IN-SESSIONNESS

A lecture given on
30 January 1962

Thank you.

Okay. Now this is the what?

Audience: Thirtieth.

Thirtieth of January. What year?

Audience Member: 12.

Good. AD 12. Okay.

Haven't a thing to talk to you about. You're all doing so well, you're all doing so beautifully, know your stuff so well, everything's going along so swimmingly, I have nothing to talk to you about at all. There's only one small question, is when are you going to start to audit? Now, that sarcasm was uncalled for because with very few exceptions, why, you're doing splendidly.

Now, you are about to get demonstrations here the like of which you never heard of with TV. That's coming along fine. And the sets are all upstairs, and I think the cameras are being adapted, specially built in Germany to be flown over here. Adenauer's bringing them personally. Anyway, it's very special, so you can expect that in very short order.

Now, I'm tempted to give you a lecture about pure theory about things, speculative theory, and so on. You're doing 3D Criss Cross pretty well, and I'd like to make a comment on 3D Criss Cross, no more than that. And that is 3D Criss Cross sort of comes to you all of a sudden. It is one of these processes.

Now, in general auditing, in general auditing, you will find that there is a point where an auditor all of a sudden realizes he can audit and that he doesn't mind auditing and auditing is fun and that he can do it.

Now, there is such a point just in normal auditing You would expect that to happen someplace in Class II that all of a sudden, why, the fellow can sit there and ask Sec Check questions and run Havingness and get rudiments in, and so forth. And that's all right. He can do that. If a person hasn't had such a realization point, they can expect that sometime in the future.

But in 3D Criss Cross there is apparently another one. And it is just that one thing. A fellow all of a sudden realizes he can do 3D Criss Cross. It suddenly shows up in all of these reports. And I've never seen anything quite as sharp as that difference.

The reports right up to Tuesday are all "Well, *ha-ha, ha-ha-ha-ha* scratchy needle, couldn't do anything, and we got a list all right, and what do I do with the list, and I guess . . ."

And then all of sudden, why, you get the Tuesday report, and that is to say, "Well, we made a list and differentiated it and got the object. Going to check it out tomorrow, and the pc feels much better, and everything is running."

And do you know that's happened with nearly every one of these auditor's reports? You, yourselves, might not have realized it, but anybody doing 3D Criss Cross went across this either gradually or suddenly in almost one session, you know. It was just *bang.* There it was.

One of the reasons for this, of course, at this particular time is you've been taught to assess in order to find something in order to run; to find something in order to run. That was the orientation point.

It took a little while to find that you weren't finding something to *run,* that you were *running* the case. And I suppose that is the main point of "geewhiz," you know, that comes up.

But I think you're prepared to say that 3D Criss Cross – when it's running – is about the hottest thing that you've had on two wheels yet, isn't it?

Audience: Yes.

That's very hot in the way it runs.

Now, I want to talk to you about pure theory. It has something to do with 3D Criss Cross.

First is flows. And this applies to Class II auditing, Class III or any other class of auditing – is rudiments have to be kept in during the session.

Now, reorient yourself with regard to rudiments. Rudiments were something you got in at the beginning of session in order to get the individual, pc, to run during the bulk of the session. Now, that was the basic orientation of rudiments over a period of many, many years. We looked on rudiments as just doing that and doing nothing else. That is to say the pc sat down, you got the rudiments in, and then *bang!* From there on there was no rudiments. You didn't have to worry about rudiments because you had those in. And then you went along and you ran the body of the session, and then you came to the end of the thing, and you said, "All right. Now we make sure the pc is all right. And we'll do something here at the end of the thing even if it's just say, 'End of session' or 'That's all, bud'."

We certainly did something to get the pc out of session at the end of the thing

Well, that's expanded, of course, to your very complex end rudiments today.

Now, end rudiments are there to keep the session from hanging up, and that's the purpose of end rudiments. It's to keep the session from perpetuating itself. And if you do end rudiments with that in view, you will be doing end rudiments properly. And you're not interested in anything except you don't want the session to hang up.

Well, the session can hang up on all the points of end rudiments. If you took them up one after the other, you would find out that any one of these points would hang the session in time. So you just take all these things that would hang the session in time, and you evaporate the session, see that? You not-is the session right there at that point. It's gone.

Now, beginning rudiments is to get the pc out of the Physical universe into an auditing session in his own universe. Let's be factual. That's really what it is. You see, there he was going along with all of his beautiful adjustments to how awful it was that he was not-ising, you see. And there he is going through life somehow or another, trying not to walk through brick walls, and his total concentration really is on how present time shouldn't be or is or wasn't or should be alter-ised or something like that. He's coping, you see. He's coping all the time. Now, this copingness is to a slight degree or to a great degree, but it's always slightly coping Always. Right up to the point where you got the fellow all the way up the line, he is coping in every waking moment of the day. That's all he's doing. He's coping

He's navigating a ship through the rapids. He's piloting a body down the highway. He's keeping a body seated at the desk properly. He's very aware of what's going on. The various impulses of existence are hitting him and he's resolving them, and his concentration's extreme on present time.

Now, if you have a pc who is still coping, while he is sitting in a session and is being made to cope while he's sitting in a session, with the physical universe and the life he lives out of session, you of course don't get him into session because it's a different universe.

It is his own universe that he is occupying in session. Now, if he is made to put too much concentration on the auditor, if he has too little confidence in the auditor, if his trust level is very poor, he, of course, carries the copingness of his day-to-day life over into the session, and he's on some sort of a social basis or a copingness basis or a handle basis on this other human being. And the auditor's a human being He isn't an auditor, you see. He's just somebody else that – just as he'd meet the streetcar conductor or he'd meet a tradesman or he'd talk to the boss or something of this sort. That is the role that he puts the auditor into, and therefore he goes on coping with the auditor. And you will find him doing all sorts of social things with the auditor. You see, he'll be very socially minded toward the auditor, and so on.

Well, he wants to make a good impression; he doesn't want the auditor to get into the nasty, dirty little sewers, and so forth, that some of his life has run in, he thinks, you see, and the auditor must have a good opinion of him, and so on.

Well, this is actually the way he treats human beings out on the street. This is the way he treats human beings in his office. This is the way he treats human beings that he is in concourse with all the time.

And if that attitude continues, of course you have the pc really coping with the physical universe, not in-session. And that's a different attitude. There's a great difference in this.

Now, an auditor who does a poor job of getting rudiments in and fumbling around, you know, and he fumbles with the E-Meter and he doesn't know, and he misses a withhold, something like this, why, any one of these things will get the pc coping with the auditor, you see, and puts him back into the physical universe somehow, but now puts him in the physical universe with a liability. He's supposed to be in-session and he is not, don't you see.

Now at the moment he went into session, he is then expected to cope with the auditor, you see? Now, actually, the state of a pc is no responsibility. No responsibility for the physical universe around him during the period of the session. It's a no responsibility. Let's just face up to it.

Now, that's the reason you can plumb the bank. The less responsible you make a pc for the physical environment and for the auditor and the auditing, the more no-responsible the pc is for those things.

Now, this sounds very peculiar. That sounds very peculiar because that also is a common denominator of an hypnotic trance. The pc in-session is not in an hypnotic trance. He definitely is not. The difference is very, very interesting

In an hypnotic trance, it is demonstrated conclusively that he has no control over anything That is what is demonstrated to him, you see. He not only has no responsibility but he also has no control over anything and that the only person who can do any control i9 the hypnotist. May sound rather slight and esoteric, but they are nevertheless quite factual.

All you have to do is show somebody that you can make his right arm rise without touching it and that he is powerless – you always punch this home in hypnotism – that he is powerless to stop the right arm from rising, and he goes into a trance. Zzzzzz. It doesn't matter what trickery you indulge in to get these combinations of conditions to exist. Nevertheless, those are the combinations. So that he loses all control.

But hypnotism is devoted to the physical universe. It is devoted directly and immediately to his body and is not consulting the person concerning his bank, his reactions or

anything else. Hypnotism is a total overwhelm. You do a total overwhelm and show the individual that he has no willpower of any kind.

Now, that state, a hypnotized subject, is very, very far from and has very little to do with an auditing session's pc's attitude, but nevertheless it is a state, and it was the only strange state that man had plumbed and could induce. Man could induce the state of cured by physical means. You know, set somebody's broken leg He could induce the state of injured. He could induce the state of dead, and he could induce the state of hypnotized. And those were the states which man could induce on man. He couldn't induce much other states. He depended totally on other automaticities for other states to exist, such as get hungry. He depended on the automaticity of the individual, you see, and 80 on.

Well, there are a lot of minor states with regard to these other states but they're little tiny things that don't amount to anything, like get cheerful, get sad, you see. They're various tricks. They don't amount to much because they are not very deep-seated states. And they are all very much what we would consider the ordinary livingness and existence – we'd consider these states.

But these others are not really considered ordinary states. The state of dead, for instance, is not an ordinary state. It is so extraordinary that the very people who should know most about it, the medical doctors and the coroners, know nothing of it at all. They are the most ignorant people on the subject of death we have on this planet. Almost any child could tell you more about death than a medico. It's quite interesting.

So they've become less and less familiar with this particular state. But man can induce that state on man, and it's an extraordinary state. He can induce the state of injured on man. He can induce the state of cured by a few minor means. Somebody has a headache and you give him an aspirin. And he can induce this other state called an hypnotized state. That's a highly specialized state. And that is the one string of man's guitar where it approaches the mystery of the infinite and the unknown. And that was the only string he could play on. And he strummed on that, and he played "Yankee Doodle" on it, and "Brahma Be with Us," – he's played that on it, and "Christ Save Us," – he's played that on it.

In other words, he plays all of – all these things are played on this onestring guitar: hypnotism. So it's very, very easy for somebody who has this in his background to get a misinterpretation of an auditing session. And therefore, you get many states called in-session because there are many people auditing who have different interpretations of states. Well, you take somebody who was a gee-whizzer back in Egypt on the subject of levitation and rigidity and he knew how to handle the priesthood, you know, and the lesser priesthood, and the neophytes and the public, and that sort of thing. He knew, you know. He did *uuuuu*, you know, and that was all set.

And because you get these past experiences with the induction of these states, such as kill them, injure them, cure them, hypnotize them, you see, that sort of thing, you get different attitudes toward the pc from auditor to auditor.

They will color the quality or state of the pc in-session by these other things. Now, we also have, of course, all these social states which are near present time, which is entertained, happy, sad, hopeful, all of those things, you see. And that's one long, long catalog, but of course those are just social states. Anybody does this to anybody.

And an auditor who plays those exclusively, you see, really isn't auditing He's trying to make the pc cheerful, he's trying to make the pc sad. He thinks the pc ought to have a grief charge, and so on, if he can force it, which is interesting

But there's no sin in playing on that particular guitar. It's perfectly all right. I do it myself. Every once in a while I see a pc that is close to a grief charge, and I speak somewhat quietly and sympathetically. And it'll spill, you see.

Now these states, then, all get mixed up in an auditor's individual interpretation of what is in-session. What is this thing called "in-sessionness"? What is it?

Well, is it hypnotized? Is it overwhelmed? Is it cheered up? Is it griefy? Is it injured? Is it dead? What are these things, you see?

How's this pc supposed to be? What is this thing called the beingness of the pc? That's the point. Well, you could probably draw up a long catalog, and you could do a lot of things, and so forth, and search forever for the answer if you bypass *the* answer. And *the* answer is, the state is simply this: willing to talk to the auditor and interested in his own case. And that's all there is to the state.

But this is such an idiotically simple statement that tremendous numbers of auditors think there must be more to it. And you get additive states on the top of this one. When you see an auditor doing that, you say, "Well now, there's something wrong with this session, but we can't say quite what it is."

Well, I'm sometimes horrified. I see somebody who has been audited consistently by some auditor – not here, around here. This is not a minor thing This is a major thing and quite rare – who has done nothing but overwhelm. You know, he's got death or injury or something mixed up with the state the pc is supposed to be in or hypnotism or something – and you see, he's got a *total overwhelm* on this pc. And you'd see this pc, the pc is just *way* out of present time, you know. Every time the pc said "I thought," you see, we add the hyp – let's add the hypnotic angle now.

Remember the two shuns of the Auditor's Code. And all you have to do is don't shun them, and you can turn auditing into an hypnotic trance proposition. I'll show you how it works, see.

Pc says, "Well, I think it's a miller. I – I think it's a miller. I think that's the terminal. I think it's a miller."

And the auditor says, "Well," he says, "You know better than that. We had that on another list, and it couldn't possibly be a miller. Now what else is it?"

Well, the pc goes *ahh rhrrr, you* know. And he says, "Well, it – it might – might be a carpenter. It mi – mi – mi – mi – might be a m – m – mi – mi – might be mi – mi – might be a carpenter. Maybe."

"No, that's much too bold a terminal for that particular list. No, we don't want a carpenter on that list."

You see how gently it could be done. And do you know that at the end of that long thing the pc would be totally *thhhaaa*. But we would have violated in-sessionness. The pc not only unwilling but totally unable to talk to the auditor.

You know, the pc just – he had a dropped jaw in place of an in-session.

Now, as far as being interested in his own case, he's not interested in his own case now. He's totally fixated on what is this auditor going to do next. See? That's the fixation. What's he going to do next?

So of course, this definition, willing to talk to the auditor and interested in own case, are violated at once, and you can induce an hypnotic trance that way. Just overwhelm the pc, get the two shuns backwards, and you've got it all set from there on and you'll have trouble. But it's an overwhelm. And of course the overwhelm doesn't have to be that subtle. And when I see it in an extremity, it is not subtle at all. The person has simply been clobbered and wiped out, see.

I mean everything the person said was muffed and thrown back in his face, see. Any effort to communicate to the auditor was instantly blocked till – if we ran 8-C on the person, we would have it running on the auditor's willpower, you see, and we'd get the levitation of the arm, and touching the wall, and we'd get a robotized attitude. This would be a pretty wild thing

Now, this can't happen easily. It really takes some doing, and it's nothing that any of you are doing at the present time. I'm not being accusative, for once. But it is – it would happen. And you see, the auditor has made a different evaluation of what is auditing.

What you want is somebody who is no longer fixated on the physical universe or in a social state with the auditor. So that's why you run your beginning rudiments. But now, of course, if you violate the Auditor's Code too thoroughly, you've got somebody – a pc now – who is still hung up to part of the physical universe. He's got a person, not an auditor.

And so he's got this social chitter-chat going between himself and the auditor, and he's still out of session. And he's too interested in what the auditor might think and what the auditor is doing. And he is defensive, and he doesn't understand what's going on, and he's coping. He's almost sitting there with a pair of small theta boxing gloves on, you know, and you can kind of see him putting his dukes up every time you say anything.

Well, early in auditing, that can be expected to some degree from a pc. There is some degree of that always early in getting audited. Some tiny degree of it.

"What's this? It's all new and strange. Case? Case? I don't have any case. I've never had any trouble at all. The psychoanalyst always told me that if I were careful I never would have any trouble. I wonder if he really thinks I am crazy. Do you suppose my wife is right in saying I am just a fool to be sitting here with this stuff? Is this really black magic?"

You know, all kinds of wild little questions, you know.

And he's got to get a sense of trust. Therefore, the first auditing a person should have, should be optimumly the best possible auditing

After a person's audited for awhile, you could get a little careless, but not early in his auditing. Why? Because you take that distrust and build it up into a constant, running thing. It's always there, don't you see. And the person's sort of been parked out of session permanently. This is how you regard an auditor, and that has been hardened into a habit. That is how you regard an auditor.

Now, getting rudiments in, getting beginning rudiments in, is getting the individual to be able to sit there without taking full responsibility for what's going on in Russia at the moment and what's going on in the United States at the moment, and without taking full responsibility for what's going on at the office, and taking full responsibility for having to go home at dinner and so forth. In other words, you detach him from all of this superconcern with the physical universe, and you set him up so that he can look at his own universe.

And you have to indicate that he has one, you know? And that's what's known as impingement, in various ways. The impingement is also part of the auditor saying things to the pc to make the pc respond. And he's in a state of no responsibility with regard to the physical universe. Its immediate concern is right now. That's quite interesting because, of course, he's been in this state since the beginning of track.

The first time he said, "Why did you build this universe?" you see, began that long career of no responsibility for the physical universe. What he's actually doing in the physical universe is, because he has no responsibility for it, he has to cope with it somehow. And because he can't be fully responsible for it, it's all agin him a little bit.

"Ah, i-isth-this all?" We're not quite sure about this, you see.

And it's an insecurity, you might say. Well, of course, this is a common denominator bank. At those most aberrated spots on the backtrack, you'll find that the individual is 100 percent irresponsible for the lot.

Now, if you put somebody into the middle of the reactive bank, you would have him into the most zero responsibility state that a person could be gotten into, or that that person could be gotten into. Common denominator of the reactive bank is no responsibility.

So he goes into this state rather easily, but remember that we are more interested in the backtrack. In fact, we don't get any auditing done if we're not interested at any degree in the backtrack. We're more interested in the backtrack than we are the present life. So the reason we're trying to detach him from present time physical universe is so we can put him into communication with back time physical universe, and that's about all it amounts to.

Now, if he stays obsessively – this is an old, old phrase that was used to describe certain pcs back as early as 1949 – were stuck in present time. He just couldn't get out of present time.

You'd say, "Now go to the time when you were three years old," and the person would just go, *"Uuuuuuuuuh-uuuuuuuuuuuuh.* Yes, I'm there."

No, he wasn't there. He was right here in present time, you see. Well, this is supercope. And he's just in a state of supercope, that's all. It didn't matter if he were lying on the couch, the house was dead quiet, there was nobody going to come near him, nobody knew where he was, including his wife. He had no worries, there wasn't anybody worrying about him. You could get all these things exactly right in present time, don't you see. I mean, you could make present time right. Perfect. And a person would still be stuck in present time. And you say, "All right, now get the idea of thinking about a clock."

"Yes, yes, yes." At no moment could he ever . . . He actually had to mock up a new clock because otherwise he might move out of present time, don't you see, and that would be terrible.

Now, of course, the less willing a person is to move on the time track, the more dangerous he considers the time track to be, and the mind to such a person is already – because he has lived trillennia in this state of uuuuxzzzzzzz superalertness to present time – it is already an area of danger. It is an area of danger because the time track he has lived, in the consecutive moments we call – the consecutive moments of present time which make up a time track, of course, are fraught the whole distance with insecurity. And even greater insecurity than he feels in present time, don't you see.

So here he is in present time being very insecure about present time, and now you ask him to go to an even more insecure place, which is the insecurities of yesterday, and he just sticks right here. This is safer, thank you.

But oddly enough, the flipperoo on this is, of course, he is stuck on the backtrack. Nobody is ever *stuck* in present time. They have to be stuck on the backtrack which they *believe is* present time. So you're always auditing a certain – a person of that character with the CCHs – you're always doing backtrack auditing, which is very interesting

You're giving him present time exercises, and it's always backtrack auditing, because of course they can't even get close to present time, although they're stuck in present time, although they're coping with present time, although they're not in present time – all of these things, apparently contradictory, simply add up to a tremendous confusion. And the common denominator of the pc, of course, in that state of mind is confusion.

Well, now all of this adds up to a necessity to get your beginning rudiments in much better early in your auditing of a pc than you might later. And on taking over a new pc, I would just beat the beginning rudiments to pieces. And after I'd been auditing somebody for twenty-five or fifty hours or something like this, I would just take a long yawn one day. Everything seems to be going along just fine, you see, except we've lost the high rate of change that we were experiencing The individual was changing with great rapidity and now isn't changing so fast.

In short, anytime auditing settled down to a long grind – let me characterize that and give you the stable datum for it – you just take those beginning rudiments and you just tear the thing to pieces. In other words, *you make* the rudiments function. Now, that's different than just seeing if they are in. Most sessions, you just want to see that they're in. That's great. That's nothing *Zoom, zoom, zoom, zoom.* Fine. Fine. Now we get busy doing what we're doing, see.

But now we find out we've got a scratchy needle and not going anyplace, and there's not very much progress, and so forth. Now we make a different use of the beginning rudiments. Entirely different use of them. We use them to audit the case with regard to an auditing session. And we get those rudiments in. And we don't just get them in for the session we are running We get them in for any session the pc has ever had anyplace, particularly his first auditing session. Let's get them in. Let's get them in, the lot of them.

Well, now, do you see then the difference, the two ways you could use rudiments?

Way number one, you go *zip zip,* disconnect the pc from all of his anxieties of present time so that he'll be interested in his own case and willing to talk to the auditor.

All right. That's the immediate, most common use of beginning rudiments. *Bang!* There they are, they're in. You're off. The individual's interested in his own case, willing to talk to you; you go on and audit what you're going to audit.

The same exact items have a wider use. And that wider use is to get the rudiments in for *every* session the pc has ever had. Make sure that all sessions are in. In other words, you could expand it from this session to all auditing with considerable profit.

Now, how many rudiments processes would you use? Ordinarily, it's enough, really, to flick the withholds off of every rudiment. Did you know you could do that? You can get any rudiment in by getting the withholds off at that rudiment level?

All right, that will normally get the pc immediately into session. He's willing to talk to you, and he's interested in his own case and ready to sail. But there are just about "forty-eleven squared" processes that could be run to get rudiments in. They are almost uncountable. If you'll notice, your last Model Session does not have any current rundown of processes connected to it.

Well, I was writing it up, and I finished it off. I worked on it rather late, and it was a tough evening in general, I suppose, or something like that, and it was getting on to about four o'clock in the morning, and I lifted my pencil to write down the processes, and I was simply overwhelmed. How many processes are there? Good heavens, I know of literally dozens and dozens and dozens of processes that could be used to get rudiments in.

They are really some of the cream processes of auditing of yesteryear.

For instance, I was running a session not too long ago, and what do you know – the 1st Saint Hill ACC, I got tired of the pc's boxing around and being social and standing off toward me, so I simply said, "Who would I have to be to audit you?" And we cleared this up in about four questions, and the session ran quite well.

Well, that's an interesting use of the situation. But it's just what process was needed at the moment, don't you see. There are lots of them, you know. "What part of that problem could you be responsible for?" Perfectly valid. On withholds, "What doesn't George know about you?" you see. Oh, you know – just know endless processes get withholds off on the withhold question.

There are at least thirty-six Havingness Processes, and just today an old-time field auditor had been dreaming up and had been culling the stuff out of old textbooks and had walked up to sixty-three Havingness Processes. I looked over the list and thought that's very industrious, and all of a sudden saw that there were six or seven more. There must have been that many because I got an additional one in the first two.

Well, at that ratio, it would have been ninety-some, don't you see. That's an awful lot of Havingness Processes. That's a lot of them.

Now, as far as getting somebody to talk to you is concerned, well, any communication process you ever heard of can be used. Yeah, just take a weird one, workable or not workable, just take a weird one.

Just thinking off the cuff, and the fellow is not facing you and that sort of thing, and say, "Well, what spot around me could you communicate to?"

You know, make him point it out, and he'd finally punch you in the nose or something of the sort, and he'd say, "There," you know. And he'd feel much better.

In other words, any of the old communication processes, just any of them, any valid process would get the auditor in to some degree. As far as ARC breaks is concerned, "Recall an ARC break," would be the most strenuous of these that I know of. Run the whole track, run for hundreds of hours probably without ever fetching up to a dull halt.

So you could get in all kinds of aspects of the rudiments, and therefore it is necessary that you recognize what the rudiments are, you see. Exactly what these rudiments are. A rudiment is not a process. A rudiment is a reason why he's not in-session, see, a reason why he might not be in-session. And that's what they are.

And your job in using the rudiments is to get him in-session, and if you wanted to straighten out a pc, 100 percent straighten out a pc on the whole subject of auditing, then you'd simply straighten out the pc on the subject of every session he'd ever had. Well, that sounds more arduous than it is.

All you have to do is pick up the first session. That'll take you quite a while sometimes.

"Well, was the session then?"

"No, no, there was a session. Oh, no, no, there was a session – *ra-ra,* yeah. Then, then it was Joe, I've – had completely forgotten about Bill, yeah." And then, "Oh, no. No, no, there was – it was much earlier than that. Come to remember, I had a session in 1950. What do you know? I'd completely forgotten that one."

You know, it'll take quite a while to sort this out. What is the fellow's first session that he's absolutely sure of. And then you might run such a process as this – and this, I think, would possibly be the best process – is "What didn't that auditor know?" That seemed to run the motivator of the untrainedness of the auditor, gets off his withholds and that sort of thing, coupled with, "What didn't you know about that environment?"

Now, some such combination as that – "What didn't you know about the environment" and "What didn't that auditor know" – this could be marvelous.

Now, maybe this pc has been an auditor and has tremendous overts on pcs and you haven't run a complete 6 on him. The form about pcs, the Sec Check about pcs is the best one to handle this. But you might turn it around and say, "What didn't your first preclear know about you," you see. Locate the fellow's first preclear and clean up that session from the viewpoint of the auditor.

Therefore, by cleaning up his first pc and cleaning up his first "being a pc," and cleaning up these two, you start to release charge which has accumulated up the line through such things as bad auditing and nonsense that's been pulled, and cul-de-sacs he's run into, and sessions that have been run with the rudiments thoroughly out.

Now, you could go ahead to this extremity and get the rudiment in for every session the pc ever had. You'd get rudiments in. All rudiments. Every one of them.

Now, you could do worse than this. You could get all the *end* rudiments in for every session the pc had ever had. Now, that possibly might be more profitable because they haven't been around very long

"Now, did you tell that auditor any half-truths, untruths or said something just to make an impression on him or damage anyone in that session? In *that session,* that one that we're talking about right there."

And, boy, you'd find some pcs had been having a wingding They've just been having a ball.

Even if you find it today, you find that damage question – if you're using it; it isn't in a written version; it was handed to you verbally, I think – "Or tried to damage anyone in this session?" You'll find this every once in a while a little bit charged.

And if it's always null, I'd get suspicious, you know. If it had always been null on some pc that wasn't making progress, well, the obvious answer, of course, is by not making any gains he's trying to damage himself, isn't he? That's the obvious answer, isn't it?

By failing to do auditing commands and to monkey up the auditor in some way and to get everybody upset in general, this all by itself is, of course, efforts to damage self. That should show up sooner or later – efforts to damage himself.

But you could get all those rudiments in, every one of them for every session the pc ever had. Now that looks absolutely fantastically laborious. It just looks too much. Well, what do you know? It'll only be the first session or two that have any importance. His first session or two as an auditor, his first session or two as a pc. And then the rest of it is all gross. It's just the gross here and there, one after the . . . Well, three times he got mad at pcs and, you know, they're all small number stuff.

And probably the best, probably the very best method of doing that is, of course, your Sec Check, your Form 6 Sec Check is to follow through from that. So I would say offhand that in handling a pc, I would do these two things, if I was trying to straighten this pc out. If this pc behaved peculiarly as a pc, you know, just didn't seem to be able to get into session and didn't seem to be able to talk to me, and I was having an awful time straightening all this out, and this pc had a sort of a history of kind of grinding, never got anyplace and so forth, then I would smell a mouse called a bum session.

And I would straighten out – first session, I'd find and straighten out and get the rudiments in, all rudiments in, for the first session the pc had ever had, and for the first auditing session the person had ever given if the person were a Scientologist. I'd get those two in. Those two sessions. I'd just straighten them up. Beginning rudiments, end rudiments, I'd polish those things up and burnish them until, God, the pc wondered why he ever walked in that room in the first place, you know?

I mean, just get those things really polished, and then spot check the rest of them. Now, I'm not above scanning him from that point on once I've got those things straightened out to make the pc hang on the track. That's an old technique – lock scanning. Not engram scanning, but lock scanning. Old creaky technique. It has it own – only value it has is to find out where the pc's stuck. And there it is very, very useful. Extremely useful.

After you've got these first two sessions – you see, the one he gave and the one he received – after you've got these straightened out, you've got a takeoff point. Now, you'll rip up a certain number of locks, and you do something weird like this. I'm not giving you this as a standard auditing. I'm just telling you you can do anything to get rudiments in. This is one of the creakiest old processes that ever existed.

And you can say, "All right. Now pick up that first session that we've just covered so well. Good. Got that first session? All right. Now scan rapidly forward to present time through all sessions you have ever had."

And he, *"Yyaayyayyy, mmmm.* Yeah, that was tough."

"All right. Fine. Good. Now get that first one again. All right. Now scan rapidly forward to present time through all the sessions you have ever had." Or "When I snap my fingers start scanning," you know, anything you want.

And you find by observation of the pc, this is what goes on. At first it takes place with fair rapidity. And then it takes him a little while. And then it takes him a little longer. And then it doesn't take him quite so long And then the next thing you know, it doesn't take him long at all. And then the next thing you know – he ain't moving on the time track.

"Yeah," he says.

"All right. Scan on forward to present time."

"Yeah."

"Did you?"

"Yeah."

"Oh, you've done it already?"

"Yeah."

"All right. What are you looking at?"

And of course, he's stuck in 1955 in the middle of a session. Now, you've got that session, and that'll be a juicy one. That'll be the confusion prior to and all that sort of thing. Now, you can take this thing and straighten out that particular session, get all the rudiments in for it, don't you see. And you could do this over and over and over and over, and you would run out auditing Actually shouldn't take you too long. You'd probably run out all the auditing the person had ever had in four or five hours.

But it'd just be the basis of getting the rudiments in for the sessions. If you wanted. . . I can tell you what a full straighten-out would be for an old-time auditor who'd been auditing a long time. It's just what I've been telling you, but I'll give you – it to you in a very one, two, three, four type of session thing or actions.

Straighten out all rudiments beginning and end for the first session he ever received. Straighten out all rudiments beginning and end for the first session he ever gave.

Pick up, no matter how you do it, the rough spots on the auditing track – the spectacularly bad sessions – and every time you'll find one, get all the rudiments in for that session. Give the pc a Form 6 from one end to the other to get off all of the overts as an auditor, pull all the withholds on the subject, run lots of Havingness, go back over and spot check it for anything remaining when the Form 6 was complete. Now, that would be quite an activity.

I don't know how long it would take to cover a full Form 6, but we have had, horribly enough, one question of a Form 6 require a whole week. So there's no estimating how long it would take. Also, we've done a whole Form 6 in a week, don't you see. So there's no estimate of the amount of time.

But that's how I would go about straightening out somebody.

Now, if a case were grinding, and if ordinary auditing and if ordinary activities did not bring the case in toward rapidly running and benefiting from 3D Criss Cross, that's what I would do – what I just enumerated. That is what I would do. I'd expect something was awfully wrong with the auditing either given or received on the past track or there was something *really* screwy on the subject here someplace, and I would devote time to straightening that out before I went on with it, with profit.

Now, if you're using old slowpoke processes, of course, it might take you longer than if you're using very whizzed up processes. Just plucking the withholds off from each rudiment, *bang, bang, bang, bang, bang,* would be the fastest way to go ahead and straighten out the rudiments for any given session.

But if I were confronted with a choice between going on and doing 3D Criss Cross on a very difficult pc that had a very scratchy needle and I just couldn't seem to read anything

and the pc didn't seem to be interested in anything I was doing or if the pc were afraid of 3D Criss Cross or afraid of this sort of thing or I just couldn't read anything and it's going on and on and on, well, I wouldn't keep wasting time because you're going to find out eventually that there are ways to waste auditing time. Yes, you'll find it out. There are ways to waste auditing time.

Can you look back on any sessions where you should have done different? Can you look back on any two weeks of auditing that you wish you had done different? Hmm? And the answers all of a sudden loom up at the end of this period of time. Uuuuuh. You'll sometime – I hope you don't have this experience – wake up at the end of two weeks and find out that you haven't got an item in 3D Criss Cross. You haven't even gotten a good list. You just haven't gotten anyplace, and the pc has had no advance or gain. Well, you could do that. It could happen. It would take – it would be a pretty peculiar situation, but it could happen.

Now, the only thing that could be traced back to is total out-of. sessionness. Now, that out-of-sessionness could be arrived at from two different quarters. Either you did not prepare the person for assessment – that is the heaviest sin. You didn't get the person sec checked and straightened up in general and so on. You just didn't do any of that. No preparatory work of any kind whatsoever. You just sailed in and started running 3D Criss Cross and came a cropper.

Someday you'll get away with it. You're liable – much more likely to make this blunder because someday you are inevitably going to sit down to some raw meat pc straight off the street, you're going to ask him for a list of the things he likes, and get the item, and ask him for things he dislikes, and get the item. The person's going to all be straightened up with no more lumbosis, and everything is marvelous, and you'll say, "Well, look at that. Ron said you had to prepare these cases. *Ha-ha-ha,* and I didn't prepare *ha-ha-ha.*"

And you get ahold of the next raw meat pc, and you spend three, four weeks – nothing happens. And you just wasted three or four weeks of auditing which, if you'd been sec checking and straightening the person up and so forth, wouldn't have been wasted. And the pc is disgruntled, and you're upset, and you've had a big lose, don't you see.

That will happen sufficiently frequently to make a citizen out of you with regard to preparing a case.

All right. This type of preparation – getting the rudiments in – is very beneficial, and remember, today there is no excuse for a case getting no gain. There's no excuse for a case getting no gain. You're an auditor, you've been trained, there is no excuse for the case getting no gain. There just isn't. It must be a gross auditing error of some kind or another.

I'm not just saddling you with terrific expectancies. Yeah, people fall off and fall on their heads and that sort of thing, and you have to spend threequarters of three sessions in a

row doing nothing but straightening up rudiments and that sort of thing, but if you're doing a good job of this, the pc will have a gain.

What I'm talking about there's no excuse for, is you do everything you think you ought to do, and at the end of having done this for a week or two, the pc makes no improvement or gain. That you shouldn't have. That you shouldn't have. That would be pretty gross. It would be something like trying to do 3D Criss Cross on some fellow who was fixed there in present time right straight on you and can't even think of anything and so he – he – he rapidly tailor-makes lists, see.

He – he doesn't pay any attention to the list because he's got to talk to you and keep you entertained. Well, it'd be a gross auditing error because, for God's sakes, you should pick it up in the end rudiments.

"Have you said anything just to impress me?"

"Well, everything I've said is to impress you." See?

It shouldn't have continued as an error longer than one session. Now listen, you can have one session with no gain, see. You could even have two sessions with no gain. You can even have two sessions with no gain and a session in which the pc slips backwards. I'll let you have that, see.

But beyond this point, no. No, no, no. You're abusing your margin of error, see. Something is going wrong now, and it must have been going wrong for those three sessions without your spotting it, and it must be something like the pc sits there all the time thinking how ugly you are or something like this, and you just haven't picked it up. That's all.

You – it's some gross error. You're just not reading the meter, you see, or it's something wild.

Now, to prevent that sort of thing from happening, you've got rudiments. You've got your beginning rudiments, you've got your end rudiments, and they prevent you from making gross errors, providing they are done. And they will also clean up all past sessions in which gross errors have occurred.

Now, you can make a case feel a lot better if the case has had a lot of bad auditing Well, the case had some bad, overwhelming auditing The auditor, he was the high priest of Noz, and he was that for a number of trillennias. As a matter of fact, just finished a life as a Roman Catholic bishop or something And this bird didn't come in close to an Academy and started auditing and God knows what happened thereafter. Only God would have been able to find out, too, because it'd all be withhold from that auditor, you see. Something real sour had been going on.

He got the pc into a total overwhelm of some kind or another. Got the pc all involuted on the introvert, and the pc is sitting in the square root of nowhere. Knocked out of present time, you see. Nothing ever flattened, anything of this sort.

All right. That session could coast along as a sleeper. You know, just not noticed by anybody until all of a sudden you're running a process on the pc that should give the pc a gain. And you get a lose on this process? Well, don't be so busy at condemning your own auditing Other people audit, too, and some people in the past have not audited so well either.

No, you didn't get a gain on this person! Your rudiments, as far as you were concerned, as far as you could get them in, were in, and they were apparently in, and you ran a process that should have gotten a gain on the pc, and there sits the pc with his lumbosis in full flare.

Well, one of the things you do is look for a missed withhold. Another thing you do is figure out if the pc's havingness was down. All these various things, they're all "rudimenty" sort of things, and then suspect a session.

You see, you've got techniques of sufficient power and magnitude that this shouldn't happen. I'd suspect a session. What, what session is it that's got this bird hung up, see? Did this fellow ever have a session that was hung up? Is there a session sitting on the backtrack where all rudiments are in, out, sideways and upside down? Yeah. And you'll normally find one.

Now, we've had two or three students here who have had just that experience and who didn't make very good progress until we found our past sessions, which is why I'm talking to you this way today. See? So auditing apparently, just empirically, if very badly done, has the power to nullify auditing on the basis of the first occurrence. The earlier occurrence has more force, more aberrative force, than the later occurrence.

This is one of the odd effects of the mind. It's one of the strange parts of the mind. That is odd about the human mind – that the earlier ones have more force than the later ones.

Now of course, the pc's interest is on the later ones, but the pc's aberration is contained in the earlier ones. Your pc's terribly interested. In this lifetime, the pc was a Christian Scientist, and everything just went bad, and they know the pc, everything, you know. Interest, interest, interest, you know. And – and there they were and – and Christian Science, and – and so forth. And the practitioners told him to not-is all the time. And they not-ised all this sickness, and so forth. And they know that – that's what's wrong That's what's wrong That's what's wrong, you know? The interest is right there, see, this lifetime. And you, knucklehead, all too often fall for it, following the pattern of your forebearers.

Other people interested in the field of mind have *always* bought this. This has been the uniform mistake of the whole track. That's why nobody knows anything about past lives.

That's why nobody knows anything about technology of the mind – is because everybody buys this fact.

The patient, the pc, the individual being processed, audited, slugged, has his interest on the last occurrence, and all the person's aberration is on the *first* occurrence, so they're the whole track apart, given any existing track on any subject.

You could say somebody had a track as a railroad engineer, and so on. Inevitably, you fall into this on the last incident. And all the aberration is contained in the first incident.

So this pc comes around, and he says, "Christian Science, and it got me all loused up, and here I am, Christian Science, and we not-ised the physical universe, and I'm now so I can't have anything, and this is all very tough, and it's all very rough, and – and – and that sort of thing."

And the person auditing him says, "Well, now who in your family was interested in Christian Science? All right. What about Christian Science?"

Christian Science, Christian Science, Christian Science. Well, that hasn't anything to do with that. That's a track called religion. And although the person's interest is seized and gripped with a vice in the present lifetime, it started in a little, old cotton-picking town called Whumpfburg or something back on the Sea of Whumpf, when he didn't have anything to do one day, and he thought it'd be a good idea to build a mud idol. He got to building it. And then he thought it'd be a good idea to tell people a lot of lies about it. And then he thought it'd be an awfully good way to make his living. And from there on, man, we had a track called religion.

Well, of course, the pc isn't interested in that at all. He's had nothing to do with that. He is so irresponsible for it, he doesn't even remember it. But he can only take responsibility for the motivator – this life, now.

Now, that's very responsible. He can be very responsible for that, comparatively speaking He can remember it. That is your first designation.

You see, bad memory is just a low responsibility on any subject. These two things are absolutely coordinated one against the other, and no memory means no responsibility. You'll be utterly fascinated. Those acts which a person has done in his lifetime for which he has the least responsibility are those he remembers the least. Well, that's the woof and warp of the Sec Checking which you do.

You've got to pull those things because the person has no responsibility for the worst ones he's done, and therefore has no memory of them.

Now, you get an inversion of this thing whereby the person has no responsibility for them but apparently some full memory of them. You get this occasionally, too. Only beware. That is no memory of them. That's a dubin. That's the dub-in that goes below.

This guy tells you very factually, yes, he's been in prison. He's been in prison this lifetime. As a matter of fact, he's been in jail four or five times in this lifetime, all for chicken stealing.

You look up his record, and you find out he's been to the penitentiary for manslaughter once, see. So you get the lower level, of course, of responsibility – the lower level of no responsibility is an inversion called dub-in. He's obsessively remembering the wrong thing

Now, look at this then as a barrier to knowledge of the mind. That's a terrific barrier to knowledge of the mind. The only way you would ever get anybody over his aberration is track it from the beginning to the end, see. You could then do something for the person, but if you just took the end, and particularly the motivators at the end, you would do very little for the person. Run motivator, motivator. You can do something for him just running motivators. Don't think it doesn't work. Dianetics worked. And Dianetics ran mostly motivators, in its first year. And it did things.

But look at that. See your inversion? Now, the one place he can't go, of course, is the beginning of track because he has no responsibility for anything that went on then, so he has no memory of it, so it doesn't exist. Or it is dub-in, and he thinks he's just pretending to know about it. Boy, that is below having forgotten it. Man, you'll hear some of the wildest dub-ins off pcs. Every once in a while some of you get discredited in your own eye, and you invalidate your own past lives because you hear somebody going off at a mad rate on a superpretended knowingness, you see.

You know, they'll be eight to twelve famous people in the same lifetime? Well, he might have been somebody in that lifetime. Give him that. You see, they remember it by dub-in, but it's below the level of responsibility.

See, it's this fantastic effort to take some responsibility for something they already have totally no responsibility for, and it all winds up backwards. This is a real goofy situation. Well, all you got to do is go down to the spinbin and look up Napoleon. Man, you find him all over the spinbins, so there must be something wrong with this. So – yeah, he was not divisible. Thetans is not divisible.

Anyway, you see that this would operate as a considerable barrier to an auditor unless an auditor had a way to detect that there was something under it. And that's your E-Meter.

Your E-Meter will detect no-responsibility areas that the pc can't remember. And a bad meter will only detect those things which a person can remember, and detect them late. That's a bum meter. It only detects those things which a person already knows about.

But a good meter, like this Mark IV, detects below the level of conscious memory and detects into the zones of irresponsibility, and of course then appears to be very magical and appears to know more than the pc knows about it. Well look, if the pc knew about it, he

wouldn't be aberrated. You can just always put that down in a little thumbnail margin on almost anything the pc says that is motivatorish.

If the – or the pc is talking to you about his case, and he's going, *"khakha-kha kha-kha-kha* and so forth, and I've been out in the cold and - and uh - and - and uh - my mother was very mean, *mean* to me, *kha-kha-kha,"* and so forth. And he gives you this *long* history about all the horrible things that's happened to him in this lifetime, and he's still going *kha-kha-kha,* then you had just make up your mind that he doesn't know what's wrong with him. Because if he knew what was wrong with him, he wouldn't still be going *kha-kha-kha,* see?

This one day you're going to get an individual reality on of great magnitude. An auditor can't audit forever without running into a miracle – real, full-fledged miracle. You audit enough pcs, you'll sooner or later run into an honest-to-God miracle, you know. The only mistake you can make is wearing white robes yourself afterwards. Takes a lot of washing and so on. Anyhow . . .

This bird sits down, and he's got a shrunk arm, you know, and you're puttering around with the E-Meter trying to get him in-session and that sort of thing, and all of a sudden his arm goes out to its full size and quite normal, you know. My God! You know? Or it grows an inch or something like this, suddenly, you know. Or somebody grows a new set of teeth, something like this. These miracles are not frequent because you're not particularly looking at them, but they do happen.

And it will always be because you have tripped an area which was right on the fringe of consciousness, and that the person knew nothing about whatsoever, and all of a sudden leaped full armed into analytical recall. What you've done, then, is take a no responsibility which was almost complete, and turn it into a responsibility which was almost complete, and of course, you're not going to do that very often. It takes a gradient scale.

But they are very, very interesting, these cases that know exactly what is wrong with them that will have sitting right in the middle of all that is wrong with them some totally occluded area, which when you trip it does something odd and peculiar to the case. And there's your zone of miracles. If you're going out to work miracles, why, just go along that line.

"Let's see, what's happened to you in this lifetime that you don't know about? Where are your occluded areas? Well, thank you very much. Good. Now that you've told me, we'll look elsewhere."

And just watch the meter very carefully and say, "All right. Start at birth and scan forward to present time, and the needle will fall on all occluded areas." Oh, no, I don't think that would be a good auditing command. But anyhow, that's almost what you're doing when you're sec checking Everytime that needle goes *plang,* you're playing with a somewhat occluded area. He may know some of it, he may have a recollection of some of it, but he

doesn't have a recollection of all of it. So some or all of it is occluded, and by yanking that into view, of course, you've shown the individual a spotlight on something, and the release of charge on the thing is sometimes quite spectacular.

Of course, Sec Checking is as spectacular as you make it. It's not as spectacular as it is written down on the sheet, you know. I mean there's a lot of people around who are asking Sec Check questions just, *"Da-de-da,* yeah, that's null, *ha-ha. Da-de-da,* well, that one is null. Okay. Thank you. Now *da-de-da.* That one is null. Next one. And that one's null. *Ahhh,"* and think they're sec checking, you know. And think they're really getting somewhere. They're running Sec Checks like rudiments. The lick and the promise that you give rudiments to get the pc in-session is not the same way, of course, you handle a Sec Check. You've got to handle a Sec Check probingly, searchingly. You've got to handle a Sec Check question as though it is a hint of a possibility, and then make the most of it.

And "Have you ever shot any angels with a 12-gauge shotgun?" That's the written Sec Check question. I'd take a Sec Check question sounded as oddball as that and wind up making something out of it, you know? *Hmmmm,* all right. *Hmmm,* now, let's get down to work here. Sec Check question. "Have you ever shot any angel with a 12-gauge shotgun? All right. Here we are now. All right."

"Have you, ah, are you withholding something right this minute? What are you withholding right this minute? Oh, what did you think of? Oh, good, all right. Are you withholding anything else from me? Have I missed a withhold on you? All right. Very good.

"All right. Now, have you shot . . . Yeah. All right. What about it?"

The guy says, "What about what?"

"Well, what about shooting people? What about shooting things? How about shots? And so forth. Did you ever play golf or something like that. Did you ever cheat anybody in a golf game? Come on. Come on. Come on. Unload here. Shot. Shot. What is this? What is this?"

"I don't know."

"Mmmmm. I've got a fall on 'shot,' and he doesn't know. *Ha-ha. I* can..." There's a whole session: Have you ever shot any angel with a 12-gauge shotgun? You say that's absolutely impossible. Nothing would ever come out of the Sec Check question. No gain would ever occur on a case on something like this. A guy who was walking two feet off the ground, he says, "What in the hell happened, huh? It's just a bunch of words, and they restimulated things, and I was watching the meter. Only I was *making* it work, see." *Ruhhhruhhh.*

I never let a pc get in a disarmed frame of mind where the pc is calm about what I'm going to ask him or about his past. Only I don't want him to be interested in me. I want him to

be interested in what's going to come up. I like him to be very interested in his own case, and after you've pulled a couple of rabbits out of the hat of this character, of course, the pc doesn't know what the hell's going to come up next. And he gets alert. The first lesson he learns in any Sec Checking I would give him is, he doesn't know all about it because the first thing he does when he comes into session and sits down, he's either in one or two frames of mind. "Nobody knows anything about their lives, do they? That makes me average," you see, the guy says. "I'm average. I don't know anything about yesterday or my youth or anything."

Or "Everybody knows everything there is to know about their own lives that's important, don't they? And what could there possibly be in their own life, you see, that has any value or importance of any kind whatsoever because, of course, a person can remember all these things, naturally."

And he comes in with one of those two frames of mind, and I, of course, make it my business to destroy whichever one it is. I shoot it down in flames with rapidity. Why? Not to trap him into his own bank, but to get his attention fluid on the subject of himself.

You know, he's been walking around all these years trying to live with that bank, and he's going to be around a lot longer, not living with the bank necessarily, but he's going to be living with his own thinkingness, and he'd better sure know what his own thinkingness is all about. If I only had five or six hours to process somebody, I think I would teach them to live with their own thinkingness, more, more thoroughly than that, just on Sec Check questions, you know.

I'd give him enough research, when he suddenly realized he had done something, to make him realize that he had some causation over his acts in life. Not to make him more careful about the things he was doing, but after he had done them, for sure remember them.

Anyway, this would be the handling of cases, and the handling of cases to a large degree is a technical matter. But over the top of all of this tremendous technicality, you have one thing that continues to loom far larger than all of the technicalities. All these other technicalities simply serve this thing as a state. That is, the rudiments, the beginning rudiments, the end rudiments, and so on, only serve this one thing, and that's in-session. That's the state of being in-session. That's the only thing they serve.

So what's in-session? And it's just simply in-session. An individual's willing to talk to the auditor and is interested in his own case. And that's all in-session is. And when in-session does not occur, you don't have auditing. And the most gross auditing error there is, is not being able to run a session in which the pc is in-session.

Now, a pc overwhelmed or a pc obedient or a pc propitiative or a pc this or a pc that aren't necessarily a pc in-session. See? Because the pc in-session is very simple and it has very few additives onto it. He's simply interested in his own case, and he's willing to talk to

the auditor. Very good. More likely *able* to talk to the auditor, after I've seen a few auditors *prevent* pcs from talking to them.

And I defined it, I think, a little while ago as willing or able to talk to the auditor, but it nevertheless amounts to the same thing.

Now, what – what is this state? And it's one of these things that you recognize when you see it as an auditor. You'll simply recognize it. That is in-session. This pc is in-session. All of a sudden the things go *whiz, bang, boom.*

Now, the only thing which I'm calling to your attention is that you often fail to recognize when it is not occurring You fail to recognize. You hope it will materialize. I'm trying to make plain to you in this lecture that it never materializes. It is not an accidental. It is just not an accidental. It's not something that you can put on automatic. That is all.

You put a pc in-session with the rudiments or you take advantage of the pc's state of in-sessionness when it occurs. What your end product is – insession. If a pc is in-session, you certainly don't *put* him in-session. If you've accidentally achieved this state, that's it. I mean, you can accidentally achieve it, just by complete accident.

A person's sitting there, and they're rather bored, and so forth, and you all of a sudden say, "Well, all right. Now, are you willing to have me audit you?"

And the person all of a sudden looks at you and says, "Well, yeah, yeah, I sure am, you know. What a good idea. I've a lot of things I'd like to tell you about," and he all of a sudden starts talking to you about his own case, and he's in-session.

Now, you're going to go ahead and put him out of session with the remaining rudiments. It takes a very clever auditor to be able to do that, but it can be done.

If it weren't for setting a bad example on you, you see in these television demonstrations and so forth that probably some of my rudiments are barely audible. After the pc is practically climbing through the electrodes, you see, I don't see that you need to boost it up, you know.

It's something like, if you've got the highest steam pressure that you can get on a ship's boilers, there's no point in going on and throwing more coal on the boilers' fires. Just no point in it. You're not going to get any higher steam pressure anyhow. I'd take the highest steam pressure I can get per pc. And I'd say, "Well, that's his level of interest," you know. You say to the pc and so on, and the pc is sitting there.

Pc says, "Oh, I had an awful hard life."

I'd say, "Boy, he's in-session," see. I mean, he's got it, you know. Dandy, fine, that's it. Oh, we won't go on any further, beating him to death, trying to get him in-session, see. He's in-session, let's do something, see. The usual state of the pc is what usually monitors the

degree of in-sessionness the pc has, you know. The pc just is sitting there. That's the way the pc always sits there, you know. You've actually gotten the person to look up to you and say, "I had an awful hard life."

Boy, is he in-session. He's interested in his own case, and he's talking to you. What more do you want? Man, give me that, and I can show you miracles.

But creating that particular state is something that the auditor is supposed to do before he does anything else. Now, if an auditor does it so badly that he knocks the pc consistently and continually out of session, there's something wrong with his auditing. That is all. Because it's never going in the direction of getting audited, see. It always is in the direction of *not* getting any auditing, you see. If the auditor in the process of putting in the rudiments knocks the pc out of session and holds the pc out of session, keeps the pc out of session, prevents the pc from having any auditing, you of course then wind up with a pc out of session. Seems elementary, doesn't it?

But the main thing that you don't notice, the main thing that you don't notice, is the fact that a pc goes out of session in the middles of sessions and that you should devote considerable amount of time to putting the rudiments in when they are out during the session.

Now, this becomes very necessary to do with 3D Criss Cross. You can't do 3D Criss Cross without putting them in. You've got to put them in.

One or two of you keeps telling me, "The item keeps going in or out." No, the item doesn't ever go in or out. The rudiments go in or out. The pc goes in or out of session, see.

Now, a pc can go out of session just like that doing 3D Criss Cross, see. Like that. They're gone. There they went. They're . . . Saint Paul's is just passing below them about fifteen hundred feet. They're out. They're gone.

We don't care why. But actually you're reading charged items, and pcs run into these items, and they're having an awful hard time handling these items, and they just haven't got confidence enough to handle the item that just came up, so they have an ARC break with the auditor or something of this sort, or they invalidate the situation, or they withhold something. And man, some pcs just are busy little bees. They've just got this little automatic speaker system going, "Oh, I don't think that's it. That couldn't be it. That couldn't have anything to do with me," and so forth. "But there's no sense to tell the auditor because he'd just do something about it."

And you're busy nulling, and the whole list just goes null, that's it. There's nothing more. Nothing reads. Here it is. Now you have to go back there. And you have to find out, "All right, what did you think or what did you say to yourself a few minutes ago?"

"Oh, nothing. Nothing. No."

Clang!

"Well, what was it?"

"Oh, just – well, I don't see how it could be the item. That's all I said. I just don't see how it could be the item."

"Anything else?"

"Oh, and decided not to mention it to you."

"Oh, well, all right. That's good. All right. Thank you." And you can go on with the list.

The mistake which you most commonly make or is most commonly made by the auditor is to take this up, see. You don't think anything blows. Well, the guy said it. That's enough, man. It's blown. Skip it.

I ran into an excellent example of that in rudiments the other day. I was just doing it. And I suddenly saw a tremendous error that could be – had been made with it.

I said, "Who would I have to be to audit you?"

And the pc said, "A woman."

And I said, "Thank you." And went straight into the body of the session.

I'd just been thinking about this, taking up what the pc has already blown as the primary Q and A, and it occurred to me at that moment that that had been a marvelous opportunity. And I don't know how many auditors would have passed that opportunity up.

See, the pc said, "Well, you'd have to be a woman to audit me," and then look at the marvelous opportunity for the auditor to go in and say, "All right. What kind of a woman? When did a woman have a successful auditing session with you?" You see, all of that kind of thing could've come up, but the item's gone. It's blown. You can keep the pc smothered by insisting on taking up everything the pc has said that has already blown. This is an easy one, see. You read so much significance. You think the pc is telling you what's wrong with his case. He isn't. He's telling you what has just blown. And there's where you run into your biggest cropper doing middle rudiments, see.

The pc says, "Well, I didn't think that could be the item."

"All right," you say, "that's fine. Anything else?"

"Well, I was – decided to withhold it from you because there's no sense in telling you because you would have just blown it."

"All right. We've done so. Here we go." And go on with the list.

All right. Look at that as a marvelous opportunity, see. Similar. It's not quite as magnitudinous or gorgeous, you see, an opportunity to stray off the track. But you'll see you've already *put the rudiment in.* Your job has been done, see. Finished. Blown. It's not

going to worry you. If you were to ask the question again, you would find there was no disturbance of the meter at all because it's now known to the pc.

Instead of that, you'll find you occasionally take up something that the pc has already blown. I know that you take it up because I often do on an off-guard. I will be startled by something the pc said. It's so far offbeat. You know, it's just so offbeat from anything I could conceive of the pc thinking or saying, you know. It's way over in the other pasture. And I say, well, why did the pc think that, you see, and take it up. The pc has said it, so it is blown, you see. But then I take it up out of my own curiosity or something like that and catch myself taking it up, you see.

My curiosity is suddenly trapped in a, "Why did the pc think that elephants were on the roof?" See, it seemed to be an intriguing thought. And I'm liable to say, "Well, why did you think elephants were on the roof?" See?

Well, the pc blew it. The pc says, "Well, I've had this goofy thought. I thought elephants are on the roof"

Your proper thing to do is just say, "All right. Fine," and go on with your session. Instead of that, "Elephants on the roof? How fascinating," you know. *Zzzzzzzzzp brrpp.*

"Now, how come you thought elephants were on the roof? What reminded you of that?"

You'll notice that the pc starts to go out of session when you do this. Starts drifting out of session. That's because you have not comprehended that he has blown something So there is a disagreement going on here between you and him, and you haven't spotted the growing disagreement on this thing. And so he goes out of session on this point.

But getting your middle rudiments in is just, it's very rapid. There's hardly anything to it.

One of the tricks of getting them in is find out what flow the pc has on automatic. There are four flows. One of them is on automatic and causes the others to appear. It's the hidden flow that causes the other – one or more of the others – to materialize.

The pc is holding off an inflow. There's a big withhold on the subject. The pc always has to have a withhold back of these, but these are highly specialized withholds.

The pc has never been able to understand or stand a male voice. All right, let's just put it down to that. So every time the male voice speaks – you, the auditor, speaks, you see, as a male – *bang!* The pc's got to go this way with the inflow, see, *bzzzzzzzzzt.*

And it causes a sort of a reversed-looking withhold all the time from the pc, see. So the pc is just always kind of back this way every time you as a male talked to her. All right. Or as a girl you're auditing this pc, and you say something, and the pc has the idea that he could never stand a girl's voice or he's afraid of women. They're liable to do something odd or

peculiar, and you can never predict them or something like that, and he has to hold you back as an auditor.

You see, as a girl you'd have to be held back. And this will develop a whole bunch of automatic inflows. Well, it doesn't matter. You don't have to get down to the root of the first question, but you just trigger it, and you watch it go off.

You could simply say, "Are you doing something in a session? Are you withholding something in a session? Are you inflowing something in a session? Or are you preventing an inflow during a session?" See.

Phrase those any way you want to, and you're going to get a higher reaction on the meter. These are meter questions. And explore that one that went *bzzzzzzzt,* and you all of a sudden find your middle rudiments will stay in better because you know what the trigger is.

Every time the gun goes off and the pc goes out of session, you know all you've got to do is pull this trigger, and it'll last for a little while. And then you have to do the whole thing all over again.

The pc is preventing inflow from you. That's all you have to know. You don't have to know anything else. You don't have to know why the pc prevents inflow from you, a girl, or you, a man, see. You don't have to know that. You just have to know that the pc is resisting and preventing an inflow from you.

"All right. What inflow didn't you like then?"

"Oh, well. I – uuuuuoou – nothing. Oh well, yes, oh, well, yeah, as a matter of fact, I – huh. I thought you sounded tired."

"Oh, all right. Thank you."

Rudiments are now in. Sail. All of a sudden everything starts to go null. And wait a minute. "All right. What inflow did you – have you prevented in the last few minutes?"

That's all you got to ask. It'll go *bang.* And you'll clear it.

You see how you could keep those in?

Similarly, with a very oddball pc, not necessarily an oddball pc, you could turn the beginning rudiment question into all four flows. Not only are you withholding, but have you *had* to outflow? Or are you outflowing anything? You'll be surprised how many pcs are sitting there radiating so that they will be properly tuned in in-session or something

"Are you preventing an inflow?"

"Yes, I'm sitting here very carefully because I want to be in-session, and I want to be in-session, and I don't want anything to influence me from the outside world. And – so I'm in-session."

And you can trigger that one off, don't you see.

Or you can say, "Now, are you inflowing anything?"

And the person says, "Yes. Yes. I want some good auditing I'm inflowing good auditing"

And you say, "Well, what does it look like?"

And hell say, "Well, you know, it's the golden beams that come from you and me."

You'd be surprised. He's sitting there eating energy, not being audited. Energy eaters.

Anyhow, you've got – you've got a very handy method of handling middle rudiments by just sorting out the pc's flows, and keep your finger on what flow is now in vogue. What is the flow in fad at the moment, and you'll know that that is the one that keeps going out.