FLATTENING A PROCESS AND THE E-METER

A lecture given on
1 June 1961

Here we are. I think this is the first of June. What planet is this?

All right. All right. This is a seminar, the Briefing Course at Saint Hill. Now, what questions do you have today? Yes?

Female voice: Is it possible for us in TR on Model Session to have some training in the meter, because I found yesterday that an auditor I had, just hadn't got this. And I kept feeling "If she doesn't look at that meter, she's going to miss this fall." And . . .

Yeah, that's right. I get that myself once in a while when being audited. You know, I say, ''Well, where are we? Just where are we?" Because the auditor is sitting there doing an obsessive TR 0. He's not doing TR 0; he's doing obsessive TR 0, you see? Which means to them, ''Look at the pc. Look him between the eyes before you shoot him,,, or something. And this obsessive TR 0-you find this mostly in recent HPA students. They really go mad on this. They never do get themselves between the meter and the pc, you know?

You can actually confront a pc, you know, by looking at a meter. Did you know that?

Well, anyhow, anyhow, that is a good point that you have brought up. Now finish your question.

Female voice: Well, that's all. Is it possible for us to have that incorporated at a late stage as part of the TR O in training in Model Session?

I should say that would be perfectly all right. I'd say it would be a sort of a high-school version of it. You give the fellow a meter and let him have the meter in his lap while he's doing confronting.

The coach, however, is not on the meter. And the only time this was ever suggested, it was suggested that the coach hold a meter with the pc not on it. I never quite got why the coach would be holding a block of wood which looked like a meter. That was the exact earlier one. It didn't have anything to do with it.

But a block of wood or anything that had mass and weight, while doing TR 0, I'd say would be an upper-stage TR 0 and would be a very good thing to do. And while running Model Session and so forth, why, have a meter parked around. This would be a good thing Your suggestion is very well taken. Your question is answered ''yes.,,

Okay. Any other questions? Boy, I'm glad you're that smart. Gee, I'm glad you're that smarts a great deal of conversation around this particular point down through the years, trying to establish this and bring it home or develop some kind of a system by which the communication would become adequate. That communication has been developed and is found in E-Meter Essentials. You run the pc on the tone arm.

Now, there is an exception to this; there is an exception to this called the rock slam. And I will cover the rock slam as the exception in a moment, but don't think that I am not aware of this odd exception (and it isn't an exception).

But as long as the tone arm is waving about on a process, you are guilty of a breach of the Auditor's Code if you leave that process before the tone arm is motionless or nearly so. Now, we can communitate that, can't we? In other words, that E-Meter will sit there and it will tell you whether or not a process is flat.

Now, something can intervene in this. A pc between sessions . . you should always notice where a pc reads before he goes out of session and notice where he is reading when he comes back into session. Because if the reading has materially changed . . he's gone out and played with mud pies; and you'd better find out about it because he's got a withhold from the auditor and so forth.

That's the first and commonest error, by the way, of flattening a process. The pc goes out between sessions or even during a break, in an HGC, maybe goes, calls up her husband in Cincinnati or something of the sort and says, "Dear, I've just decided that you're the dirtiest, filthiest skunk I have ever heard of." Comes back into session again and that tone arm is reading 6.5, or it may even be reading 7.0.

You know, when a pc can't read on the meter, he is simply reading at 7.0 and that's not even a joke. Seven is between 1.0 and 6.0. And you'll occasionally find somebody who (quote) "won't read on a meter." Well, it's just due to: the mechanics of the tone arm don't turn through 7.0.

Responsibility increases from 2.0 to 1.0 to 7.0 to 6.0. And you're going to find a pc every now and then . . it's not as rare as you think, running the hot bombs you're running . . reading at 7.0.

All right. So let's say the pc was . . went off the meter. This is the most baffling thing I've ever seen happen to an auditor. The pc is ordinarily reading at about 5.07 comes back on and isn't reading anyplace on the meter. And the auditor is liable to report the meter broken or something of the sort. Well, it's just a fluke. The pc has begun to read at 7.0. All right. Seven doesn't read on this meter, you see?

Seven is actually higher in responsibility than 1.0.

So anyhow, there ought to be a 7.0 on the meter. Okay. There is that variation.

Now, as this pc goes out of session reading at 5.0 and comes back into the session not reading on the meter at all or reading 6.0, or more ordinarily goes out reading at 3.0 and comes back into session reading 5.0, and you just go on running the process; the process isn't running. Why? Because something has happened to the pc that's given him this present time problem, and so forth. And the whole thing about that is your rudiments are out.

So therefore, when you stop sessions and give breaks and start sessions after these breaks, you always start the thing with Model Session. This keeps you from making these flumdumptious errors, don't you see? So it's always a good thing to end rudiments before you're going to have a break and start rudiments after you've had a break. I don't care whether it's a lunch break or a cigarette break, see? As long as the pc has gone out of your sight during that break, you're going to have to run end ruds and beginning rudiments. All right.

Therefore, this won't get in the road with your flattening a process. See, because that could be a vagary and throw this whole computation out. The pc is running; the tone arm is waving madly back and forth. You have a break, comes back; the tone arm isn't moving.

You say the process is flat and then you go on and assess for a new process. And now you have a level left unflat on the case and a pc being audited with a present time problem. You see, the solution to that is always keep your rudiments in; that is the smartest possible thing. Always keep your rudiments in.

Okay. Now, if you inevitably and invariably do this, you'll be all right. And this rule applies, then, of: you run a process as long as it produces tone arm motion. That tells you whether or not the process is flat.

Now, this little rule about a quarter of a tone or a half a dial, or something like that, is a safety factor. It won't trouble the pc and it won't assess again if it has gotten down to reading a quarter to an eighth of a dial of motion. You won't find that level again as hot. You understand?

If you leave it that way for about twenty minutes . . you know, it's just moving that little bit over a period of twenty minutes . . you can safely leave the process. That's the rule.

Now let's see how the rule is got around. There is lots of ways to get around these rules, and this is the one which has now come up. And this is being done everywhere broadly and with the maddest abandon imaginable. Now that we have a way to flatten the process, we have abandoned the idea that it takes a process any time to get working So you can run five processes in an afternoon if none of them ever started to work and leave five processes unflat in a single afternoon's auditing. And it has just been done.

London is just staggering around from "ARC breaks from Ron" and unable to flatten "O/W on Ron" today. That's just literal truth. They're having an awful time because Ron came down at 12:20 last night, getting the last reports, and found . . ooo! I spent an hour taking it apart and so forth. I found that pc after pc had just been run level after level. I couldn't let it happen one more day, could I? You certainly couldn't have put another five-and-a-half-hours' worth of unflat processes on it.

And somebody just actually took their finger totally off their number, and even though this has been part and parcel, occasionally on remarks, they had not caught it as it went by.

When a pc has to read or be assessed with a fairly high sensitivity knob to get a third-of-a-dial drop, this is always true, and it's occasionally true on other pos. This is a rough pc, now. That's some pc that reads with a high sensitivity knob to get a third-of-a-dial drop; that is, a pc that has a very low profile when he comes in. Any one of these conditions, not all of these conditions, have to be present to make this true. And it also may be that you're just running an awfully sticky level on any pc. You got the idea?

So this could happen at any time, that you assess for a process, and then the first three hours of run on it don't really produce any tone arm motion except a quarter to an eighth of a dial of motion, which of course is the definition for a flat process.

Well, let me ask you this: Why did it fall on assessment in the first place? What mystery do we have here?

Now, only a person who has got an occasionally floating needle, who is getting right up straight toward Clear, can possibly flatten one of these things down in minutes. You'll notice as a person is coming through toward Clear that they do flatten them in minutes, but then it becomes very obvious. The tone arm actually stops moving and it doesn't stick. It simply stops moving, with a fairly free needle. And it wouldn't do a bit of harm to overrun the process. Case is in a kind of condition to take it, you understand?

But these fellows that are . . get these jerky tone arms and have a fairly sticky needle and have different reactions of various kinds will increase in read during the first period of auditing the new level. They'll increase in read, and then they'll get good tone arm motion. And then the tone arm motion will die out. And then, when it has read for twenty minutes for an eighth to a quarter of a dial of motion, it is flat.

So that is the whole statement . . with the one exception which I will take up in a moment. That is the whole statement. In other words, motion quite often has to be run into the tone arm before it can be run out. You got it? And if a thing assessed and you didn't get any motion from the tone arm and you know this pc is not in marvelous condition yet and so on, boy, you just better keep running it.

And you . . funny thing, you should ask yourself this question: "Why is it that hour after hour I can run this thing and it gets an eighth to a quarter? Why?" Well, it must be running something See, eighth to a quarter, eighth to a quarter, eighth to a quarter, so forth. It isn't tightening up.

The other phenomenon that you're trying to avoid is the needle freezing. Now, when a process is overrun on a bad-off case, the needle will freeze. The first symptom of this, you're entitled to know, is a rising arm, not a rising needle . . forget rising needles . . but you got a rising arm.

This pc has just been running along fine with a half of the tone arm dial division of motion. Been running dandy. Sometimes full division, sometimes a division and a half, sometimes a half a division, you know? I mean, it's just going along. And it's all between 3.0 and 3.25 on the tone arm dial, see? Between 3.0 and 3.25 here.

All right. We look at this and it's 3.0 . . it's going 3.0, 3.25; maybe it'll go up above, see . . 3.0, 3.25, so on, like this and here we go. And we . . all of a sudden, 4.0, 4.25, 4.0, 4.25, 4.0, 4.5 and we say, "Boy, that was a nice move."

Test it for twenty minutes because it's liable not to be that stick; it's liable to blow down, see? But the first symptom of a flattening process is a rising tone arm.

Now, there are some auditors around trying to prevent tone arms from rising or thinking they've boo-booed if the tone arm starts rising. As a case is entered into processing originally, you will see this as the first... Maybe some of the mystery of how I know whether or not your . . the level you're running on the pc is flattening out will explode under just this one fact: It's the fact you've started to get higher reads consistently, see? In the last hour you've been getting higher reads and those higher reads didn't blow down.

Now, if the higher reads were going to blow down, they would ordinarily have blown down in about twenty minutes or so. You see, they would have acted.

But that, as it drifts up first from a very minute motion. . . This is the actual behavior on the flattening of a process on a pc who is not . . he's not up even to Release yet, is quarter, quarter, quarter, an eighth, eighth, quarter, quarter, quarter. And then all of a sudden you start getting it up, and it goes up about a dial. And then it goes little bit, little bit, quarter, quarter, quarter.

Boy, then it's the danger point, because this thing can actually go up to 6.0 suddenly and go clank! And you can practically hear the thing go clank.

Now, there's no danger in it going clank. There is no danger in it going clank and suddenly sticking and you going on auditing it that way for twenty minutes. It is just going to make the pc uncomfortable. It's going to make the pc uncomfortable and you're going to have to reassess and you're probably going to have to reassess with difficulty because the bank is kind of froze up. That's the most that'll happen to you.

If you were to run this for three days, sitting at 5.0 on a total freeze, as an auditor has done . . two days, this was done by an auditor. And of course, my God, you couldn't have assessed the case; you couldn't have done anything with the case except one thing: run the auditor off on the Prehav Scale. The auditor will assess.

Did you know that an auditor will always assess when he has boo-booed? You know, you can . . you always take all the bad auditing off of a case, if you run into any? You know that? And if you're real clever, and because you're here and I can tell you, it's all right to run very brief terminals; but if you take somebody who's only been with the guy for twenty-five hours and you run that on the Prehav Scale, well, it's sort of one command or something like this. And it's just too brief and it is . . it's messed up; it gets messed up.

So on a twenty-five or a fifty-hour pc . . I mean, where the auditor has only been with him for, oh, I don't know, at the outside a hundred hours or something like this . . you'd better take the case apart with some old-time process. You understand?

"What have you thought about that auditor?" "What have you not told that auditor?" Any kind of an O/W situation or something of this sort.

Now, if the auditor is, let us say, the husband or wife of the pc you're trying to straighten out on this, or if there has been a long association going up in terms of years, now this, then, is a long-duration PT problem. "Long duration" is defined as years. That's a long-duration PT problem: years. A short-

duration PT problem is in terms of months or weeks, see? We say long and short and then don't leave you wondering what we mean by long and short. It's years.

So it's all right to take a PT problem of long duration . . i.e., years . . and assess that person as a terminal by name on the Prehav Scale and run that level, and reassess and run the level.

Now look, do you know that it's probably less than fifteen minutes a level? It may be as little as that. This is one of the exceptions to the running, flattening on the tone arm, see? It's an exception. But of course you're doing something exceptional, so it's not much of an exception.

You're doing something very exceptional. You're taking a person that . . well, they've known each other for ten years and you're running it on the Prehav Scale, which is calculated to go on the whole track. So you're doing something exceptional, so you have an exceptional answer. And it disobeys the twenty-minute rule. Twenty-minute rule . . you don't run that for twenty minutes to find out if it's flat, see? See, this is a . . this is not the same thing we're talking about.

When is a general level of the Prehav Scale flat? That is to say, we're just running it generally. You know, "Whom have you failed to help," you know, and that sort of thing. That's a general run, the generalized terminal: "someone," "somebody," you know, something like that. General run.

Or an SOP Goals terminal, which means a selected general terminal. But it's a selected terminal, see? All right. That terminal, of course, that will just run and run and run and run and run and run and run, because you . . the pc's attention is fixed on it. He's in . . zoo-zoog.

Now, these general runs . . that is, "someone," "somebody," "Whom have you failed to not help somebody?" "Whom have you desperately not intended to help and prevented everybody from helping?" You know, that kind of a question. Very broad, you know?

All right. That has a briefer run. So your longest run will be found ordinarily on the SOP Goals selected terminal. Your next longest type of run is your general run, and those are long grinds very ordinarily. And it is those I am talking about . . those two types of run, where you find the tone arm unsticking and beginning to move early in the process, then moving well, and then fading out and getting down. And eventually . . early in processing . . they will stick.

Well, if you can stop it just short of the stick, you're a good auditor. And you'll find it very easy to assess and all is well and so forth. But even so, you won't be in trouble, even though you stick it for twenty minutes.

But look-a-here, don't you stick it longer than twenty minutes. An absolutely fixed, frozen-tight needle for twenty minutes . . you would have seen it approaching for a long time if you'd been watching. Motion would have gotten less and less and less and less and less, and it freezes.

Now, that is different from the person suddenly swooping from 3.0 to 5.0 and then it doesn't move at 5.0 for fifteen minutes or something like this, and all of a sudden goes to 2.0. Or the person sticking absolutely at 6.5 and then suddenly swooping to 1.0. This kind of an action is not an expected . . you wouldn't expect that needle now to stick.

But this sticking needle is going to come about when you were running it all right and it already looked like it was getting flat and your flat rule would have taken it off then. And then it suddenly rose up and began to move even less. Now, all of a sudden it'll either move a little bit up, usually, or a little bit down and go clank! You can smell the rubber burning.

Now, if you continue to run that tone arm while it's in that condition, day after day, man, you're not doing Scientology because you're in violation of Clause 13. You are running a process which no longer produces change.

The only change it's going to produce, of course, is just sort of cave everything in. But it's not a beneficial change.

So the process is not producing change, so you get off of it; here and now, you get off of it.

All right. Now, what is this other exception? I said, then, that this rule is not followed . . going on with these things: the long-duration PTP. The guy for the last five years has been having trouble with his leg and he just sits in the auditing session with this hidden standard. He runs cows, crocs and alligators with great happiness. And at each moment after he runs the command, or every few commands, why, he kind of thetawise looks down at his leg, you see, to see whether or not that has been affected. "Well, alligators didn't fit in that leg, so it must be something else," you see? He's running with his attention fixed on something else. And he broke his leg five or ten years ago and it has troubled him ever since.

Well, you can assess that leg . . and by the way, you can even assess it this way: His name, let us say, is John; you can assess "John's leg," something of that sort. It's always best to inspect the meter for a bit of reaction, but oddly enough, you don't even have to, to do that. You just know this is a long-duration PI problem. The best way to do it is to make a list of terminals that the pc thinks it is. And then take a specific one, not take a general one. See, you don't want this thing to be a profession. You don't want it to be a profession, that's all. Because he'll run on it for quite a while if you take it as a general thing, see?

You could even say, "your leg" . . point to it now and then; bring him out of the past . . and it'll run. It'll run on the Prehav Scale. But of course, "flat process" as a law doesn't apply, then, to a terminal which is a specific terminal being run or a problem of long duration.

By "long" we mean years. We don't mean . . we don't actually mean longer than one lifetime, see? That's within this lifetime.

And if we do that, voila! We will have that thing taped.

But we run it on the needle. We just keep an eye on the needle . . clank, clank.

Now, oddly enough, you will get tone arm motion, but it's a kind of a waste of time to kind of track the tone arm motion. All of a sudden, the thing kind of frees up, the needle kind of frees up or sticks, or something like this. And you ask about it, you'll find out the tone arm has stopped, too.

But now, look-a-here. Here's the problem. If you ran this for twenty minutes . . look, the whole run in the first place was only ten minutes. Now you're going to test it for twenty minutes when there was a ten-minute run, huh? This doesn't . . this isn't bright, see? It's something like measuring the depth of a teacup with a Kelvin fathometer. You see, it's just not smart.

So you have to kind of run it on the needle. That takes a lot of auditor judgment to run one of these things. You can't be a bad auditor and handle a present time problem of long duration, that's for sure. You'll flub it every time. And also you can't run a pc, horribly enough, who has a present time problem of long duration, on any other process than a present time problem of long duration. There it is. That's it; you've had it.

So the moral of that is, audit well.

Now, there is the exception I spoke to you about, which is running the rock slam, and that's not really a violation of "a process is flat when it no longer produces tone arm motion." I'll show you this very clearly that if you had set here . . . Now, you know a rock slam . . a rock slam is pretty . . pretty wild here. And a rock slam can be kind of this, this, this wide, see? That's a pretty good-looking rock slam, isn't it?

All right. Now, there it is, slamming back and forth there. It's going two, three inches. Actually, rock slams can be a quarter of an inch wide, too, you know. But they're erratic. They're not a theta bop. A theta bop i8 as even as a metronome and a rock slam is very erratic.

And look . . look what would happen now . . look what happens to the tone arm as I make it rock slam. You got it? See . . see what the tone arm is doing while I make this thing rock slam. Hm? Look at what the tone arm is doing. See, I've got this meter just sitting here, just turned on and on set, and if . . to make it rock slam doing that. Well now, I'm doing that with my hand. But supposing the pc was doing it to it with its bank.

An auditor . . . I have to tell you a joke, by the way. I just got one through the lines the other day . . this just . . just got it through the lines. This was very, very amusing, and I hope when the auditor hears, he won't be ARC broke. But I was quite interested. I misunderstood him completely.

He said, "The pc can reactively influence the E-Meter, so I'm having a difficult time running the pc."

And so I told him, well, I'd exorcised all the demons out of the thing, so he needn't worry about that.

But listen, that wasn't his question. That wasn't what his question meant at all. He believed that this pc was peculiar in that the pc's reactive bank was operating the E-Meter.

Now, this is an awfully good joke on this auditor because that is what an E-Meter is for and what it was designed to do. And of course, the E-Meter always tells you before the pc knows about it. You see, even though it's just a split second, the meter knows before the pc does. So the common and ordinary action is, of course, to ask a pc a question, you get a fall on the meter, you say, "What was that?"

And the pc said, "Oh, was there something there?"

You know, that's kind of his feeling. Whether it's just for half a second, he's still got a feeling on it. He will once in a while kind of feel the jolt in himself and tell you, but he has this "Glmmp," you know, "What was that?" you know?

And then he says, "Oh . . oh . . oh . . well, that's the time I robbed the bank. It was nothing much. I robbed the bank, yeah. Whew!" and the meter frees.

And that's what an E-Meter is for. And this auditor asked me, actually . . put the question to me that this was a peculiar pc and that the peculiarity is that the reactive bank acted on the meter. But look, that's a good thing This auditor, when he finally gets the answer to that, he has actually made a virgin observation of the thing, and he'll all of a sudden come up with an awful cognition on this. You got the idea?

Well, that's better than just fooling around with it . . with a box . . because Ron said to, you know? And I think that in past years auditors used to do that. They just used to fool around with the box because Ron said you had to have one in your lap. Because I would find the most remarkable settings on meters sometimes, and so forth, and all kinds of things going on, that had nothing to do with the pc or the case. It is connected directly to the pc's reactive mind so, of course, you get this answer.

Now, supposing the reactive mind was moving this, that way; and instead of you seeing it on the needle here, supposing the needle were being moved by the pc's reactive mind. To hold the needle at set, your tone arm would be doing this, see? My God, what . . what . . how much meter action do you want? How much tone arm action do you want, see? Get the idea? Look at that!

And you see, that's about what the reaction is causing over here, see? Meter can't even keep up with it. How much action do you want?

Well, the oddity is that when you're running a pc whose goal has rockslammed . . .

I'll tell you another little peculiarity, while I'm going by it, I noticed the other day. You know, the goal becomes less intense after you find the terminal. Did you know that?

Do you know why that is? Because the goal is the significance which surrounds the terminal. And the person's attention has been yanked off the goal over onto the terminal, where it was fixed anyhow. You got it? So therefore the goal, after you found the terminal, usually will read less now than the terminal.

For a very short period of time the goal reads as much as the terminal, but after you've assessed an awful lot of terminals, that goal starts looking awfully thin and ragged. And it still will . . will flick a bit . . it'll still react a bit . . but it was the right goal. And it isn't the time for you to start doubting, "Well, was that the right goal?"

Now, you could probably strip a goal off by stripping the fellow's attention off all the terminals that that goal was represented by, see, and then the goal would go null. And the terminals went null. And then you go back and look for the goal and the goal goes null.

You see, the person's attention is fixed on the terminal. See, there is nothing in a goal for his attention to be fixed on. That is just air and theta. See, that's nothing But a terminal is something, mmm. And he got into this goals line. And what you're doing is reversing this situation. He had a problem that had to do with a terminal, so he then reactively achieved a goal to solve this problem. And the goals he comes up with are solutions: If he could just do this, then that series of problems would be solved. You see, that's what a goal is. It's a solution to the problems which have been given him, usually by terminals.

And of course a terminal can also be just an idea to him, too . . which is a bum thing; we hope it isn't.

He was approached all of a sudden by this terminal, and it . . he got a problem . . probably got some overts on the terminal or something. And then eventually, because he got overts on terminals in this way, the terminal itself approaching him could overwhelm him. That leaves his attention fixed on the terminal.

The little tag that is hanging out on the bank is "goal." You can always reach the goal, whereas you very often don't reach the terminal with any other assessment, see? I have found a more reliable tag in the goal. It's a little label, and it's sort of hanging out here in the light from the dark, dark bank, you see? And it's a little red tag and it says, "On the other end of this thing is something that has overwhelmed the living daylights out of me. If you will pull here, package will open neatly."

First observation that something like this would happen, by the way, is clear back in 49. Every engram, by the way, leaves its own little tag. The whole track may be in a complete, spinning loop; all parts of the track are all parts of the track, and there it is in a crumpled ball. The odd part of it is that there's always this little tag reaching out of the ball that you can pull, and the track starts coming apart. You got the idea?

I'll give you an example. This boy has always been worried about red caps. Red caps actually upset him, and for some reason or other red caps are a very desperate and violent thing, so we'd better not have much to do with them. You get the idea? Red caps.

All right. You go into this case on the subject of red caps, and you will find a nice, great big, juicy engram that the pc knew nothing about. He was in a desperate automobile accident at the age of six and he hasn't a clue about it, but the driver of the other car was wearing a red cap. You see, there's always a piece of the engram showing.

Well, now, we've gotten smart enough here so that there's a piece of the whole track showing and that's called a goal. And you start knocking these goals out, one after the other . . you actually do start knocking goals out; it's a form of auditing . . and as you move ahead trying to find a goal, you eventually will find the biggest tag that has been left out. See, this little red tag, and it's the biggest, most visible one and nothing will pull that tag. And that is attached to the toughest terminal that overwhelmed the pc. You got it?

So now you're going to do your Goals Assessment. Well, don't be amazed that the little red tag now isn't quite so red. See, we pulled it; we've got fingerprints on it now. And it isn't quite representing what it represented before.

So after you've found a goal, you've proved the goal out, and it's there and it won't change and it won't move and that is it and there it is, boom . . now we actually follow the string down and find out what it was attached to. The pc's attention of course goes, clang! onto the terminal where it was fixed anyhow and this little red tag will not read as much on the meter now. The goal won't read as much on the meter. The terminal will now read more than the goal, after you've really shook the terminals out. You got the idea? It's only for a little while that this tag will read.

Now, when you've got that terminal flat you've got to check for the tag again. And when you check for the tag again it's liable to come back and read better, because you've got his attention freed off of it and it may be attached to something else, too. So you always inspect the goal again. So goals tend to disappear on meter read, but they still flick, they still click and so forth.

All right. As you're running this case on assessment, this case develops, on the goal, a rock slam. And as you're assessing, you just . . rock slams become more and more visible, more and more visible and many falls are apt to drop into the category of rock slam. You start with a fall and you wind up with a rock slam. You got the idea?

When you've got a rock slam assessment on a goal, you'll have a rock slam assessment on the terminal or you haven't got the right terminal.

Now, you rock slam assess on the pc on the Prehav Scale. In other words, you assess only for levels that rock slam. Have you got the idea? You're running a rock slam case and it's all going to rock slam from here on out. Have you got that? Everything is going to rock slam.

So naturally in running the case you run the rock slam out. And if you don't have a rock slam . . this is a conditional rule; needs to be proven out a bit more, but I think you'll find it holds true. When your rock slam has been gone . . there's no rock slam of any magnitude . . for a period of twenty minutes that level is flat for that terminal. You got it?

Why? Well, your rock slam is now somewhere else on the Prehav Scale. And the more you run an ordinary falling level, the more your pc is going to get upset because his attention is affixed over on here, you see, and he can't keep his attention off of it. So he's actually shooting to another part of the Prehav Scale. Got it?

So you run rock slams out and the same rule applies. The rule applies uniformly and routinely. And that is simply this: that if you have assessed on a rock slam . . whether on a general level or on a terminal/goal level . . if you're assessing rock slams you must run the rock slam out only. And then for twenty minutes there must be no rock slam on that terminal. And that's, by the way, by the stopwatch practically; that's really twenty minutes. Then you can consider that level flat and reassess. And you reassess and find where the rock slam is now. And now you will get a new level that is rock slamming and you run that out. You got the idea? That's running by rock slam.

But as I've just demonstrated to you, a rock slam is a terrific amount of tone arm motion . . fantastic amount, even though it's not visible. It's the needle that's going, not the tone arm. But if you were to hold that needle at set . . if you could . . you see, that was how your tone arm would be going for that level.

Now, it can happen that a present time problem of long duration can rock slam, and that means that the pc is on his rock chain, which is his goals chain in this particular case. That's why we call it rock slam, because that's his rock chain. And his goal is sitting on his rock chain. And so you're running right on down his rock chain.

Now, you're probably going to find more rock-slamming pcs than you really suspect exist. There are quite a few of them around. They are not a rare phenomenon. But that's how you do a rock slam.

If you do a general assessment and one of the levels rock slams, you've had it, because you now have to assess for rock slam. You won't find anything but rock slams on this case. You may find a fall, a fall, a fall, and then all of a sudden rock slams during the assessment.

Well, a rock slam persists. And the difficulty in assessing a rock slam i. You know, I . . you know, when I get up that smart. Gee, I'm going to be real proud of myself.

Well, if you haven't got a question, I will tell you about some mistakes that are made. The first and foremost of these mistakes is while running a level flat . . running a level flat. This is the commonest mistake which is being made in HGCs, Academies, co-audits, from hell to Halifax: They don't run the levels right.

Now, let me give you a very brief summary of what this is all about. In the first place, we have discovered how to establish whether or not a process is flat. We have discovered how we can obey Auditor's Code Clause 13. That's for the first time, this question is answered for auditors.

I never have any trouble with this. A lot of auditors never have any trouble with it. But the majority of auditors do have trouble with it. "When is something flat?" That was the burning question, you see? Did the needle whistle at you, or what happened?

And as a consequence they overran and underran and so on. And there was that the rock slam persists for several levels after you've turned it on. So, there is a rule about this: Every time when you're running a Prehav Assessment or you're running a Goals Assessment or something and you turn on a rock slam, don't go to the next five levels without getting rid of the rock slam.

Now, how do you get rid of a rock slam? You can run, essentially, TR 10. That gets rid of a rock slam. You just say, "Floor, floor, floor, floor, floor, floor, floor," and there's no rock slam. You got the idea? Now you say the next level. But boy, do you note that that one you just had rock slammed because that's now what you're going to be looking for. You start turning rock slams on, on a case, that's what you'll follow down to. Okay?

All right. Good enough. I hope you're doing all right with your training, and I hope your auditing is coming along fine. You all look better.

All right. If you get a lot brighter tomorrow, why, you'll have some questions. Okay?

Thank you.

Audience: Thank you .