

INFORMAL DISCUSSION WITH RON

A lecture given on
31 December 1951

Common Denominator of Cases

Somebody came up and said to me “I can spend hours running just one grief charge.”

Betty: That was me. That’s the thing that has been bothering me.

That’s right. You handed me a note. You spend hours running a grief charge. If you spend hours running a grief charge, that grief is not prepared to blow or there’s just so doggone much grief on it

Betty: Some men cry on you before you can hardly get them on the bed.

I know. But you can scan through that. You see, thought is relatively instantaneous, and you can go through that over and over.

Now, you see what we are basing processing on. The test of this processing is whether or not it accomplishes the job. The preclear has a fairly certain knowledge, however, that something will accomplish a job when it is hit.

There may be two, three, six, a dozen of these similar computations on the same case. I am not talking to you today about the handbook. I am talking to you about auditing. This is a fast auditing technique. It is very fast.

Stan: [preclear from earlier demonstration session] Ron, maybe for the benefit in here—I had a concept that it is like a tube, a dark tube. Grief is coming from a whole line of incidents. The grief in there wasn’t, actually; it was purely opening like a plug, and the grief is coming from the whole incident. When I got a concept, I immediately contact all this incident. And I felt I could have cried for all the incidents in this one incident.

That is correct. Because there is only one emotional curve on a case.

Betty: It has a tendency to drain off where you tap it, apparently.

That’s right.

What I have been going over today mostly isn’t in the handbook with its various computations, but as a straight auditing technique, done by the auditor, he is working on this one central computation, which he should understand thoroughly. He ought to be able to do problems in this in his sleep. For instance, I’ll mention several factors: A fellow is very protective of his little brother. He hates his grandmother. What has happened?

Ellen: Well, his grandmother made him come in for meals at a certain hour.

Now come on, what happened on this thing? What is the whole curve? What is the whole picture?

Ellen: Well, he hates little brother first, so he sympathizes with him.

He hated him and what did he do to him?

Ellen: He hurt him.

He hurt him, and then what did he feel?

Ellen: Regret and shame and remorse and sympathy, finally.

What is sympathy? Regret, shame and remorse. Now, what is the next sequence here?

Ellen: Somebody else tried to hurt little brother, and he tried to protect little brother and this effort failed.

All right. And who was the person who tried to hurt little brother?

Ellen: Grandmother.

That's right. Now, who is the villain of the piece?

Ellen: He is. And who has he elected to be the villain of the piece?

Ellen: Grandmother.

And that is how they get these dopey combinations of sublimations and tokenisms and yapisms and so forth; you vary this thing around and you can see how the sublimation is on the left-hand side or the right-hand picture of the second dynamic, and you can do all sorts of weird things with it. Because it will manifest itself, if you don't know the central computation, in many ways.

Here is another one: This girl feels very sympathetic toward animals and hates men. What has happened?

Bill: She has harmed an animal.

Yes. At what period before she started liking animals?

Bill: You mean age?

Well, yes.

Bill: You say she is sympathetic toward animals . . .

She is very sympathetic to animals.

Bill: . . . and hates men.

And hates men. What has happened? You're on the right track.

Bill: It has something to do with men in her life.

Men in her life? Go on, give me the computation. Come on. Don't let me upset you. What has happened?

Bill: She has harmed an animal.

Right.

Bill: Then she has identified that animal with all animals, or

The hell with what she identified. What has she done?

Bill: She felt sympathy for the animal.

Because she doesn't identify. She will only feel sympathy toward one kind of animal for each incident. Now what has happened?

Bill: Well, she has tried to protect the animal against some man.

No, she hates men. Now, repeat what happened there: She loves animals, she hates men. She just thinks animals are too darling and that people are cruel to them. All right, what has happened in the case? Just repeat it.

Bill: Well, first she harmed an animal, and then she felt sympathy.

Yes.

Bill: She tried to protect an animal, failed. Then she has—

Now, wait a minute: She tried to protect it . . .

Bill: She protected an animal from harm from—now, let me see, if it was men. . .

That's right. And failed.

Bill: And failed.

You see, there is a specific drama that goes on getting played over and over and over.

Bill: Probably the reason she hates men is because she tried to protect the animal from an unidentified man—a stranger.

It's possible. It could be that. She will give you the computation. As the auditor, you will know this computation.

Susan: "All men are bad."

All right, here is another computation: A girl is very sympathetic toward Jesus and she hates truck drivers.

Susan: She has offended against Jesus in some manner. And then she felt very bad about it. And then later on she tried to defend Jesus against a truck driver, I suppose, and failed.

Precisely. How has the church got it rigged? Why is the church successful as far as Jesus is concerned? Jed: It's a reverse system because they've got

Mary: It's his duty to protect you.

Come on. What's the initial . . .

Doris: They worship Mary.

Bill: All men are sinners.

Vera: We all killed him, then.

Betty: We start out by having

Susan: We are born with the offense against him.

Yeah. We're born with the offense against him. So what do we have to do for Jesus?

Susan: Be sympathetic and defend him, for sure.

We have to defend him against everything, don't we? Isn't that right? (agreement from group)
Particularly men and infidels! Isn't that a great computation?

Susan: (laughs) It's terrific!

There is where you will find all the grief, regret, blame and so forth on the line. But where you run into it on the eighth dynamic, remember that that computation is on almost every Christian case.

Betty: I had one last week— "I'm a bad Christian," he kept saying

It is on nearly every Christian case.

Now, if you are processing somebody who doesn't have this particular type of religion—let's take Buddhism—it is based on the same equation.

It is not a question of whether or not there is a God, whether or not there is Jesus, what happened and so forth; it is a question of how this is being utilized. You can see that it is being utilized and you can see that the utilization of it is to some degree aberrative, and in many cases demonstrates itself as a complete roaring insanity.

You go down to the spinbins, and this is the one that you will find uppermost in most of the cases you process.

Ann: Especially in Kansas!

I don't know about that, because my research on this happened in California—in Los Angeles, as a matter of fact. And they are supposed to be very freethinking about the whole deal.

I have checked on through, and that religion which most believes that Jesus is sinned against and has to be defended at all costs by the individual, and which offers the least in the form of a Supreme Being to help defend Jesus, is the religion which will cause the most spins. You understand, this is not a critique of religion: this is a demonstration of a modus operandi.

Mary: You mean more Quakers spin than Catholics?

Well, Quakers don't go around defending Jesus. Very few Catholics spin.

Mary: No, you said the one that offers the least defense is the one that spins the most.

No, the one that offers the least assistance from God. For instance, the Catholic Church—boy, does God help you out in the Catholic Church! They defend Jesus, but God helps you out. God is right there and so forth.

You take Christian Science, it doesn't offer you just exactly this thing. God isn't necessarily giving you a helping hand. And furthermore, they have caused the vanishment of the material universe, so they have a bad deal. There is nothing wrong with these. By the way, there are tremendous numbers of truths in any of these religions, because they are a combination of a great deal of study and thought in the spiritual and other fields.

But I am calling this to your attention because if you go on with this process and you go processing people, not sixty days will elapse before you will run into a case that is spinning madly on the equation I just gave you: "We have offended against Christ." And when the little girl realizes that she has sinned and it is proven to her she has sinned, she has then been given a target toward which she has sinned. Afterwards she has to be defensive; she will stay defensive

up to the time she is seventeen, eighteen, nineteen or twenty, perhaps. The real universe will fall in on her somehow or another. Then she will do a second one.

I want to bring this up: She will come off the sympathy line and just get mad and apathetic and all confused about the whole thing. A person who keeps failing in their effort to protect the “sympathee” will eventually just get mad across the boards. They just back off from the whole deal. This is where you get the computation hidden. But this does not even begin to really hide the computation against this regret-blame formula.

Ellen: How does this hate come off? How does that work out, as far as getting off the hatred somebody has engendered? I can see how it developed from this formula.

How does it come off? As hate.

Ellen: I know, but . . .

As the emotion of hate.

Ellen: Pounding, beating, cussing, swearing?

Not necessarily. I have seen a lot of people pound with hate. I’ve seen some preclears practically grit their teeth into splinters over it as they go through. It gets pretty violent.

Ellen: But what I mean is, how can you get it off quickly? By scanning, again?

Scanning it. Don’t get them to articulate every phrase in it, because the phrases aren’t important. You have the mechanical basis which is underlying all of this.

Stan: Ron, you’re emphasizing here phrases are not important. I have found in many, many cases a phrase leads me to grief. Just repeating, for instance, “I’m not wanted, I’m not liked”—this phrase brings me direct in to grief. But he goes down with this phrase and grief comes up. So it seems certain to release.

Do you know what you’re doing? You are forcing a person into a secondary with that phrase.

Now, there is no doubt that this phenomena exists. This one we are not arguing about. But remember what I started out to tell you: you want to get this preclear up the tone scale past the counter-effort band. The fastest way to do it that I know of at this moment is just to speed him up and get him over the top of the band quick. And if you validate language as aberrative en route, you will slow his climb.

Jed: Ron, there seems to be some relation here between the emotion, the ability of the person to handle counter-efforts and so on, and the type of phenomena which comes off, rising up into the emotional band. In other words, the faster they speed up, the faster it comes off. Let’s say from grief up to laughter: the same type of discharge, but it is faster.

Well, you can get any type off the line. I am giving you what is the central computation on cases. You must remember that a person is hanging up also on this maybe. Just this process will normally knock out the maybes without you addressing them.

If you can do a fast job of auditing, theoretically you should be able to take a preclear from home for a few hours—theoretically, if you are really sharp and you are working with no waste of time and he is to some degree accessible—and work him with these various curves, and he would go back home a very fortified man. The environmental restimulation of his home or his work would be ineffective. Theoretically, you could do this.

If you get a case that is pretty tippy, you should bust them through this stuff in a pretty good hurry.

What I am giving you now is actually the basic, the commonest common denominator of which I know, practically, in working cases.

Let me go over these factors just once more. You find out the individual is sympathetic toward some portion of the dynamics and antagonistic toward another portion of the dynamics. You could find this out in two minutes of play if you wanted to just sit down and think the case through. So there is a sympathy line and there is an antagonist line.

Now, you could run into this baffler: He has picked out an antagonist from another sympathy line. He has two computations. You ask him what he is sympathetic toward in life and he gives you what he is sympathetic toward in combination A. Then you ask what he is antagonistic against and he tells you what he is antagonistic against in computation B. But B has its own B sympathy line, and A has an A antagonist. You can run into this, particularly in schizophrenics.

So there is the sympathetic target and the antagonistic target. You know immediately that the individual at some time in his life offended against the thing toward which he is sympathetic. And you know that this could have wavered: his sympathy can go back to further antagonism and that can go back to further sympathy. The curve doesn't have to be just one swing; it could be "I hate you—poor thing. I hate you—poor thing," because he dramatizes the original curve. But there is actually only one first incident. He dramatizes this curve and so he just keeps in laying on the same emotional curve toward this subject. He could be alternately hating it and sympathizing with it.

You will run into a case, for instance, that has puzzled a lot of people in the past, where the person is saying, "I love my brother, but I hate him!" You say to him, "What did you do to him?"

"Well, I took his car," and he gives you a lot of late-time stuff. You run it back down the line on that curve and you will find the original thing. He hit his brother over the head with a flatiron or something and his brother felt very cold afterwards. He all of a sudden realized he had offended against this dynamic and he felt sympathy for his brother.

Four hours later his brother got up, figured out he had been hit over the head with a flatiron and went and got a baseball bat and banged your preclear over the head! Then the preclear could wear the somatic of being hit over the head with a baseball bat by his brother as the cause and reason for his hatred of his brother. Do you understand? This shows that he has been offended against, so he wears the badge of that offense. So it is just this cyclic proposition. It goes both ways. It can get awfully complex. So when you are looking down the barrel into a case, for heaven's sake don't be confused, because this is what is at the bottom of it: an overt and sympathy; later on there is defense of this thing being sympathized with against a new antagonist. He has to defend this against the new antagonist or be the antagonist. So he has to hate.

One could say the only reason one hates is an effort to reject being something one does not care to be.

Betty: Is this the same as or connected with the service facsimile?

What I have just mentioned there—being hit over the head with the baseball bat? That can be the service facsimile.

Betty: How about the overall equation there?

He has some reason to explain why he at will can offend against this antagonist now. He has the reason. That is really a service facsimile, if you want to get down to rock bottom about it.

Bill: You said earlier—I think this is important to bring up—that a blind man wasn't helped because the process wasn't fast enough. The process is fast enough: the auditor wasn't fast enough.

That is not really the whole story on it.

[to Stan] How do your eyes feel? They change any?

Stan: I didn't pay attention. I paid attention to you, not to my eyes.

Well, now, take a look. How about your eyes right now?

Stan: They feel all right. I mean, how do you mean it?

Do they feel changed? That's all I'm looking for. Worse, or better?

Stan: I have to clean my glasses constantly because it seems to me there are always some spots on it, where many times I'm not aware if it's a lot of dust on it—if this is an indication. In other words, my glasses bother me how they do often. They often bother you?

Stan: Yes.

Are they particularly bothersome right now?

Stan: I feel they need cleaning. In other words, I feel my eyeglasses I have might be a little too strong. In other words, my visio is better because I see every little bit of dust on it. I mean . . .

Can you see dust now?

Stan: Uh-huh. Oh, gosh! (laughs. then LRH and group laugh)

I wanted to ask you something else. I wanted to go back to what was said in relation to the blind man—that it wasn't the speed of process or the preclear, it was the slow speed of the auditor. This emphasizes the need of having to in some way turn out a little better auditors. And this, I believe, should be the start of a nucleus of better auditors to achieve the miracles you spoke about in the lecture.

Well, the only danger that an auditor can run into is if, before he tries to work a case, he doesn't get this principle in mind. Suppose he is still very foggy on this principle, he doesn't have a concept of what this principle is: it would be up to an instructor to just go over this with the auditor, and over it and over it with him again, and then work it on him. That would be part of the training.

You would say, "This is what it is. This is what it is." Or you could just take an auditor and suddenly work it, and it would appear magical to him. Then you would explain the mechanics of the thing. In other words, we have a technique here which was necessary in training auditors. The techniques themselves, in the past, have very often not seemed real to the auditor because his case was in such a condition that he could not experience them. That is true, isn't it?

Stan: Yes. I would like to state one case; it happened about a month and a half ago at the Foundation. He is an engineer, and he sent his wife for therapy because she was quite bad off. And he said Dianetics doesn't help him. He went to the Elizabeth Foundation to get auditing and he had what at that time were considered the top-notch auditors.

I was called in to see whether—everybody likes to take a crack at a case. And I just asked him, "Why do you send your wife for processing if you believe Dianetics is no good?" And he said,

“Oh, my wife is bad off.” I said, “Why do you feel your wife is bad off ?” He said, “You know, my first wife died.”

And I did leave him for a little while. Then I told him to contact the incident when his wife died. He started crying and crying. I got grief for about three quarters of an hour. He admitted it, and so did his previous auditor (who was sitting in), that he never cried!

Now, actually, his sending his wife (this was my computation) for therapy is blame upon himself of the death of the first wife, fear of the death of the second wife. And the grief was his. And his blame and sympathy involved in there around the blame of the death of the first wife, he applied to the second wife. He wanted to cure the second wife, but actually, who needed more therapy was him than the wife!

Sure.

Stan: But he didn't come anymore. He came once more and I got the same incident—and again, grief. And then he went in and cuddled up, and he got pressure and a slow palpitation in the heart. And he said, “You know, it's like a little baby would have this palpitation of the heart,” and cuddled up in a fetal position and had a lot of somatics. Of course, I don't want to go into an incident. But here is one: He sent his wife or sent somebody else for therapy—to him it is no good, because of blame again.

Sure. That was a very astute diagnosis. Fortunately, we have a technique that will just ladle it out.

Now, we should know this about visios: No visio at all is the assignment of a tremendous amount of cause to another individual. A visio, itself, is generally blame of self. A dub-in is a picture of somebody telling a story; that somebody is occluded. A dub-in case has been surrounded by somebody who has done nothing but evaluate, and this person is occluded. And the next step after occlusion is pictures.

Doris: Ron, I would like to ask you something. I may have picked up what I need to crack this thing, but on the other hand you may have a gimmick. I have a preclear up in Minneapolis who has been psychoanalyzed. He comes in, lies down on the couch, you ask a question and he starts off. For two solid hours he runs absolutely nothing but garbage—and symbolic garbage at that—on the second dynamic. There may be just a tiny bit of fact in what he is saying.

You see, if he can subject himself to this all the time, he is paying a penalty. And there is where you get self-punishment.

Doris: But the thing is that he runs it with such relish; he mouths this out as if he was tasting . . . He also pays you, doesn't he? He pays you well, doesn't he?

Doris: No, he doesn't pay well; he pays at the lowest possible rate.

Well, the cheapskate! He wants to get out of this punishment easy, doesn't he? All you would have to do is talk to him about his guilt in life and so forth and he would start paying you well. You realize this?

Doris: Well, maybe I will do this. After all, he's a chiropractor; he could send me some preclears, maybe.

Now, the point is that you have gotten somebody who is trained into free association. It is an educational process, and he will just keep on doing this. The best way to handle it is to blow up all past psychoanalysis. And one of the best ways to do this is run sympathy on doctors.

Doris: I think we will try that.

You can blow that stuff out pretty well, pretty easily.

Clara: Ron, may I ask a question here? This rather explains what the chiropractor does, doesn't it? He keys out a nerve block and interrupts the action of the facsimile. The individual goes out and becomes restimulated because of the original overt act, so it keys in again. So he has got to go back to get it unblocked again.

Sure. And then, of course, a chiropractor brings a person up into present time. Don't forget that. He doesn't necessarily have to stay in present time.

Clara: I was thinking of one specific treatment, where they work on the nerve centers themselves and key out the block.

I know about this one. There is a lot to bringing a person up to present time.

As a matter of fact, you can take tactile as a communication line on the insane, and you can sometimes produce some very marked results with tactile. You can throw a falderal into it of massaging his nerve centers and relaxing them, but that is not really what it is; it is tactile. You can get his nerve centers relaxed and so forth, and you have a tendency to key something out. But tactile is what it is. It is communication.

You say you want to get this preclear into ARC. He has to be in present time, so how do you get him into ARC? Part of ARC is C. And what is C? C is communication, and it is any kind of communication. You can actually get a preclear attentive to you by putting him into communication by blowing a very large automobile horn at him for five or ten minutes. He gets in communication, all right! He will get in communication with his own bank too.

There is only one slight difficulty. The communication is so enforced— so thoroughly enforced—that he will go into a hypnotic trance. And that is your danger in tactile, that you put the person into a hypnotic trance.

Mary: With audio. A horn is audio and tactile is touch.

It is communication. Communication isn't just audio. Communication is defined as those sense channels one uses to contact the physical universe.

Mary: But you were saying tactile, and then you gave an illustration of the horn.

That is just another channel of communication.

Mary: But then I didn't know which one hypnotized: the horn or the touch.

Both of them. Any enforced communication line will. That is all hypnotism is—just an enforced communication channel by which you can put things into his counter-efforts. That's all. You just take his counter-efforts and you get them all scrambled up with what you said. Then you use his counter-efforts to knock him flat.

Mary: But touching a catatonic will sometimes make him make his first movement toward . . .

Sure, he even goes into communication with you. But if you can keep it up—well, let me be very precise if you want to go into the technicalities of this: A constant, monotonous stroking or a constant, monotonous noise or a constant, monotonous anything on a sense channel fixates the attention units through that sense channel. What you want to accomplish is an unfixed present-time attention. So, if you use tactile, for instance, you would want to use it with randomness, not with a static. On tactile, don't keep stroking the fellow's back on and on and on. Stroke him in the back and hit him alongside of the head! Jolt him up. Shake him a little bit this way and then stroke him a couple of times and then work on the arms and then shake him some more and so forth. Just jar him around a little bit if he shows any tendency to

go out just because you touch him. But on the other hand, you can sometimes take a preclear and take hold of his hand and he immediately starts telling you all his troubles. This is tactile. Establish a communication line.

Ann: Ron, on the business of tactile and hypnotic suggestion and .so on, I have a very specific problem, only in this case it is a fourteen-month-old child—a very interesting case. The child is the girl of a girl-boy fraternal-twin set. About two months prenatal, the mother began to get very uncomfortable and had some X-rays taken, and her bones were starting to separate. And about that time one of the children—it turned out later to be the girl—got her head wedged down in the pelvic region between the hip bones in such a way that she couldn't move in the way that kids usually do—I mean, they turn every five weeks. From the second month prenatal until birth she was wedged tight in that position. Her mother went into a wheelchair.

Whose fault was it? This thing keys, you know. The child has been told that this is why Mama is in the wheelchair. Oh, you hadn't looked at it on that side.

Ann: No, I didn't have this data before.

There is an interesting reason why that series of facsimiles would be in there, completely aside from the discomfort. It isn't quite true, but you can't go far wrong if you just assume that your preclear could have been cut up, chopped up, fed into winding knives, hanged, drawn and quartered and everything else without any harm to himself, unless he elected to harm himself because of blame for the harm to the rest of the dynamics. That is a theoretical statement. If you tackle a case just with that in mind, you will find out that this sort of a thing causes an immediate resurgence on the tone scale. The second a person realizes this, he will go out the top.

Ann: But this is a fourteen-month-old child. What about the communication line?

A fourteen-month-old child? I am afraid you have to take into consideration some factors that we often try to figure out Dianetics without.

Ann: The thing of it is, the child won't sleep. Put her in a prone position and it seems to throw her right back into that prenatal restriction and she thrashes.

This is an interesting case. How on earth are you going to do anything for this case?

Ann: I don't know.

The case is not in communication. Come on.

Ann: It was suggested and it was tried and it has worked so far, just stroking the body.

But don't stroke it monotonously—not the same stroke over and over and over again. Don't try to be soothing; that is sympathy. And monotony is a static. You want this child to go into action, don't you?

Ann: Actually, go to sleep at night so the mother can sleep.

No, you don't want that child to go to sleep at night. You want that child to get up on a point of the tone scale where it can handle its counter-efforts to some degree.

There is what's wrong. The goal here was to get the child to sleep. That is the wrong goal. What you want to do is to get the child into action.

Now, mesmerism is very, very interesting. Any time you want to monkey around with something, monkey around with mesmerism. You will find out how closely all eight dynamics are associated. Believe me, they are really associated. You can take a person and you can

mesmerize him and pinch yourself without his knowing it and then find a welt on his body, just like that. People talk about the individuation of human beings—there isn't any.

Susan: If a person were very, very high on the tone scale, would it be possible for this person to arrive at these various things computationally without having to run off the emotion and effort, or would the emotion and effort still hold it on?

The most powerful thing you have is thought.

Susan: Do you think you could key the whole thing out by yourself?

If you could contact the thought channel with no further complication on the case, you could blow it out. Theoretically, a person could get a powerful enough idea to jump himself up to the middle of the scale and stay there—theoretically. In fact, I have seen it happen, but it peeled off in six or seven months.

Betty: I have one more question. All the time during this conference and the seminars almost the complete emphasis has been that we find the whole key to the thing in birth, or if not birth

Who gave you that?

Betty: Well, all the seminar leaders, as near as I've been able to figure out.

That is because they have resolved a series of about six or eight cases, one right after the other, by running out effort in birth. This is something like shooting seven sevens in a row.

Betty: Well, there has been nothing to tie in what we had in the seminars with what you have given us. It has been quite confusing.

That is why we brought out that Hand book for Preclears.

Vera: Ron, on a very, very low-toned case, can you run these incidents without any trouble?

You generally can find them and you can run them. If you get a very, very low-toned case that can be gotten into any kind of communication, you can run any of this emotional stuff, but they generally won't go up above an apathy type of emotion for a while. I'm a little bit shocked with this business about birth.

Betty: Well, I've been shocked, frankly, because it hasn't tied in with the lectures at all, and because the emphasis, then, would be entirely on birth and your emphasis is entirely on something different.

Let me tell you how this could come about: Everybody is scared of being stuck in birth. Okay, they find out that you can run birth with Effort Processing without running anything else on the case. "Whee!—let's run birth!" This whole thing comes out of a very wrong idea. I can see how this would be. But that is a lot of malarkey.

Betty: Thank you.

That is seven sevens in a row. The eighth one is going to be something else. The tenth one is going to be something else. You could actually practice in Dianetics without ever touching birth or any particular facsimile in a case, beyond these blame-regret setups, and set people up so much better and so much faster than they have ever been set up before by a psychotherapy that you would make quite a splash.

Now, you take these miracle cases: they are very often pinned down very heavily into an effort facsimile, and you just have to run everything under the sun to get them off.

I wonder on these cases that they have run birth on. They have actually postulated the possibility of a recurrence of the disease or the illness or the deformity, because they haven't got the computation on the case. But I know one of these cases will stay that way because they found the basic cause—a little girl's sympathy toward another little girl. And the auditor ran that. It is what will work that counts.

[to Stan] Are you going to get that finished off?

Stan: I'm going to be audited in New York.

Are you going to have that tape? Are you going to have a copy of this tape? Before you let anybody audit you, you have them listen to the copy of that tape. I don't care if they say "So what?" or anything else. There would be no sense in chewing up your case, because you are maybe three or four hours from taking your glasses off for keeps.

Stan: I have a very strong desire to get an auditor there to do something about it.

At this point our recordings end, as the discussion group broke up and the people began talking among themselves.