BASICS OF AUDITING

A lecture given on
23 January 1962

Twenty-third Jan. 62, AD 12. And how are you this week?

Fair. We have three good people from California. I hope that you don't get as chewed up as the others do in their first week or two. That's very insincere.

The first action a new student has, they've been auditing all this time, they've been doing wonderfully, everything's been going along fine and of course there's nothing to learn. And then they collide with the Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. *Crash!* And somebody says, "All right. Now, what is the confusion and the stable datum" and so forth.

And they say, "Well, the confusion uh – is uh – that was uh – *mm-hmmm-hm-mm-hm.*"

And the Examiner says, "Flunk!"

And they say, "What? You have to know this stuff? That's something new." And then they eventually say to themselves, "You know, I wonder why – if this was possibly why I've missed on a few pcs here and there, that I might not quite have duplicated something just right. I always thought before that the auditor held the cans and . . ."

Well, it's not quite that bad. It's worse.

All right. Well, that's all due respect. But everybody who comes to this course learns sooner or later that there is something to learn here. After about three weeks of griping, why, then they decide to buckle down. And there's a way to cut short your time on course, is take the first three weeks of griping, scrub them and buckle down now. But this is a rough one as you will find out.

All right. Well, now, today I haven't the least idea what to talk to you about. You know everything there is to know. There's nothing left, and probably nothing I could teach you at all, at all – except Scientology, of course. That slight reservation.

Now, you're about to have – we've been upstairs. . . People think I work all the time. I don't. We've been upstairs loafing this afternoon, testing around on the new TV setup and you will shortly be seeing live sessions on TV. And the reason it's on TV is not because the BBC wants it, but because pcs never respond like pcs when being audited in front of an audience. And you audit the pc with television cameras, one going on a meter and showing up on a

television set, and the other one showing up on the session. And you audit the pc just as you would run a session. And you run those things which the class is working on or struggling about.

But you actually audit the pc and you'll be able to see then what it might possibly look like. And this might help you out a lot. That is something we haven't ever been able to do. Frankly, nearly all sessions are very artificial when they're demonstration sessions because the auditor has to hold down the audience, has to hold down the pc, has to get something done at the same time, has to be careful of the pc's reputation and all that sort of thing You really don't get into a good auditing situation. So any auditing demonstration you've ever seen is actually an artificial demonstration, unless it's at long range such as this one.

And we've just had a very lucky win here. We have a Grundig camera that apparently it was – it was photographing just fine under the light shined by my cigarette lighter. So the pc, in this particular case, won't even be blinded by the lights of the television room.

The auditing room, of course, is quite remote from here. It's upstairs on the first floor and several – oh, I don't know, one hundred and twenty-five feet from here or something like that. I don't know how far. And the auditing session goes on there and you hear it and see it and so forth, down here on two screens.

Now, because it's difficult for a class that is this big to see it up, we have two pictures of the session on twenty-three inch screens and we have two pictures of the E-Meter on, I think, seventeen-inch. Isn't that the way it's supposed to work out or are they . . . ?

Male voice: Nineteen.

Nineteen. And two nineteen-inch screens that show the meter in full view and two twenty-three inch screens that show the session. The only thing that you're going to see that's a little bit different about it – of course, you won't see the green color or the red of my hair. Otherwise, it will be fairly real. If you can mock those up and fill them in, you'll be all right.

And the – Fowler and Allen has just undertaken to build a Mark IV with a black rough face so that it won't reflect and a gray card. And they didn't like leaving off the glass because they said some dust will get into that element and it'll all of a sudden cease to work and we'll have had it. But I think we can do it with the glass on with a gray and a black faced meter. So that looks just like the meter you're using except it's duded up for television so that it registers well.

Well, that's what's in the immediate future. This will probably be in operation within – certainly well within presentation operation within two weeks. We'll have it done before that actually, probably. But it all depends on the second camera that comes from the North Pole apparently and has a small wait on it of eight or nine years. You know, the usual manufacturer's delay. That's the only bug on it. Everybody's working on this at the present

time. You'll be seeing men down here stringing wire in all directions shortly. Cable in all directions and so forth.

Well, now, that's the – that's the immediate view. This of course doesn't supplant any other training that you're getting or doing. We just add the other hour or two on to your training day and you do everything you're doing now and then this other comes on, too.

In a month or two – in a month or two we'll probably have motion pictures going which give you meter reads. And we are already on a scout of that camera so that we can photograph meter reads. And you'll have a mile or two of film and you can sit there and the Instructor can say, "What's that?" And the thing is falling badly.

And you say, "A rock slam."

And he says in – he doesn't say flunk, he says, "Infraction sheet." And you can get a – you can get a good hasty review of what meter reads should look like.

One of the things that's most puzzling to people when they show up here is what is a null needle. That seems to be a very controversial item and so forth. And other such things as that and we'll have those things taped, too.

So we're moving up to it and I'm – we're hoping to get this in and operating so that those who are leaving mid-February get a week or two of viewing of this sort of thing so they can straighten out some little thing they may have been doing themselves such as sitting on the pc's lap. Spitting at the pc. Little odd tricks that they've developed unbeknownst to themselves in training, you know. Like throwing – throwing the E-Meter out the window to demonstrate that they're dissatisfied with the pc's answers, you know. It's these small bugs that a person picks up in his auditing procedure that possibly could be ironed out.

Now, we're very interested in you being a good auditor. And a good auditor's auditing begins first and foremost on an understanding of his basic data. It's quite a fundamental statement of fundamentals. And an awful lot of people pick up a datum and they sail at ten thousand feet with it, you see. And they've never landed with this datum and they're still up in the air with this thing.

And you'd be surprised how many data can get in crosswise. We're just now learning this in Central Organizations where morale is suffering because people are making them duplicate bulletins. And they are writing us to find out how we keep up the morale in the Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. And I'm writing back and saying, "Well, it's a very simple answer. We don't."

But this tells you at once that if they have a morale problem, then this tells you that they have never enforced duplication in their Academies. So that somebody's walking into something brand-new when he's asked to totally duplicate a bulletin or totally duplicate a tape or understand exactly what is on this. Or perhaps their examination is buggy. The examination

might be poor. The examination might be on the basis of "What are the last seven words of the fifth paragraph of the HCO Bulletin of 22 December 1961?"

And the fellow can't answer that and so they say, "Flunk," you see. It's the data you're supposed to know on the bulletins. Of course, if you antagonize the Instructor, the Instructor has a perfect right to ask you what is exactly on that particular bulletin regardless if it contradicts some other bulletin. What is that bulletin?

All the auditor is expected to answer is what is on *that* bulletin. Not what is the right answer to the question, but what is on *that* bulletin, which is quite different, you see, than studying things.

You find out, then, they will develop an acuteness, an alertness to what the – what is being demanded of them. And they can measure up to this.

Anyway, when you're studying and you don't have good auditing going forward at the same time and when you're under this much duress and there's no auditing going forward, I don't think it could be done.

So of course, that makes an instant criticism of staff staff auditing in Central Organizations, see. If there isn't good auditing present by staff staff auditors on staff, why, of course their morale would suffer because you realize that if your ARC breaks with the Instructors were left even for twenty-four hours without being picked up by your auditor, you realize your whole bank would cave in. You recognize this – . Joke. They take it seriously. It's almost true, you know?

And it takes good auditing to carry forward hard training And that's something for you to realize sometime when you start in on a small group of auditors someplace and you're going to make Class IIbs out of them, something like that. And you're really going to fix them up one way or the other and you're doing it while they work at the filling station or something of the sort. And they're all out of your sight and they aren't getting much cross auditing and nothing much is happening in the way of results. Their auditing is so poor that no results are occurring And then you hit them with this much duress, this much insistence, this much this, this much that, they're going to go up the chimney. They can't take it, that's all.

The reason why you can get this high a velocity of learning in is just one little reason and that is because you are applying that learning at the same time and you are getting case gains while you learn, so that you're getting a reality on these various things – at least some are.

And the person, of course, who has no basic reality on Scientology itself, who is still in a big question mark, of course, is actually stuck in some kind of a ridge, usually, of just no reality, you know. Big question mark. You recognize that.

You ask him also – the way to test that one out is to say, "Well, do you think medicine works?"

And he will say, "I doubt it."

"Well, do you think that car repairing works?"

"Well, I doubt it."

"Do you think that anybody ever painted a picture?"

"Well, I doubt it."

And you begin to spot that the circuit hasn't anything to do with Scientology. He's just going on this way. When you run into that problem in learning, there's no sense in trying to shove it down the person's throat one way or the other. It's simply such a case problem that there isn't very much you can do about it except audit the person.

That is the only real problem that anybody should ever encounter in an Academy. Somebody who comes around and says he has no reality on Scientology and then you try to give him one and he can't get one and all that sort of thing – well, most people's reality on Scientology consists totally of having read something about Scientology. They recognized that was true and that was all there was to it.

But this other person is making a big fuss out of this, see. He has no reality on Scientology. He has *no* way – he doesn't *know* whether – and so on and so on. He's riding a ridge. You'll find out that you have to run negatives and positives on that person because he's sitting in the middle of a maybe. Of course, his whole life is in a maybe. Is he alive? No, he doesn't know that. See, he's doubtful.

This is about the only problem you'll run into in education is the ridge of doubt. There is another one which is rather easily overcome and that is pretended knowingness. And that, of course, is another downscale mockery of knowing, is pretended knowing The person has a horrible sensation of pretended knowingness occasionally. You yourself have had this once in a while, I imagine. You all of a sudden recognize that you were pretending that you knew something or something like this. And it gave you an odd sensation. And then that was gone.

Well, think of somebody leading their whole life with that sensation. They're going around pretending that they know they're here and insisting to everybody they know they're here why they – while they know themselves that they are not here, you know.

And it's a funny sensation. They just feel like fakes all the way through. That one, however, is not as difficult – that, because it doesn't buck your data. It doesn't fly back in your face. It's only this – the person who doesn't have a reality on (blank) or can't get a reality on (blank) that you really worry about in instruction.

Now, when you have that as a chronic thing, it is, of course, a very low case level. This is the "What wall?" proposition. I'm not being essentially hard on this particular person. I'm just regarding it with regard to training people and training in general and that is a tough one to jump.

Now, that's also very tough to jump on a pc and you'll occasionally see that in an auditing session. The pc will set goals, sometimes very extravagant goals. You want to watch a pc, by the way, who sets extravagant goals for a session, see. Wants to be Clear by session end. Wants to be OT by session end. You know, a person wants to be Clear, that's a perfectly normal goal. But this session, that's got to make him OT, you see, and so on.

That person is in an obsessive games condition with the auditor and is attempting to give the auditor loses. That's the whole works about that. If you want to know if a pc is in an obsessive games condition, well, you look at those goals. And if they're too extravagant and they're just beyond anything that anybody ever could possibly have anything to do with anywhere, why, just recognize to that degree that the pc is in a games condition with you. And watch it because this pc will go out of session at the drop of an electron. And to try to run very much on them is very hard because they're scat. They're insecurely in-session. They're indifferently in-session. They are not under the auditor's control. And you can actually plunge them in over their heads and then can't control them in the session and then they get all upset and, you know, this kind of stuff. It makes a messy session.

And the thing to do with that pc is, of course, is run very easy, very fundamental processes – very, very fundamental. Audit him lightly. Audit him with a feather.

If you want to knock over a pc who is a no-effect pc, of course, audit him with a feather. Don't do what the psychiatrist does. The less effect the person can have, the more effect the psychiatrist tries to give them. Don't do that.

The way to handle such a case is give them the breath of air from a slowly wafted feather and you will just be absolutely amazed what will happen.

Such a person can very often run 8-C. Oh, man, they'll touch those walls and they'll march over and they'll touch the other wall and turn around and they just go on and on and on. Never a comm lag, no change of any kind. Just do it. Nothing to it. Well, why couldn't they do it? They're not there. It doesn't bother them any. Doing it on the auditor's determinism; they have no reality on it at all. Perhaps many of you have seen this phenomenon in running 8-C. Well, apply that to mental reaction. In other words, 8-C, as simple as it is, is too far up scale for this person to run. That's all.

Now, you sit down with a very tiny, microscopic object. I'll tell you a good gag for this person that can't run 8-C like that. You sit down with a little microscopic object. Very small. Smaller than a cigarette lighter and sort of dull. Well, actually, this piece of chalk would do just fine, see. Dull and can be seen and so forth.

And just ask them to get the idea that the chalk is there and that the chalk is not there. Total process. And just do that one after the other, something like that. Man, you pick up more confusion. More randomity will fly off

"How can you say that the chalk isn't there when the chalk is there?"

Ah, you just say, "Well, get the idea the chalk isn't there."

"Well, all right. I can get the idea maybe that the chalk isn't there, but the chalk actually is there and you can see it right in front of you," and so on.

"Well, go ahead and do the auditing command. Get the idea the chalk isn't there. I'll repeat it for you."

"Well, nobody can get the idea the chalk isn't there because the chalk is there, you see, and that defies all the laws of reality and so forth."

"All right. That's fine. Now, just get the idea the chalk isn't there. I'll repeat it again."

"Ah, well, you can't do anything like that. You'd see the cloth through it if you got the idea the chalk wasn't there and so forth. And that would violate physical phenomena."

And you say, "Good. Well, I'll repeat the auditing command. Now, get the idea that chalk isn't there."

Man, you go on like this for about a half an hour, you know, and you finally get it answered. I've even gone to this degree.

I've said, "Now, look-a-here, see that – see that piece of chalk? Now, you see it right there right now. All right. Now watch. Now, can you – can you see no chalk? Can you see no chalk? All right. Now I'm going to put the chalk there and now you look at the chalk. Now get the idea there's no chalk there. Can you do that? No. All right. Well, I'll do this again now. Now, here's your chalk. Now, you see, now you're supposed to get the idea the chalk isn't there and if you did that and this is what it would visually look like, see. No chalk. Now, just watch that. Watch that. Good."

"By God, you're right, you know."

"All right. There's the chalk."

Work with the person. Work with the person until the person could actually take over the automaticity of not-ising physical objects. And all of a sudden the room starts to go solid on them, you know, and things like this supposed to happen. Just keep on working

"Get the idea now the chalk is there."

You haven't told him to see the chalk. You told him just get the idea the chalk was there. You haven't told him not see the chalk. And you'll see the confusion blowing off on something stupid like this. That's what I mean, just take a feather and waft the wind off that

feather very gently past one ear at a distance of about a yard, you know, and they say, "God almighty, turn off that Pratt & Whitney engine."

See, you have an effect. What you're dealing with there, of course, is the old Effect Scale. And as the person goes down, down toward total effect, the effect that can be had on them is a breath of air. See, that's a terrific effect. But if you were to blow them up, if you were to drop a building on their heads and so forth, they'd never find out about it. See, that's too much effect.

Now, we see that clearly in our overt-motivator phenomena. The overt that the person has, we think it's a comparable motivator. No. The more motivators that the person has earned, the less motivator the person can have. So you'll be astonished sometime to say to somebody, "Sneeze" and the person has said, "What is the idea of killing me with that terrible, piercing scream which you just uttered?"

Let's take last year's or last lives' *Murders of the Rue Morgue* character. Man, he had bodies strewn from one corner of Paris to the other. We pick him up in this life in the auditing chair, he actually taps his toe with the faintest of taps – you see, just a slightest tap, see, against it – in avoiding your toe, see. Your toe was there and he didn't step on your toe, but he tapped his toe against the side of the chair. Boy, is he upset. That's the motivator. That's a motivator. That is enough to practically kill you for. Do you get the idea? And it's just nothing, nothing for a motivator.

He thinks everybody is against him, as they go by him on the road because their wheels are going round or something, you know. That's enough motivator.

Well, the more overts a person collects, the less motivator it takes to blow him to pieces. That's an interesting principle. If you look this over, you'll understand auditing this no-effect pc rather easily. The greater the person's overts, why, the less motivator. The motivator can be just absolutely, fantastically microscopic.

Let's take this girl, she's gone out with other men. She's stolen all your money. She's sold everything out in all directions. She's acted in a most outrageous fashion, you know. And then you give her a bunch of flowers and the petal of one flower is bruised. You hear about it. That's enough motivator. That's a motivator. Got the idea?

But frankly, you could throw her the length of the block and run over her head with a truck and it wouldn't be much of a motivator, you see? That's too much effect. It is – it's simply that she doesn't notice it. She can't perceive that much of an effect. So you get the idea of people perceiving large, explosive actions and people perceiving very small actions. Now, who could perceive a large, explosive action?

Well, it'd be a person in fairly good shape. And he'd say, "Look at that, you know?"

And somebody else sees the large explosion and notices that a little puff of smoke, see, came up at the side. And they'll tell you about the little puff of smoke at the side, but not all the debris and the arms and legs flying through the air. See, they won't tell you about that. They take up that other. And that would be enough. That's a terrible explosion because of the little puff of smoke.   And you say, "Well, how about all the arms and legs and the factory chimneys that were flying through the air?"

And they'd say, "Well, where were those?"

You get the idea the person wasn't viewing the same view that you viewed. The person probably wasn't in the same universe or something Well, evaluate it just on this: Their automatic not-is takes care of all large effects. And the little tiny effects are left on the fringes. So they can really get upset with small things.

Well, you'll see this in a session. And the funny part of it is you probably could give somebody no auditing I mean, gross auditing error, see. Just no auditing. You know, I mean, do something or other. Crank up the E-Meter, ride him yappety-yappety-yap through the rudiments, you know and then say yappety-yap to him, and miss a half a dozen of this and don't do anything of that and then end rudiments and end session and that sort of thing. Just a clown, you know, a total clown type of auditing with a bunch of crash in it, you know, a bunch of crushers, you know. The pc didn't instantly answer the auditing command. "Are you withholding anything" And you say, "Why the hell don't you speak up? Come on. For Christ's sake, you know." Swear at him.

But really no auditing at the same time because you don't care whether they answer or not, you know. Just a total no-auditing session. And this person doesn't think anything has happened to them. The person doesn't think anything bad has happened to him. They didn't get any auditing, but that's all right. The auditing is so gross, you might say, the errors are so gross that they don't notice it's bad. All right. Now, let's take the reverse. They get a very good auditing session, somebody's going through perfectly all right and they miss one tick on an ARC break or something of the sort, you know. That's enough motivator. See, they take off like a startled gazelle. Doesn't have to be a good session particularly, but a mediumly good session. But just – it's the little tiny error that they will notice. They won't notice the rest of it.

Well, we see this in critics of auditing They're always looking for the little error when the whole session is missing. Pc hasn't even sat down in the chair, you know, that sort of thing We see somebody trying to straighten up an auditing session on this. Well, what would he consider a motivator? That's what he finds wrong with the session is what he would consider a motivator.

Therefore, a critic of a session is also indexed, frankly, by his own ability to have an effect.

Now, you get along in life with this and you'll notice that the Spanish people, the Mexican people, regardless of their reputation with revolutions of a bombastic and brutal governmental action, banditry, tortures, imprisonments, civil abuses of great magnitude and we think maybe that they're vicious people or something like that.

No, basically they're very good people. You could probably leave a bicycle lying all day in the middle of Madrid and nobody would touch it. Maybe not Madrid, but Seville for sure. And you – nobody'd touch it. You leave your wallet on a counter in a store or something like this and my God, the manager himself runs five blocks to return the thing to you and make sure that you see that all the money is still in it and all that sort of thing. Fantastic, you see, their level of honesty, as you would call it honesty and so forth, is utterly fabulous. And this in the middle of countries – a country which tolerates enormous criminality in its government, atrocities in its wars and actions, exclamation points in its banditry and so forth. People don't object because they don't see it. See, it's not a motivator. Doesn't have anything to do with them.

A democracy is only as good as people can observe what's going on. And a democracy goes to pieces promptly that people cannot see what's happening and get onto this enough-motivator kick.

Oh, my, you should see though what happens in a Spanish family if little Juan or something like that, accidentally loses a penny or a peseta or something or takes one off the living room table, you see or fails to sit for four hours in the sun waiting for his father to come in from fishing and so on. My God, you'd think the empire had just been torn to pieces, you see, just fantastic crimes have been committed here. It's something that everybody goes and cries about quietly in the corner, and Aunt somebody-or-other goes and – into the convent, you see. It's just – it's just enough motivator, you know. It's just "Oh, my God, how could they do such a thing?" you know. He didn't sit there for four hours in the boiling sun. He went and sat in the shade. Terrible. Terrible.

And yet their bandits, their governments, their supersystems of some kind or another. These things are utterly just *blaaaah.* Just total uncontrolled criminality from the word go. That's Mexico. That's Spain. T hat's the way an old empire has gone. It gets down to enough motivator. What's enough motivator? What can people see? Well, "What effect can they have?" is all this adds up to.

And in auditing pcs, in auditing pcs, this shows up very strongly so that you in auditing low-level pcs could have a perfectly fine time auditing some spinning psycho. Oh, you could sit on his head and sit all over him and make him answer up one way or the other and push him this way and that way and he might get some big gain out of it, you see. With gross auditing errors, you could audit this psycho, see. I mean, it could just be fantastically bad auditing And he'd take it. It's perfectly all right.

Now, you take a person in the middle band of sanity, something like that and it's a different proposition. It goes from low-scale cases can be given, shouldn't be given by you, but could be given without their noticing it – I don't advise this, of course, but they could be given without their noticing it – very bad auditing and take it. All they'd notice is that it just wasn't happening very good. Nothing much was happening.

But you could just knock their heads off, you know. Run everything backwards, upside down. And just be a complete, colossal mess. Do you see that? You could just give them a *horrible* session and you'd have no objection of any kind whatsoever. You'd have no objection.

Now, that's something for you to look over. You wonder why you don't get objections in some quarters and spheres and so forth, in auditing clinics or something like that, when very bad auditing is done by some auditor on lowscale cases and you got no objection to it.

Well, that isn't the reason. It wasn't that it – wasn't bad auditing, don't you see. It's that the pc couldn't tolerate that big an effect. Couldn't tolerate that big of an error.

And if the pc were asked to criticize the session, if pushed very hard to find something wrong with that session, it's actually not even, you see, that the pc is in propitiation. The pc just doesn't see it, that's all. And if he was asked very hard to search over the session very, very hard to find something wrong with the auditing he had had, see, he would come up with the fact that the auditor one day was five minutes late for the session. And that was everything that was wrong with the auditing, see?

It's quite fantastic. Actually pitiful.

But in your middle-range auditing, people who are not in that kind of condition, the little tiny errors are registering and mediumly large errors are registering And it'd be pretty hard to audit wildly enough so that they couldn't see it. So that they'd see auditing errors, don't you see? And these do have an effect on them. And as they come up scale, then they see the whole of the auditing error, you see. They see everything in the error that – in the auditing that is in error. And actually, it has less effect on them than it would have on the lower-scale case, you see.

Don't make the mistake of thinking because the person didn't observe the effect that it didn't have an effect. It did have an effect on them, see.

But you get an upper-scale case that audits pretty easily and so on. Man, he can see everything wrong with an auditing session from the word go. He could criticize the whole living lot of it.

Therefore, as you audit people up the line, your auditing has to *improve.* See, if you get them off the launching pad while sitting with your stocking feet on the windowsill and puffing a cigarette, you see and looking at the E-Meter now and then, don't you see and never

starting the session and never ending the session and never cleaning anything up that happens and always Q-and-Aing with the pc, auditing will still give some gain.

All right. That person will come up to that gain point and your auditing would have to improve. Do you see how that would be?

All right. Now, you give this person – at your improved auditing status – you give this person a lot of wins and they get better and everything is fine along that level. And now to make them any better, your auditing has got to improve. You see where we're going with this?

Now, we're not monkeying around with improving your auditing while the pc is improving We're trying to put your auditing straight up at a high peak right now because there is no sense in Q-and-Aing with this. Just audit well always. I myself don't particularly follow that maxim. I've given lousy sessions. I've gotten cross and upset in sessions over the years and so forth, but when I sit down to give a session, I give a session. And unless I'm involved in some particular way trying to clean something up that doesn't have anything to do much with auditing – you know, using auditing to do something else with it – but as far as the sessions go, sit down to give a session, yeah. Well, I'll give something that's very, very close to the letter-perfect session.

Well, what do you mean a letter-perfect session?   Well, it just takes up what's wrong with the pc and handles it and pushes it along through and ends it up with the pc improved. That's a perfect auditing session. You couldn't be more perfect than that because that is exactly what you are trying to do, don't you see?

It is-perfection does not necessarily derive with how you hold your little pinky in the air. You know, your little pinky up here and you must hold this finger as you hold the E-Meter, you see, this – the posture of this finger is important. Whether or not you have the index finger and the little finger up while your thumb is on the tone arm, you know, that kind of thing. It doesn't matter. It's whether or not your auditing communication with the pc is effective at the pc's level of case. That is what is it.

Now, of course, in the forms which we have today, you have Model Session. And Model Session has been very arduously, very carefully worked out over a long period of time to pick up the maximum number of pcs and the maximum numbers of upsets that pcs can be prone to and the maximum numbers of things that upset sessions. So that's there and that's well tailored. But you come along, you knucklehead, and you lean on that. And you got a beautiful tool, you see and there you lean on it. And you say, "Well, this will see me through." No, nothing will ever see you through but auditing. That's all that will ever see anybody through a session as an auditor is just auditing.

Now, the second you start *leaning* on the Model Session – "Start of session. Is it all right with you if we audit in this room? All right. Good. Talking about *(mumble), hmm?* Withholding anything? Oh, well, you don't want to go into that. All right. Have a present time

problem? Huh? Oh, well, hm? Hm? Hm-mm. Ah, hm. Let's see, what are we going to audit in this session? Oh, yes, Security Check. All right. Have you ever raped anyone? Thank you. That's clear. There . . ."

What's phenomenal is without paying any attention whatever to the pc you can make a gain on the pc. You don't have to pay attention to the pc or get mixed up in his nasty old case.

You see? What's carrying you through there is just the mechanic. See, the ritual. And if you went through the ritual and went by the meter, you would wind up at the other end of the session with having done a session. And what do you know, you would have something done with the pc.

Now, immediately you think, "Well, if that isn't good enough, if I'm not just supposed to sit there and reel off Model Session and read the E-Meter and take up what I see on the E-Meter and come out the other end, what the hell is auditing See, what's that?"

Well, that you would ask the question shows that you have defined auditing as a Model Session going off in a certain unit of time monitored by an E-Meter. That's what – what you've been defining auditing by if you ask that question.

No, auditing – auditing is a science, definitely a science, not an art, contrary to old Joe Winter. He used to stand up and tell students, "Auditing is an art." Joe used to watch me audit, didn't have a clue what I was doing and it all appeared different to him every time he saw it, you know? So of course, to old Joe auditing was an art. It was rather fantastic.

There was nothing scientific about auditing because it all looked different. Well, when we start TVing these sessions, you're going to get some of that reaction around here. You're going to say, "My God, you must have thrown away the whole rule book." That's why we're going to have to run a tape every time we do one of these things. So the arguments will cease. And you go back through and you'll find a Model Session and you will find the E-Meter and you'll find the readings of the E-Meter are taken up and you'll find it's all going off and after you get all the auditing off the top of it, you will find a Model Session and an E-Meter. Got the idea?

I'm not talking to you about how wonderfully I audit. As a matter of fact, my auditing could improve. There's no doubt about that. As a matter of fact, right now because we're going to televise these things and so forth, I've got to learn the end rudiments perfectly. I had – I had them down perfect in the old version, you know and since I – since I rewrote them and worked them out, I haven't got these new ones taped. It's very funny. Even in my auditing now, I say, I always have to say to the pc, "Well, you'll have to pardon the lack of end rudiments here, but are you withholding anything How's your havingness? Anything you'd care to say before we end this session?"

I've gone completely off the old rudiments and I haven't picked up the new ones. But you can expect that to happen to you too, see? The end rudiments weren't something I suddenly dreamed up. The end rudiments were a whole bunch of errors that were being made by auditors that were worsening cases and there was a wonderful opportunity to scrap the end rudiments as a repetition of the beginning rudiments and put all those beautiful stopgaps in at the end. And they were simply worked out rather arduously of what is the wording that works and what sounds good and what carries it in and that sort of thing They're all perfectly worked out.

But working them out wasn't memorizing them and I was caught right there. But if you took my auditing, if you took a session and you took all of the auditing off of the top of it, the bones that you would find would be an auditor, a pc, an E-Meter, Model Session and the TRs. But you'd have to take all the auditing off the top of it to find 'em, see.

Now, get the idea of a very, very, very skinny girl. A very, very skinny girl, you know. You'd have to stand twice in the same place to make a shadow. And now, if she had a little flesh on her, she'd just look gorgeous, you see. Well, your auditing may be looking like the skinny girl. Even the best of your auditing right now kind of looks a little bit like a skinny girl. It hasn't got any flesh on it, see. Those bones show through.

The pc is very, very aware of the fact that you are taking up beginning rudiments. Well, isn't it interesting that a pc even though he's a trained auditor is aware of your taking up anything What's the pc doing listening to the auditing bones? See? Well, he must be out of session. He's supposed to be interested in his own case and willing to talk to the auditor and there he sits watching the bones rattle. See? Now, if you want a test of good auditing, did you know that the auditor was using Model Session? If you didn't he either wasn't using it or it was a perfect session. *Smooth,* man, *smooth* is the keynote of this sort of thing

Auditing a pc the other night. Now, think what you would do in this situation. The pc's havingness isn't working. We've run the pc's havingness, we've given the can-squeeze test – all standard, you see, all perfectly nice – and it isn't working.

All right. Now, what's the textbook solution but not necessarily the textbook solution? What would you do in that particular case? Think what you would have done. You'd have bridged out of what you were doing and you would have tested for a new Havingness Process and then you would have bridged out of that and run it. And a half an hour later, you would have gotten the session going again. Wouldn't that – isn't that the way it looks?

All right. That's fine. And I wouldn't for a minute take away any ability you have to do this because you often have to do it.

All right. But what about this as a situation? Watching this session I was running, you would have – you would have been – "What the hell is this?" you know. You're sort of alert that something else was happening here that you hadn't quite noticed.

Pc ran it – can-squeeze test. Run Havingness – can-squeeze test. Five more commands – can-squeeze test. Five more commands – can-squeeze test. Pc has a long history of having had Havingness run. What's wrong here?

So, without breaking pace and the pc never even noticed this, I just asked the pc how many Havingness commands the pc hadn't ever executed. And the answer was thousands. The pc had never done a Havingness command in the pc's entire history in Scientology. Had never done a Havingness command. Had told some early auditors, two or three of them, that this was not possible to do. And it cut loose on the Havingness Process and run it that way.

All right. Here's some thousands of commands never done. Thousands. Here's maybe three, four auditors, whole sessions, upsets, unanswered auditing commands, ARC breaks. Here's the whole mess, yawning wide for the auditor to dive into and get lost, see.

Cleaned the invalidations off, shifted to a Havingness Process that was elementary – just an elementary Havingness Process, having gotten the invalidations off havingness. The unanswered commands. Having attacked that. And simply asked this other command and got the can-squeeze test and it worked and went on with the Havingness session. And the total lapsed time was 2.5 minutes to straighten out a pc's whole history of Havingness. And the pc never noticed this, but thought that was very nice that Havingness was now operative, you know? They just thought it was nice, but never noticed that it was nice because the auditor had done it.

In other words, there's no gears ever got shifted. There was no difference in the reading of the speedometer in the session. The pc never noticed any change of pace. This was a discussion between can-squeeze tests.

This was apparently to the pc just a little two-way comm that went on and the auditor interested in the pC'9 case, you know. No more important than that. No big resurges. No bridges. Nothing. All in the middle of this.

All right. Now, you should be able to know the right way to go about things and find the Havingness Process and straighten out that sort of thing. All right. That's fine.

Well, how about this other thing Why make a production out of it? See? How come each one of these things has got to be a production? That's what I would like to ask you. How come? See?

So the pc's Havingness Process isn't working and it was working yesterday. Well, you can find a new pc's Havingness Process and you probably should if it's some esoteric process like "Tell me the cubic inch capacity of that – what the cubic inch capacity of that wall might be." If it's something this complicated and esoteric, why, certainly you'd better be working on it gradually, session by session, to improve their Havingness Process till it's something very simple like "What can you have here?"

See, I mean, that's the essence. You're trying to work toward a simplicity, by all means. But the pc is already running "Point out something Point out something Thank you. Point out something" The pc's running on this and it loosened the can squeeze – on the can-squeeze test yesterday and it isn't loosening on the can-squeeze test today. Well, why the production?

Isn't it perfectly obvious that the pc has invalidations or withholds on the subject of havingness? Isn't that all that would make that Havingness Process cease to function? It's too – it's an elementary process. Yes, we can see that other things, such as "What is the emotion of that (indicated object)?" We could see that that, for God's sakes, let's get off of it and get on to something else because that's a complicated process and we'd love to better it.

But why make a production out of improving something which is very simple already? This is a perfectly satisfactory Havingness Process. "Point out something Thank you. Point out something Thank you." Auditor can just sit there and yawn. It's very easy. The pc thinks it's marvelous. Everything is going along whizzingly.

Well, it ceases to work, what should you do with it? Well, let's patch it up. How long does it take to patch up something and get an invalidation off something? If the pc is in-session, doesn't take very long to find it. And the more the pc is in-session, the faster the pc will blow an aberration, the less afraid they are of things, the less they duck and dodge, the braver they feel. And they'll take on large masses and blow them and blow holes out of engrams and they're just brave as hell, you see, because they've got confidence in the auditor and they know the auditor will take it up if they go wrong.

So why the production, see?

This pc comes into session. This pc is saying, "Natter, natter, natter, yap, yap, yap and it was so-and-so and so-and-so," got a roaring present time problem. The pc is right on the top of the present time problem, has nothing else but a present time problem, what are you going to do? Yank the pc's attention all over the room and on the floor and the ceiling and go through this and talk to you about your difficulties? Why, hell, they're talking to you about your difficulties and so forth.

I'd handle the present time problem then start a session. See? You're auditing a case that's in front of you, not something else. The pc is stuck in a present time problem, it's perfectly obvious the pc is stuck in a present time problem, what are you doing handling anything else? What are you doing starting any sessions? Session got started someplace. Lord knows where the session got started or why it got started or something like that and if you want to square it with your conscience, why, just mutter, you know, "Well, start of session. What was that again?"

But even that might distract the pc. All right. She says, "Oh, my, this garage mechanic. My God. And it took my car and I mean they took the rear wheels and put on the front wheels

and they got the flywheel off and they put on the steering wheel. And they just poured oil all over everything Right afterwards," and so forth.

And you're going to say, "Start of session. Is it all right to audit in this room?"

Going to say something like this, are you? Well, how many ARC breaks can you handle at once? How many can you handle? That's all. Now, you've got the present time problem and an ARC break. You've got an ARC break with life and an ARC break with the auditor. Let's see if we can't dig up another ARC break someplace. Two doesn't seem like enough. Two ARC breaks and a present time problem and the auditor out of session – yeah, this'd be good, this would.

No, the obvious thing is to say, "Well, what are you withholding from him?"

"His payment. I'm not going to pay him a dime!"

"What else are you withholding from him?"

"Well, I've got the car. I've got the car outside."

"What were you withholding from him before that?"

"Well, it was a wreck."

"Well, was there any earlier withhold on him?"

"Ha-ha-ha. Well, I wasn't really going to pay for the repairs anyway."

"Oh, is that so? Well, all right. Any other withholds on that? Any other upsets, withholds?"

"No, no."

"How do you feel about that now?"

"Oh, I feel all right about it, I guess. I guess."

"Well, were there any other withholds?"

"Well, withhold from you that I had withholds from them."

"Well, all right. That's fine. Okay if we start this session now? Start of session. Look around here . . ." There we go. That's auditing. That's auditing. It's auditing the case that's in front of you.

At the time you do that, however, you are not absolved from any of the obligations of the auditor to have a proper Model Session running. You're not absolved from any obligations whatsoever, but you audit the case that's in front of you.

You're just about to ask the pc, "Are you withholding anything" and the pc dopes off. You say, "Are . . ."

Well, what's the matter with you, that you can't shift gears at that point? You know the pc's Havingness Process. All right. Your classic method of starting that would be to say, "Is all right with you if I run some Havingness now?"

But if the pc is so dopey he couldn't even hear it, I don't waste the English. I would just say, "Point out something Thank you. Point out something" And the pc does, you know.

Get the pc back up into session again and say, "Well, all right. Are you withholding anything"

"Oh, well, that's something else." Here we go.

A lot of you are saying, for instance, "The elements, the items found – the items found – are going in and out." Why do you say something like that? That's an odd thing to say.

No. Elements never go in and out. For them to go out, they would probably have to be audited or blown in some fashion that would be very arduous, so these items are not going out, but rudiments are. Rudiments are, which is cancelling the read.

In other words, rudiments are going in and out if an item goes in and out on its read. The item doesn't go in and out. The rudiments go in and out and cancel the item's read. That's all. You get the rudiments back in, the item is reading again.

Well, that doesn't mean that the *item* was going in and out. It wasn't, which gives you an entirely erroneous picture. You now – you now present the fact that an item is not the item. Why isn't it the item? Well, because it's disappearing and appearing. Well, that would be characteristic of a bad item, a poorly assessed item, sporadic read. You're not dealing with that at all. The rudiments are going in and out and cancelling the reads.

No, you don't say even that the item is being cancelled by rudiments out. You say rudiments are cancelling out the meter reads. See? The rudiments are cancelling the meter. That's proper. That is to say that's factual. That's what's happening.

So you're whizzing on down the line – you're whizzing on down the line auditing somebody – what are you going to run into? Well, how many parts are there to a human mind? And how many thinks can a person thunk, particularly if he's a thunky kind of thinker. Hm? How many?

You're liable to run into any one of them. You're either going to handle him with TR 4 as an origin or you're going to have to take them up and keep your session going. That doesn't mean you Q-and-A all over the place. You have to know whether or not something is out of session or in session or going to throw the pc out or something. You have to have an adjustment. You have to have an idea of what you're doing.

In order to accomplish what you're doing, however, move heaven and earth to get the pc down that particular *slot.* See, just do anything you can do to get the pc down the slot. The

pc's trying to move away and you say, "There's the slot, see? That's the cliff and we want you to go to the edge of the cliff and jump off."

And the pc is saying, "I don't like the cliff and I don't like the edge of the cliff and it's going to take a lot more than an auditor to make me jump off the cliff."

And you say, "Good, well, how deep is it?"

Pc says, "Well, it's quite deep."

"Where you looking at it from?"

"Well, from up here at the edge," and so forth. And the pc says, "But I'm not going anywhere near that because another auditor ran that at some time or another and had a lot of trouble with it."

"Well, you got any withholds from that auditor?"

"Oh, yes. That I didn't want to run it. I just pretended to run it before."

"Good. Now, how deep is it? All right. *Jump. Thank you.*"

No, sir. A pc hasn't got a prayer if an auditor is a good pony wrangler. He hasn't got a prayer.

Now, if a – if an auditor is that good so as to keep a pc rounded up at all times and headed in toward the slot the auditor wants him to be headed into, don't you think it'd also be a good idea if the auditor knew what slots to head the pc into? Don't you think that would be a good idea, huh?

If an auditor possesses all this horsepower that he can head the pc down this particular slot, then he certainly ought to know the slots. That's why you duplicate bulletins and things like that, so you get some idea where the slots are.

Of course, you take somebody that's been eighty-nine years a member of the Theosophy Society and two lives ago founded it, says, "Well, uh. . . *tsk!* Hubbard's a little bit wrong here. Actually, what he's talking about when he's talking about these black masses, he's talking about astral selves, which have begun to haunt the pc. And I know that, and so forth. And so obviously the thing to do is every short distance in the auditing session, why, we will put in this cancellation thing so the astral selves, you see, will dissolve and so forth and that will make it all work." And then he uses auditing techniques to head the pc down toward the astral selves slot.

Of course, there's no slot there, so the pc doesn't know where to go and everybody winds up in a – in a horrible bash. No, you've got to have a slot there for the pc to go into and you got to know what the slot is and then you ride him into it and through it. And it's very easy to do if you're doing that.

Now, I'll give you an idea of auditing on your feet, auditing there on the spot. I've just given you a flow process.

All right. There are four flows.

One is outflow. And the other, of course, is *restrained* outflow, which you know as a *withhold.* That's all a withhold is, is a restrained outflow. That's number two. And then there's an inflow and there's a restrained inflow. That's very simple. These are all selfdetermined flows. They're the most easy flows for a pc or a thetan to self-determine.

Now, we have heretofore looked on the inflows as motivators and the prevented inflow as a sort of a motivator side of it. And that was very easy to do because these things are very snarled up. But mixed up inside the motivators, there was a pc selfdetermined action to make the inflow occur and a pc self-determined action to make the inflow not occur.

And of course, also, the pc's self-determined actions to make the outflow occur. Now, flows 3 and 4, which is the inflow and the restrained inflow, are not as important as the withhold and outflow.

Now, you handle the withhold and outflow all the time in a Security Check. You ask – on one hand you're asking, "What are you withholding?" and on the other hand you're asking, "What have you done?"

In other words, you've asked for the outflow and you've asked for the withhold. So you've asked for flows 1 and 2.

Now, you've got flows 3 and 4, however, still available; and although these are fainter flows, they nevertheless can be selfdetermined flows. A pc self-determines an inflow. Now, oddly enough, a pc can self-determine a bad inflow and can practically force you into making an auditing error because he has to have a good inflow. Good, nice ARC break is what he needs at the particular moment and he'll force you to inflow something. But he has something to do with it. In other words, however, the action is so much yours that you seldom notice that there was a self-determined action involved in it.

Now, he might have done this so he could thereafter outflow a make-you-guilty. So you've got these little, tiny inflow and braked inflows which are self-determined which are operative in a mass.

Now, you have this in the Flow Process.

You run the Flow Process fifty minutes. The reason you can't run it less, particularly early in sessions, is because it cycles too hard and it's too ridgy and it's too beefy. You can't run it slightly. It's got to be run heavily. I already tested that out. I originally thought that it would be ten minutes of the Flow Process and twenty minutes and ten minutes. But I've underestimated entirely the power of the process and the power of the process kicked it up that the minimum length of time the process can be run is about fifty minutes.

Now, that's all right because that gives you fifty minutes of that and it gives you twenty minutes of Sec Checking and ten minutes of Havingness and twenty minutes of Sec Checking and ten minutes of Havingness and you've got ten minutes worth of rudiments before and after and you've got a two-hour session, which is fine.

Now, that is all very well, but understanding this mechanic of the four flows... Of course, you know, there are some more flows. That is, it doesn't exhaust all the flows there are. There are the flows from left to right and right to left and there are all four flows for somebody else – the pc determining the four flows for somebody else. And you could be determining them for England.

In other words, they could occur on the – on the third dynamic, you see. The pc's busily running "What should be outflowed? What should be inflowed?" and so on and he's running them for England. He isn't running them for himself. "What should be outflowed? Exports. What should be inflowed? Dollars," you know? "What inflow should be prevented? Jamaicans," you know. All kinds of wild things. Actual answers that came out of a session. Pc was running what should be inflowed, you know, and that sort of thing, and I was – and the answers were well, food, you know, all logically. And then exports. Exports? What's this, you know?

And three or four commands later, I suddenly realized the pc was running these for England. This was England. The pc ran out the whole British Isles in about eighteen or twenty commands. It was quite remarkable.

Now, you got a principle of four flows. I said there's the principles from right to left and left to right and the principles from bottom to top and top to bottom. And there's a lot of weird ones in that particular line. You could run into those on the basis of "What are you holding down?" and "What are you keeping from being held down?" And you see, you could get terribly involved in all this, but it isn't necessary to get that complicated to get an effect – get a proper auditing effect.

Supposing you were to use these things in session to keep the rudiments in. I'll show you something on the order of auditing on your feet and auditing by basic principle.

This pc says, "Well, I'm very tired of being audited."

And you say, "Do you have a withhold?"

Well, the pc – yes, the pc has a withhold. Withhold themselves from the session.

All right, good. We got that session withhold off and a couple of seconds later we have another session withhold and a couple of seconds later we have another session withhold, and there's just more session withholds than we can easily take off of the case.

Well, if there are four flows, don't you think that it would be a simple thing if you tripped one of the other flows that was causing the person to withhold?

So let's take as an auditing question, "Well, are you outflowing anything?"

"Yeah, auditing answers. I answer just one more of – these list items, you know. Just one more and you keep asking and asking and asking me these items. I – I – I – I – I – I – and I give you all the items there are and so forth."

"Well, good enough. Well, did you withhold any?"

"Well, a ton or two, of course. Had to," and so forth.

"All right."

Now, all of a sudden you'll find the pc isn't going to get a withhold every two seconds. See, you tripped the outflow that was causing the pc to withhold. See, it was actually the being demanded to outflow – the demand to outflow, you see, was what had the pc withholding.

You keep picking up the session withholds and getting the reads back in, but you had to keep picking them up all the time. And you're just mopping your brow, you know and "Aw, all right. There they went again," you know, and you've gone down three lines, null, null, null. They weren't null before. And one of those items didn't even vaguely look like it was going to null. All right, that's out.

Now, if you just say, "Are you withholding anything"

"Yes, well, I'm withholding. I'm just – well, no, no. Just – yes. A few minutes ago I thought. . ."

"All right. Good." Get it in and you're reading again, see. Well, you have to keep doing that unless you balanced up the flows someplace. There must be something else he is upset about.

All right. So we say – we say, "Are you outflowing anything?"

"Hell, yes. Can't you hear me?" you know? "I just had to outflow about four more of these things."

"Well, when did you decide that it was a rough thing to have to outflow?"

He said, "Well, early in a session. I don't like to mention this, by the way. I don't like to mention these – this particular item. After all, it isn't nice for a young girl to have to list a whole bunch of opposition terminals to a policeman. It's not seemly."

"When did you first think that?"

"Well, I just thought it . . . just it was a bad thing to do and so on."

Of course, it is a specimen of withhold, isn't it? But nevertheless, it's the outflow they've been objecting to. All right. You get the objection to the outflow off and of course the tendency to withhold vanishes.

All right. Now, let's use another one of the flows.

You say, "Are you inflowing anything?"

And the person says, "Yes, auditing commands. If I just get one more auditing command . . ."

And of course, your tendency is, of course, at once to ask why and to be concerned about your auditing, but that just shows that you're ignorant and stupid and a knucklehead and were born that way.

No, the person says auditing command – yes, they're inflowing auditing commands. One of the troubles people have with auditing is they don't realize that these things *blow* and they take them up after the pc has got rid of them.

In other words, a pc says, "Are you with – ." Auditor says, "Are you withholding anything"

And the pc says, "Well, yes, I was withholding a critical thought about the nasal twang you were using in your auditing commands," and so forth and so forth.

And you, you knucklehead, all too often say, "Well, what is wrong with that?" or "What does that associate with?"

Look, the pc spat it out, there it is, you've got the withhold, it is now lying on the floor and it's totally doggo. If you jumped all over it, it couldn't be more dead, you see. And you carefully pick it up, attach an air hose to it, you see, and pump it up and put it back in the session.

See, it's just the basis of the – you don't believe the pc ever blows anything. The pc mentioned it and it's gone. The auditor is very often left stonied, you see, because the auditor gets in a bit of a games condition with the pc sometimes.

Well, he ought to take this up. The pc objects to his nasal accent, how in the name of common sense could he audit the pc? Well, it's all gone, you see. There isn't anything more on it. Let it lie. The Shakespearian phrase of "Let sleeping dogs lie" is "Let blown withholds and overts expire." Don't keep beating them to death because they're already dead. The pc blew them.

One of the ways to stop a pc from blowing is to take up everything he has blown after he has blown it. This is one of the nice ways to keep a pc from advancing because it's so innocent. Nobody ever quite notices what's happening

The pc says something and the auditor takes it up. He doesn't do a TR 4 on it, you see. He takes it up. The pc says something else and that's blown now. He doesn't express an interest in it or something like that. The auditor doesn't. He wants to know, now, how he can remedy this situation.

This is the way you really stop a session, see: The pc has just had a cognition. Now, the auditor wants to know how he can remedy it. You almost train the pc never to have a cognition after a while because the auditor is going to take it up. That's what's called Q and A, normally.

Q and A is – covers a multitude of situations of this particular character and that isn't exact Q and A. But you watch; it's a specialized kind of it. See, "Well, I just was having trouble because a nasal accent always upsets me."

"Well, when did you first withhold that?"

"Oh, I don't know. I thought that several days ago."

"Well, all right. Have you thought it often since?"

"Yes, yes, I have."

"All right. Well, that's fine. Thank you."

That would be everything that you could do. That would be sort of polishing it off, you know and buffing it up and putting out a piece of velvet and setting it in the middle of the velvet, you see and turning a couple of spotlights on it, you see.

Everything you could possibly do is done in just that little phraseology I just told you, see?

Oh, no. Some auditors won't do that.

They say, "Well, did you ever know anybody that had a nasal accent? Did anybody in your family speak with a nasal accent? When you were in the army, did you ever notice anybody with a nasal accent? Do you yourself ever use a naval accent?"

And then the auditor suddenly wakes up and realizes he's talking about naval accents and the pc is talking about nasal accents and it's all – it's all bogged down somewhere. And then the auditor has an ARC break and the pc doesn't take it up and that's the end of the session.

See, but that is a common error. Sometimes even the best auditor is startled into this error. He's just momentarily startled. It just took him a little bit off guard. It was something new and he has a tendency himself to satiate his own curiosity with regard to this sort of thing.

He's sometimes trapped into this one, but my God, don't make it a habit, you know, that every time the pc blows something, hand it back to the pc and say, "Did you lose this?" Anyway, in handling this sort of thing, you could say to a pc, "All right. Now, have you inflowed anything" Or "Have you prevented an inflow in this session?"

"Yeah, I'm sitting here waiting for that picture – that picture to – to move the other way."

"Oh." The pc hadn't mentioned this picture before, see. Prevented an inflow. There's the picture.

"Well, how long has the picture been there?"

"Oh, well, I don't know. It's been a long, long time."

"All right. Well, when did you first start preventing that inflow?" Not "What is in the picture?" Il1 clue you. That's wrong. That's wrong That's a gross auditing error. It'd be, "Well, when did you first prevent that inflow?"

See, on any flow line, you want to know when is it first and has it been going on for very long You just want to know this in order to get their attention to pick up the – an early one. You don't want the first one. If you're auditing withholds or something, for heaven's sakes, get the first one. Get the first tiny glimmering as it came out of the divine ether into the pc's left eardrum, see. For heaven's sakes, just *hound it down* with the meter, *pin it down* in time and find out what color the clock was painted.

In other words, go the limit if you're doing something that is utterly dependent on this. If that's the channel you're driving the pc into and no other channel, well, for heaven sakes, be thorough. But you are going down into channel Q and you're trying to get a list assessed.

And all of a sudden you ask the pc something like this and the pc says, "Yes and it's that picture and I'm trying for that."

"Well, have you been preventing that long? All right. When was that? Yeah. Have you done it many times since? Thank you very much. All right. Thank you." And go on with the list because it'll now be reading. You get the idea?

In other words, when you're driving them into channel Q, don't change your mind and try to get over here into this other channel. You weren't heading for that way. That's what Q-and-A really is.

Pc dives for channel G and the auditor, who has heretofore been heading for channel Q, immediately reverses his monowheel bicycle and goes clear across to the other side of the plain and heads down what he thinks the pc's channel is, you see.

In other words, he doesn't keep on with what he's doing at all. He does something else. Now, these are the lick-and-a-promise sort of thing and the way you handle the flow on a lick and a promise is just *bang, bang*

All right. "Are you?" see? "When?" "How often?" "How is it?" That's just about the limit of it. You don't go any further into it than that. That's it. It's blown.

Now, you've actually got four flows that you could monkey with on this basis of keeping rudiments in and you'd find every one of them would trigger some kind of a rudiment.

Pc who's sporadically getting rudiments out has got a flow off that you were not asking about. Now, that gives us a question. On beginning rudiments, do we do something on this order? Do we say, "Well, all right. Are you withholding anything? Are you outflowing anything Are you inflowing anything? And if you – are you holding off any inflow?" Yeah, it predicates that you very well might do something like that.

It would certainly give you all the pcs you would ever audit. Pcs have to outflow. They have to inflow. They have to prevent inflows, you see. And they often think they have to withhold. So that's the score.

It'd be perfectly legitimate, in other words, to balance out a person's flows with a simple question. Or with two questions. Or with all four questions relating to those flows. It's just what is this pc doing that he isn't communicating about? That is what the final analysis is. So it all comes under the head of a withhold.

But which direction is the withhold? See? Don't get lost on this and think that it is because the pc is outflowing that has got everything upset. It is because the pc is withholding his resentment and expression of that resentment that he is outflowing You got that? See?

It is not that the pc is inflowing your auditing commands. It's the pc has not bothered to communicate to you that he sometime since has started to resist the inflow of your auditing commands, that he has not communicated. That is the button that is off, see?

The pc has noticed for some time that there was a cold draft of air coming in some portion of the room and the pc is trying mentally to hold off the cold draft of air and it is not holding off the cold draft of air that is going to do anything to the session. It is the fact that he has not told you about it and that you haven't found out about it that has got the session off

So you'd say there are four flows you could find out about in clearing up things and making lists read. And those four flows will just be the four flows that are the four flows. And of course, it's withholding data about any one of the four flows that is the most aberrative thing to the session. So withhold is still king, but you have to remember these other things that go along with it.

All right. You could straighten up a pc and keep a session running under almost any circumstances providing one thing were present: an actual desire to assist the pc and to keep the pc in communication with you. Not necessarily to communicate with the pc but certainly necessarily to keep the pc in communication with you. That is more important than communicating to the pc, although that has some importance, too. You see, you can be communicating to the pc, but the pc isn't communicating to you.

Now, an auditor can interfere with a pc's communication to him in various ways. There are things called obsessive withholds on other people. The cop is totally inspired in all of his duties in restraining people from undergoing dramatizations of these mad impulses known as kleptomania, homicide and other Latin phrases which all mean "a mess," see? And those are all getting somebody else to withhold.

Now, the tax collector, of course, is up against an entirely different problem and he has to get people to outflow. So if you have an auditor who has a tax-collector background, why, probably they keep the pc talking forever and if you have an auditor who has customarily been a cop, why, he won't let – ever let the pc say a word.

And actually an auditor can function so as to shut off the pc's communication line. Not to keep the pc going down a channel, but just because pcs mustn't talk.

Now, auditors always talk too much. That's one of the earliest criticisms I ever uttered of auditors. They always talk too much. An auditor always says too much. This is – this is true.

You look back over a session and you won't be able to find places where you didn't, ordinarily, speak when you should have, but you will find several places where you should have kept your ruddy mouth shut. If you'd just kept your mouth shut, it would have been all right. You can always find those as you review a session. So the point of the thing is, is some nice adjudication on the part of the auditor.

Havingness is defined as that which a person believes he can reach. And no-havingness is defined as something that a person can't reach or doesn't permit itself to be reached. So an auditor who is talking too much, too roughly, too crossly, interfering too much with the session appears to be a confused area into which the pc cannot reach and therefore the pc cannot talk into this confused area and the pc simply clams up. It doesn't matter how (quote) "interested" the auditor appears to be. It doesn't matter how the pc this or the auditor's this or that or the other thing or whether or not the auditor is monitoring the session with his little finger raised forty-five degrees or sixty degrees. None of those things would count.

It's just that the auditor appears to be such an enturbulated area that the pc could not possibly reach into that area. If the pc has this sensation about the auditor then the auditor is simply making too much confusion for the pc.

Now, in that pcs very often can't have much anyhow, a slight confusion and too much yap on the part of the auditor can cut the pc's havingness down and the pc will dope. See, any communication was almost too much communication for the pc.

Well, that means the auditor is out. "Who would I have to be to audit you? What don't I know about you?" Processes of that kind. Clean this up, you see? But it's a very bad thing for an auditor to use the auditor's body in any way in the session, by the way. That's a good tip

for you. It's just bum, bum auditing for the auditor to call attention, for instance, to his body as a part of Havingness. For instance, you're running "notice that" and so forth and call attention to the auditor's body. That's just poor auditing in general.

However, regardless of that, a rather interesting phenomenon can be observed with a pc who has believed the auditor is too enturbulative to reach into.

Just tell the pc, "Put your hand on my shoulder. Thank you. Put your hand on my shoulder. Thank you. Put your hand on my shoulder. Thank you. Put your hand on my shoulder. Thank you. Put your hand on my shoulder. Thank you. Put your hand on my shoulder. Thank you."

All of a sudden, the pc smiles and that's fine. You say, "All right. End of that process."

That's never good to use the auditor's body in this lineup at all, but I'm just giving you that as an example. Give the pc the illusion of being able to reach the auditor and the havingness of the auditor picks way up. And what is more demonstrable by that than the fact that he could put out his hand actually and reach into the auditor's zone.

The pc finds this out and all of a sudden he's got an auditor. Now, when you have people around who are terrified of anybody coming into their zone and they say or attempt auditing, of course, they put the pc on – in an odd frame of mind.

Now, the auditor who is trying to make the pc obsessively withhold "because everybody should withhold, because we know how to control life and we know how life should operate. If everything withheld everyplace, then life would be okay, wouldn't it?" Well, anybody who is operating on that as a sole modus operandi, of course, makes a poor auditor because every time the pc speaks, the auditor makes the pc guilty for speaking. And "Boo," you know. "How dare you?" you know?

"All right. How tall is a bear?"

The pc says, "Six feet."

And the auditor says, "Hmmmmm. Are you sure you answered the auditing command? Oh, you are. All right. Good."

You know, builds up high ARC.

Now, just as you have that mechanism, so you have the other mechanism, which is the auditor to – into whose zone nobody must ever reach. Nobody must ever reach into the auditor's zone because the auditor should run away. You see, the proper thing to do is to run away. And you will find the auditor changing the auditing process as a symptom of running away and doing many other things, all of which are classifiable under running away.

See, punish the pc for reaching or run away to keep the pc out of your zone of area. These are all basic auditing error mechanisms. And where those are going on, you will

discover that the pc is more aware of it than the auditor. The pc just knows he isn't getting an auditing session. That's the way the pc sums it up. See, when he says something, it's never taken up. When he tries to do something, it's somehow or another handled. And when he tries to speak, he's prevented from speaking, you see? When he asks the auditor something, the auditor isn't there.

And all of this sums up to is, of course, out of communication in some fashion which then sums up for the pc of an inability to talk to the auditor which is unintentional. See, he's on an unintentional withhold all the time because he can't talk to the auditor. The auditor's putting him on a continuous withhold.

Well, if he's into that kind of a condition, why, of course, the auditor doesn't have the pc in-session and we get rather poor auditing There's numerous mechanisms I could mention in this particular line, but those are the principal mechanisms which make an auditor have trouble. It's not that the pc gets these ideas but that the auditor fosters them.

Oddly enough, a pc, how you could ever have trouble with a pc, I wouldn't ever know. That does exceed my reality. When I tell people to sit down and do something, they always sit down and do it. Whether I have to pick them up and put them bodily in the chair or fast-talk them into the chair or sweettalk them into the chair or whatever I have to do and then to get it done, they always do it, see. And it just never enters my head that they won't. So therefore, it really never enters theirs.

I'm perfectly willing to carry out the auditing command on the pc, see, whereas perhaps other auditors are more willing to have the pc carry out the auditing command. Now, I'm perfectly willing to carry it out on the pc. I have no illusions about the pc's bank. I know I have more control over it than he does. It doesn't scare me, so let's roll.

And the only thing that ever upsets me is when a pc starts out intentionally to give me loses. And I can even cure a pc of that. But I think that's the one thing that pcs do occasionally. They just set out to give you a lose, you know, give you another lose, give you another lose. I don't like that. And I'm not above punishing them. Drop them in an engram and say, "Well, it's getting awfully late. Don't you think we ought to end session?" But that's a bum thing to do. But then, I'll be human someday.

Anyway, the difficulties that you have as an auditor actually are basically of your own creation and they stem from using ritual to avoid auditing and various things of this character. And there is no substitute for just sitting down, taking the pc, sitting there and you audit his case and you use what you know about the human mind and so forth and putting it in the most optimum form and the most optimum presentation you can for that pc, just get that session rolling, fix it up, find it, what it is, tape it all out, square it up, *bang!* There it is. Write it down on the auditing report.

The pc always says, "Boy, that was a wonderful session, you know. And *wooooeee, you* know."

Ah, it wasn't any different from any other session, but it was for the pc. And auditing was intended and if that's all you intend to do with a pc is audit them and improve them, v*oilà,* you'll always have good sessions.

But if you've got other considerations entering your mind continuously, of pcs should be better than they are, they should be worse than they are. This pc is too tall; we will make this pc thinner, therefore and so on. And we're not really auditing the pc but sitting back in some long stream of criticism of the pc of some kind or another. Well, I don't know what could happen. There'd be ten thousand things that you could do. It'd be impossible for your Instructors to enumerate the number of ways of doing auditing wrong.

The easiest thing in the world is to articulate how to do auditing right. Audit. Only one word. And it all really comes out all right. And you vacillate from trying too hard to not trying hard enough and so forth. And when you get too baffled and too confused and you don't know what to do about it and you just think it's all up in smoke every way you possibly can think of, why, just remember what I've told you. Well, audit and I'm sure it'll come out all right.

Thank you.