hangs up is a sure index of an incomplete source list. This is a tricky thing. You say to a pc – I've told you all this trick now so it probably won't work on you very well – but, you say to a pc, "Now, we've really found quite a few items on you, now, from time to time, which one are you still most interested in so we can do something about it?"

"Well, I'm still interested in goats, we found goats on that list and I find them very fascinating." And his eyes get somewhat lambent and the slits lengthen, you know? Well, you don't want to do anything about goats, don't oppose goats! God help you, don't oppose goats! I've already put this into great practice, see. No, let's find out what list goats appeared on. It was an understood list or an actual list or otherwise. But let's find out what that list was, and if we possibly can, complete that list to its proper item and oppose that proper item to – with a complete list that packages in the total knowingness of the pc and go *bzzzz,* and then you say to the pc, "Ah, all right, what – how do you feel about this 'goats *'?"*

"What about it?"

"Well, how do you feel about goats?"

"Well, goats, goats, goats. How do you feel about goats? I suppose I've been one at one time or another, hasn't everybody?" No interest.

Now, let's say the item which we did find on the thing was "milk pails." You say, "How do you feel about milk pails?" Hell say, "Ha-ha-ha-ha, yes. Yes, sure gave me hell during the war." You just milked a little bit of cognition on the milk pails, see. Every time you mention the real item to him, why, hell give you a cognition. He won't discuss it with you. He won't have an opinion about it, but it still is not effective on him. In other words, that's an erasure. It's an erasure of interest. He can always cognite on it.

He often had time – a hard time remembering the right items, but they always remember the wrong ones because, brother, they're stuck there in pillars of stone.

Now, these are all indicators and indexes and so forth, but you can use these various indicators I've just given you for all kinds of case repair.

Now, I want you to forgive me for giving you a process which could be done wrong or that could have a limited application or could have this or have that, but I won't forgive you if you think I've invalidated all of everything we've done because I actually have no intentions of doing so and I don't want to and I'm certainly not invalidating what packages have been found on you. Packages that have been found on you did some good. Now, if they stay erased when you complete a list some place, fine. They won't beef up, so that's dandy.

But there's one thing that you have taught me is that we needed a faster, harder set of indicators, a better set of indexes to telegraph to the auditor this and that, and we needed to reach just a little deeper technically in order to get a pure, sure – fire gain out of these things. All right. I've been working for a couple of weeks now watching you sweat around. I've been working for a couple of weeks' improvement. I recognized a couple of weeks ago that you weren't about to get some of these lists straightened out. And I started to say, "All right then, on all cases we have to cut to the ultimate and we have to get back to an ultimate foundation and begin from there and so forth or auditors are going to have a hard time with it."

All right, that's fine. But this is gain. Now, what you realize that you should be realizing here is you're actually simply opening up the present time problems, knocking them out, and knocking out the hidden standards, because these things have been stopping clearing in some enormous-majority percentage of cases. These are the important things that bar clearing. These are the barriers. And that's why I've been working on Routine 2 stuff. You actually probably could keep on getting packages if you could keep on getting sources. You could probably go right on back down the track and you'd finally hit the rock and opprock, and there'd be the guy's goal.

All right, fine. There's easier ways to do it. You can clear away the chaff from PT and untangle the GPM, you can get back there and find the rock slamming goal and run it and life becomes much easier. But of course, remember that pieces of the GPM can still key in after you have found the goal and you can still bypass items, you can still miss things, you can still do this and still do that but if PT is cleaned up and if things are knocked out of present time consistently that are going to barrier the pc onto a free needle and so on, even with more Routine 2, he's going to clear easily. So long as you've got Routine 2 you can always find an entrance point. That's the purpose of Routine 2.

You haven't got a devil's chance of finding the goals on a lot of cases without clearing away those two things: the chronic PTPs and the hidden standards. You haven't got a prayer. And if you did find the goal you haven't got a prayer of running it because the PTP will clonk-bang in on him and wipe it out.

Now, therefore, we've got to keep a wide-open track on the pc and therefore the use of Routine 2 does not necessarily cease on having found the pc's goal. You might run everything his goal influences in present time and package it up and the things his goal doesn't influence in present time and package that up and he's going fine and he seems to be getting free needle. Then all of a sudden he hits some terminal, like somebody did in Perth the other day, motion with exclamation points, or something, hangs up like mad, can't quite see which way he's going, whole thing caves in, goal read disappears and now he doesn't know what is happening and so forth. Ah, well, you don't know that the pc simply hadn't caved in on a brand-new

present time problem. And instead of spending hours and hours and hours of prepchecking, you've got another weapon called Routine 2. You just use Routine 2, not with any difference at all. You don't change Routine 2 just because you're running it on somebody who is back down the line, see, on a goal. No, you just assume that something's caved in on this pc in PT or something.

So you just, "What does present time consist of?" That's all, see? And you're off to the same races. Or "What doesn't it consist of?" or "What does auditing consist of?" Or, she's a temple priestess and all of a sudden, by George, by George, there's only one way to get Clear, see, and that's by jumping into the maw of the flames. Everything hangs up, there are no flames or something.

See? The pc – the pc has, perhaps, missed an item in goals clearing. Now, everything that applies to straightening up lists also applies to your Routine 3-21, everything I've told you about it. Everything I've told you about having a list complete applies to 3-21. You do a list from a goal, you've got to get down to one rock slamming item.

Now, one of the hardest things you will use to get a rock slamming item from is a goals list. Let me put this two cents' worth in. Goals lists almost never run out of rock slams. When they do, fine, but they behave just like any other list of items. They don't behave any other way.

Let's say you had a lot of slams early on a goals list and then had one slam late on the goals list that's still slamming, see?

All right, in that case you could take that last goal and oppose it because it's just an item from a list, if you want to call it that. The funny part of it is, because the pc skips all over the place with a goals list and can run all over the bank with a goals list, you get some very wonderful complications with these goals lists and probably the hardest list to straighten out for a purpose of doing Routine 2 with, but not goals, of course, is a goals list. It's the spottiest and the least satisfactory of them. But you will still some day be prepared to find the earliest list done on the pc, a goals list, which has – now has only one rock slamming goal on the end of it and use that to oppose and the whole case blossoms.

Now, remember that a rocket read is senior to a rock slam. And for your purposes you do everything with a rocket read that you'd do with a rock slam, except the rocket read is accepted above it.

Let's say you have four rock slamming items on a list when you start to null. Boy, you're not about to have a complete list so you complete the list and get it down to one rock slamming item and there it is, beautiful, single. You go back and find out those four no longer have rock slams on them. You've now got your item. This is fine. It follows through all tests. It doesn't generate a lot more mass – it generates some pain, sen or something like that, but not lots more mass – and you go ahead and you oppose that properly and you get your list out and you find that item and it all blows up. Fine. That's just Routine 2.

But what if you found four rocket reading items on the list? You better complete the list to one rocket reading item. This has already happened, by the way, and they had four rocket reading items on one list. And I told the auditor to complete it – a Saint Hiller, just left

here a short time ago – and I told the Saint Hiller to complete it. He went ahead and completed it and he found one rocket reading item and the other rocket reads disappeared.

Now, that's perfectly valid for opposition. It's also valid for goals finding. You can do a lot with a rocket reading item, so you mark those down rather special in caps. But remember that the four – that more than one rocket read on a list – now we get something complicated whereby you have three rock slams and two rocket reads on the same list – well, what's perfectly answerable is the rocket read is senior.

But all those rock slams and earlier rocket reads have got to disappear before you accept that last rocket read. You got it?

Anyway, there's your case repair factors.

Now, I've tried to give it to you in such a way that you don't have to memorize 8,645 bulletins. But I'll still write all those bulletins for you to memorize anyhow just so you can't miss it.

The – now, to show you how you can make mistakes, you can take a perfectly elementary case, sail down with enormous cockiness, be just absolutely grooved in and you know you're just sailing, you've got the first item and the pc is singing and everything is fine and then you get your opposition list. And you get down the line on the opposition list *pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa* and there was one rock slam and there was two rock slams and there was three rock slams. And that was the first page. And on the second page there was one rock slam and there was two rock slams and there was three rock slams and there was four rock slams. So on the third page there's one rock slam and two rock slams and three rock slams and four rock slams and five rock slams. And on the fourth page you have rock slams.

The funny part of it is your needle, because you've picked the case up to the stars by finding the right item, doesn't cave in, and neither does the pc. The pc just becomes a little doubtful or something like that, and you say, "Well, it's merely anxiety." You're listing the list wrong way to. The needle is so beautiful that you don't notice it. You say, "Well, it's better than I've ever seen a needle on a pc before." Well, list it the other way to and the needle would still be looser. You've got to watch it.

But this test of the frequency of rock slam, I think you will find quite valid because it says the pc's bank is beefing up by reason of the listing. Of course, we expect sometimes the list to go a page, a page and a half, before the first rock slam occurs; Then we expect a whole spate of rock slams. That's quite normal. But down on the last page we don't expect the rock slams to be more frequent than they were on the second or third page of the list. That tells us we've got a wrong way to.

Now, if our first line was so beautiful and came out so lovely, we certainly aren't dealing with a wrong source. We're just dealing with a wrong way to list, you see? Everything checked out and there we were. But if we still listed it the other way to and couldn't make sense out of it, then we would decide that that list just before that we just did, that we grabbed the item prematurely. And the way to test that is to add to the list and see if some new rock slams came about. We might find that that was the one that was wrong way to.

You see how we could straighten it out? We'd have to be pretty knuckleheaded to be wrong, but be prepared to be wrong. Be prepared to be wrong. Don't be so persistently, cockily right when you are so horribly, devastatingly wrong. And always straighten out Routine 2 before you straighten out auditing. Spend ages straightening out Routine 2 and briefly straightening out auditing. If your auditing is perfect and you never have to straighten out auditing with auditing, your Routine 2 is perfect, the auditing is very, very rapid. But the paramount importance is get the Routine 2 done first.

All the cases that are here at this particular moment are easily straightenable just by the rule of finding the first understood list – the list that was never listed from which you took an item. I mean just if we went back to that.

We didn't even have to go back to 3D Criss Cross or anything, see. I mean, just if we did that, we would be in clover. We take List One. What's the question that would complete List One? We simply complete List One, get all the rock slams off List One down to one rock slam, oppose that, then everything that has gone wrong earlier on the list fades out. Got that?

I think that takes care of most of the cases present. You talk about case repair, that's about all the case repair there is. Sometimes an item has been found as the single rock slamming item on a list and it's never been opposed! You'll find that kind of thing going on. I know one case right now where that is true. All kinds of assessments have been done since. Here's this bypassed item sitting back there, see?

All right. Well, I hope you have good luck in straightening these out. I think you're getting to be much better auditors and I want to give you one small compliment you turned me in a whole bunch of papers on what you do with case repair and in the understanding – in the complete understanding that you had at that time – the incomplete understanding which had been issued to you at that time – the case repairs which you advised were right on the button. I had to then make up my mind and realize that you could learn even a complicated a procedure as you were handling and that you could repair a case under the headings of that complicated procedure then.

I was very happy to know that and I got very proud of you and I even said it in a bulletin a short time ago.

So, thank you very much.