FUNDAMENTALS OF AUDITING

A lecture given on
20 November 1962

Thank you.

Okay. Here we are with Saint Hill Special Briefing Course lecture number two, 20 Nov. AD 12.

There's a lot of material that you could have and memorize and do things with on the subject of auditing. There are probably thousands and thousands of rules that you could go by in auditing – thousands of them, probably. The way to audit – the way – to audit has only a few very fundamental rules.

When you look at these thousands and thousands of rules of thumbs and maxims and what you do and what you don't do and so forth, if you haven't got these few little basics down, you're not going to audit. Auditing does not occur.

In other words, there's what you might call some very, very senior data on the subject of auditing. One of those is: Auditing is a third dynamic activity, basis of it is communication and you have to audit the pc in front of you. And frankly, you violate those and you've had it. I don't care how many other thousands of rules you have followed. If you have violated those little rules, well, you've had it, that's all. You won't ever have any auditing occur.

Somebody comes along and he tells you this, that or the other thing in auditing, and to you, it seems to make sense that you handle your E-Meter on the right rather than on the left or something like this – the reason you aren't getting anyplace is because you're handling the E-Meter on the right or – and you should be handling it on the left. Or you have to take up the pc's present time problems and that's what you're not doing and that's why your auditing is bad. Or pcs ARC break and therefore don't read on the meter and that's why you're not getting anyplace, and that, frankly, how can you expect to audit a pc if you have dirty fingernails? You must improve your diction in order to audit a pc properly, and so forth, and go practice with diction. Your E-Meter reading must be more rapid. And if your E-Meter reading was more rapid, why, then you could audit a pc better. You could just go on down with innumerable items – all of them quite valid – which if you repaired them, without repairing the first three I have mentioned, would not make one damn bit of improvement in your auditing.

You can be told that there are thousands of things and some of you, and some auditors, get into a complete fog of the fantastic number of things they have to do and remember in

order to audit. And in doing and remembering these thousands of things which they must do, they neglect those little fundamentals. They cease to audit the pc in front of them. They start auditing thousands of fundamentals. They neglect communication as the primary function and action in auditing and they sit there as a totally individuated item – island – a first dynamic auditing, a nowhere. And, of course, they never get any auditing done. Those fundamentals have been totally overlooked.

If those fundamentals are overlooked, it doesn't matter how precisely you turn your toes in as you sit in the chair doing TR 0, it doesn't matter how much Listerine you gargle before the session, how many advertisements you put out about what a good auditor you are, hoping the pc will hear them and be impressed. It wouldn't matter a doggone what you did; you've neglected the fundamentals of auditing.

The fundamentals of auditing don't even consist of an E-Meter. They're very simple. Auditing is a third dynamic activity. There's the auditor and pc and they're basically a group. The activity they're engaged in is communication and the auditor is auditing the pc in front of him. Those things are occurring, auditing will happen. If those things are not occurring, you could handle these thousands of rules. . . Actually, I could go back over them and check them out of various handbooks, lectures and texts. And I'm sure I could count up thousands of them. You could follow all *the* rest of these rules letter perfect – and you would never make any auditing take place.

Of course, a Saint Hill graduate goes out of here and goes back to an organization or goes back someplace or another, they always make the inevitable remark. They don't make it because I have said they make it. Usually they don't make it at first – they're being polite or they're being something or they're being something. They're being nice about the area or zone they're in. And sooner or later, because they've withheld it or overlooked it and are withholding it and so forth, they will break down in a letter to me – it'll be the fifth or sixth or seventh letter they've written me, or something like that and they'll say, "But the auditing that is being done around here – oh, my God! Oh, my God! Oh, my God!" It's very expressive.

Now, of course, you say, "Well, this is a Saint Hill graduate, he knows all these tricks and he looks good and he's this and that and the other thing." Somebody out in the field will say this, you see? They'd say, "Oh, well, of course, they've just learned all these little tricks and all these little nuances and that sort of thing. And therefore, they look good." Now, I don't think that's it at all. I think around here you find out that auditing can occur. I'm usually telling you that it must occur. And out of sheer agony of trying to get off the hot seat, why, you have to audit. Because nobody's putting up with it if you're not.

And basically your case gains are coming on up the line, other things are occurring. And through practice, through interest in what you're doing, through these various things, you start auditing the pc in front of you. All of a sudden a long, blue spark hits you one day and you say, "Maybe if I asked the pc I could find out." So communication starts to occur. Then

you get so many changes of auditors that you can't conceive of auditing being anything but a third dynamic activity.

So, in the final analysis, you are being driven, actually, in that direction, until you recognize it. And what a Saint Hill graduate misses when he gets back into an area or an organization, what he misses, is any feeling that auditing can happen. He's surrounded by people that really don't think auditing can happen. They've very seldom seen it happen. See, they very seldom run into the fact that there is a right way to do it. They don't think there is a right way to do it. They think it's something they dream up as they go along.

They think this and they think that. They do an awful lot of thinking. They do an awful lot of figuring. They don't know that there's a right way to audit; that's what it boils down to. They don't know that there's a right way to audit.

And you get any unpracticed auditor who has not been very ferociously schooled on this subject and that is the first thing he overlooks – that there's a right way to audit. And the right way to audit is to consider an auditing session a third dynamic activity that has to do with communication, and that you audit the pc who is in front of you. And then auditing occurs.

Another thing you get over around here is being self-conscious about auditing. There's so much auditing going around and so much being demanded and your brains are so strained – trying to avoid you, a thetan, probably – that you get into a state where you haven't got any time to be self-conscious about it. And one of the things that happens around here quite routinely is, an auditor at Saint Hill looks very relaxed when he's auditing. It's one of the points you look for. He's stopped worrying – whether from apathy or otherwise.

But if you neglect these fundamentals, then you can add *thousands of* things to do. Now you have to have rules to handle pcs' origins. Now you have to have rules to handle this and rules to handle that and rules to handle something else, because these fundamentals have been neglected.

I'm very obliging. If somebody demands rules of me – if they're foolish enough to demand rules of me – I'll give them rules. And they'll learn better after a while. That's about what it amounts to. Uniformity of an auditing session is highly desirable. A relatively muzzled state on the part of the auditor is highly desirable, if an auditor is going to add a bunch of nonsense into the lineup. But this is all curative, isn't it? That's a curative measure. That's trying to keep people from multiplying and adding nonsenses which have nothing to do with auditing.

The other part of it is that the human race wots not of a third dynamic activity – doesn't know anything about it. And as far as communication is concerned, to this day I'm still kicking myself. When I think about it, I get very cross with myself, and knowing better than to run motivators, I don't get angry with Reg. But if I didn't know about motivators I would be

furious with him. But I didn't take a tape recorder, a pocket tape recorder, to a cocktail party that was given on the *Queen Elizabeth.* The officers give cocktail parties. I'd just love to have that tape! I could turn it on right now and play you ten minutes of it, and honest to Pete, you'd hardly be able to sit in your chairs! You'd just be dying with laughter. Because there isn't any communication in the lot of it. All they do is evaluate and invalidate. And no communication; nobody ever finishes a cycle of communication; things they talk about are non sequitur – never follow up any subject with any other related subject. It's a dispersed mishmash of invalidation and evaluation. And that's what passes for communication.

The most marvelous condensed example I ever heard of it in my life was at that cocktail party. As I walked out of the door of the cabin Reg said, "Well, I don't know, you don't look very good there – tuxedo with this tape recorder. It makes your shoulder, you know – bunches your shoulder up and so I wouldn't take it." That's what he said there. So I didn't get the recording and you can't have an example of what Homo sap considers ... Wild! I mean, you can't duplicate it. You'd have to get out a slide rule and figure this thing out. How many evaluations and invalidations can you get in per given remark? Everybody's trying to stop everybody else's communication – no communication involved. Communication is basically cause, distance, effect. Well, you can add a few more of the rules and duplication and things like that in – you got the whole definition of it. It never occurs in Homo sap.

So an auditor, or a person learning to be an auditor, has his first strike on him because he's been associating with Homo sap. He would make a perfect auditor if it weren't for that. We've got to cure him of it. Therefore, we have the rules, like TR 4. We have rules like Q and A. We have other things that we have to put in. What are those things doing there? Well, they're trying to bypass and not let into the session a number of human aberrations which already exist in the communication habits of the person who is trying to audit.

Now, I had somebody just do something very astonishing. They didn't realize that when the pc originated that the cycle should be permitted – that the auditing cycle occurred when the pc originated. They thought it only occurred when the auditor originated. And that's why they Q'ed-and-A'ed. Only the auditor was supposed to begin and end a communication cycle. Well, that immediately is not a third dynamic activity then, and you're not auditing the pc in front of you, because the pc in front of you is not permitted to originate a communication. Follow this?

What is an origin? The pc says, "Black is white." Well, an auditor who is still – he still has the cramps and coughs of being a Homo sap; he isn't, case-wise, up the line as far as he might be, lot of those things – he tends to handle this a la Homo Sap. But don't think that that makes it any less a violation of communication. A communication is just a pure cycle and a communication cycle can go two ways.

This is not the fault of auditing that he's doing that; it's because he's developed bad habits. Somebody says, "Black is white." This violates his sense of something-or-other, so he

writes script. So he says, "This person is nuts." So he says, "You're nuts. Black is not white." That's Homo sap at work, you see? A big figure-figure is added into the middle of the communication cycle. Where the hell do you find any *think* in a communication formula? It doesn't exist. You find most auditors, learning to audit, have difficulties with pcs in direct ratio to the amount of think that they add into the communication cycle. That's the extraneous action.

Pc says something, so they think something. Well, unfortunately, "to compute" was part of the definition of an auditor. So we just have to throw it out. Because an auditor actually doesn't listen and compute. The less computing he does, the better off he is, man. Pc says, "Black is white." What is the proper response to "black is white"? "Thank you." It's just a pure communication cycle.

And do you know that every time a pc has ever asked you to do something in an auditing session has been after you have goofed the cycle originating from the pc about – four times – at least once. Pc originated and you took it up and did something, the pc originated and you took it up and did something. So the pc, now being in auto-control, says to open the window. The only reason you need any definitive action between a pc wanting you to do something and the pc originating, is because the pc wants you to do something after you have failed to accept his origins.

You've queried his origin, one way or the other, before he starts *thinking* about the environment. Don't you realize that's a symptom of being out of session? Well, how did you drive him out of session? By not letting a communication cycle occur, of course. Every time you break down the cycle of communication, you wind up with a pc slightly and increasingly on auto-audit. Every time you break down the communication cycle, to the degree that you break down a communication cycle, you break down the third dynamic activity, individuate the pc, and after that, he starts running the session.

The reason you have trouble with a pc is directly related to the number of times you have not permitted the pc to originate. Pc only starts asking you to do things after you have failed to accept the pc's origins. So you fail to accept the pc's origins, he winds up in auto-control. He individuates out of the session.

Now, in view of the fact the pc is aberrated, and I wish to call this to your attention, the pc very easily individuates. It is quite a trick to keep a pc from individuating and going onto auto-audit. How many of you consider a pc in-session when his thinkingness is under your control? Same question, exactly the same question, is how many times do you have to get in the mid ruds? You have to get in the middle rudiments as often as you don't have a pc in-session. It's very simple. You have to get in the mid ruds to the degree that the pc's thinkingness is not under the auditor's control.

What's this pc doing? He's sitting over there commenting on this and commenting on

that and doing something else and thinking something else and thinking something else and thinking something else and invalidating this and evaluating that and suppressing something else and failing to reveal something else. What's all this, man? That's a very non-third dynamic activity, fellow. That's two highly individual individuations in contest – something that looks like a games condition.

Now, of course, your pc – being a bit aberrated as he comes along the line – getting better, he is less susceptible to this individuation; therefore you can't expect the pc's thinkingness to be totally under the auditor's control in the first session. But after three or four sessions, it ought to be pretty smooth. What would you think of the auditor who took a pc whose thinkingness was under the auditor's control, and then three or four sessions later had a pc whose thinkingness was not under the auditor's control? The auditor had to do something to bring this about. And what the auditor had to do to bring this about is just interrupt the communication cycles as many times as possible in as many ways as possible and get as little auditing done as possible. You eventually will wind up with just that occurring. Pc's thinkingness goes out from underneath the control of the auditor.

Number of times you have to get in mid ruds is a direct index of the amount of thinkingness going on in the pc, individuated from the session. And that's a direct index to how much individuation the pc has from the auditor. And that's how that third dynamic is broken down. Two first dynamics actually do not make a third dynamic. Any way you want to – you want to paint the barber pole it still is not going to work out. Two first dynamics don't make a third dynamic. An auditor's perception is not the perception of an individual looking at another individual; it's a third dynamic perception.

Now, I hate to build up the whole subject of intuition, because a lot of people say, "I don't have to use an E-Meter. I don't like an E-Meter. As a matter of fact E-Meters are no good, and they're very, very bad for auditors." It usually starts off in that gradient scale and gets more and more into a rave and they start talking about why they should use intuition.

Well, intuition is something that you could step all over, and probably be better off for it if it was that type of individuation which a person develops so that he won't have to confront anything the other person is doing. Now, we're not talking about that type of intuition; we're talking about pure, actual intuition. There is a knowingness about whether the pc is in-session, is not in-session – hasn't very much to do with looking at the pc. The auditor sitting there feels, knows, that the pc is in or out of session. Well, that's just a piece of perception. It's a perceptivity. And the perception of the auditor is good or bad. And it's bad to the degree that he has departed from the third dynamic back toward a first dynamic.

In other words, you get a deterioration of perceptivity. If you're real hot and you haven't got very much on the third or fourth dynamic and you're not in any big games condition with the pc – you know, you haven't got lots of oppterms on the third and fourth dynamic and you're in pretty good shape as far as pcs are concerned and you're not fighting

the session all the way and that sort of thing. You're auditing along and all of a sudden the pc gets a withhold, you don't see it here, man, you don't see it on the meter. There's the pc sitting over there, and the pc's eyes have gone – kind of gone a slate gray. And you could probably track it all down. And a scientist of the purest modern school would say that you could detect this by various characteristics.

I spent a number of years trying to figure out what these various characteristics were, studying it on the basis of whether or not I was noticing something peculiar. Because in 1950, 1 had a bunch of people around me who were nagging me about the fact that there must be characteristics that told me what the situation was. And I finally have to come to the conclusion that there were no indications. You could study these indications till hell froze over and you still wouldn't have explained this very interesting fact – that I know when a pc has an ARC break before the pc finds it out, without even looking at a meter, and without looking at the expression on the pc's face or the position of his hands or how he's twitching his fingers. He hasn't found it out yet. But I find it out. How do you explain that?

Perception. On what wavelength? Same wavelength as in space opera. Dolls, by the way, seldom have names. They know each other. How do they know each other? Well, it's very simple. How do you know it's a red light or a green one? See? Joe always feels like Joe. Bill feels like Bill and Pete feels like Pete. In other words, you're talking to Pete and Pete feels a certain way. So that's Pete. Actually, a much safer way of identifying people. You can forge passports – try and forge a wavelength! No, there's no doubt about it – thetans communicate. *Thetans* communicate, not through MEST. You don't even have to talk about wavelengths. Thetans communicate.

Now, there's some jerk by the name of Rhine. . . Oh, excuse me, I didn't mean to say this. I know he's an honorable man, and so forth. There's some bird's got a racket down at Durham University. And he runs a big swindle of getting funds to investigate extrasensory perception. And all this is very fascinating, but he's copped most of the coin. Well, we have to speak in these terms, because after all we're talking about this bird. And actually, the number of validities which he has done in this are all MEST communication lines. On some fashion, he tests it all against MEST. He enters MEST into it at every hand. And then he enters something else when he isn't entering some MIEST: he's entering proof See, when he isn't entering MEST to test out whether there's extrasensory perception, then he's entering proof

"I'm going to test whether or not you can read my mind. Now, I am thinking of a number. Now, after you've read my mind, I want you to write the number down on a piece of paper, and then you show me the piece of paper and I'll tell you whether or not that was the number I was thinking of " How cuckoo can you get? That's proof, man, which is one of the biggest aberrative buttons on the track. You're going to test extrasensory perception through the aberration of proof!

Now, you start walking through the forest in some wild place and you try to explain it,

but you don't see a bird. You've got a gun in your pocket – it isn't even available – but you just don't see a bird, you don't see a squirrel, a deer, a chipmunk, nothing. You see nothing! And you go out next time without a gun in your pocket and you see birds, squirrels, chipmunk, deer, rattlesnakes. What goes on? You're emanating menacefulness as long as you have a gun in your pocket. It isn't whether they *see* the gun or not; that's modern science, you see? They just know, because you know, that you're dangerous.

Honest, I've seen old-timers out on the frontiers, up around the Rockies and so on, comment on this when I was a little kid until it's the most threadbare record I think I know anything about, you know? They're always up to this. They would carefully take a gun out to get themselves a deer and they would see no deer.

Now, apparently some thetans emanate more than other thetans. Apparently BBC has more broadcast variety than radio Jersey or something, or ... You get the idea? I mean there's apparently a difference here. You can know more about one thetan than you could about another thetan. And you apparently get relays from one thetan more about another one. Well, you're talking about various communication factors which are beyond the immediate recognition of matter, energy, space and time. And this in itself is a very, very interesting subject as long as you don't try to drag it down into MEST, because then of course you're talking about MEST communication. See?

It's a fascinating subject, communication without MEST intervention. This is a very fascinating subject. And it can't be studied by Doctor Rhineswine. Because all he can do is drag extrasensory perception down into MEST through the button called "proof," and then say, "Well, there it is," and so on. Well, that, I'm afraid, doesn't have much to do with it.

We've tried to use this in processing. Tried to process people along in this. The biggest single button we have that it exists is this fantastic fact, which has occurred and occurred and occurred and occurred: We take pc A who is having trouble with human B. And we process pc A. We never go near and he doesn't write, he doesn't communicate in any fashion, with human B, and we straighten out the problem, and all of a sudden it evaporates with B. This has left a lot of auditors blinking. We have done this time after time after time.

I mean, first time this was ever called to my attention was an early ACC down on 17th Street. Golly! This was so interesting. So I've counted on it since and when it doesn't resolve with human being B after processing A, I generally get after the auditor that processed A. I mean, it's that tight a situation, see?

It works reversely. If you are deathly afraid of oil companies, they're going to shortchange you, give you bad stock and sue you. That's for sure. You're going to be in constant trouble.

Any time you've got a reliable item, you can rely on its producing a lot of trouble for you. And when it's evaporated, it ceases to produce this much trouble. This is what is so

mysterious. Because you haven't processed it. All you've processed is the pc. Now, how do you account for this? And yet that is susceptible of "proof," if you want to put it that way, because there it is.

Auditors are very familiar with this particular mechanism; I shouldn't be beating it in the head. But I'm showing you that there is a perception factor.

Now, when the individual is in a games condition on the third or fourth dynamic, or on, let us say, with women. Let's suppose a big reliable item on the track is women. We've got this fellow and he's an auditor and every time he audits a woman he just somehow or another, he just – things happen. It's just rough, that's all. It's just tough. Tough on all concerned.

He comes in and he's scratched from his ear to the groin, you see; he's in a mess. He can audit men, gets along fine. Why? Well, we say, "Well, actually, he's just chopping them up because of this." We can explain it. You know, we can give all kinds of reasons. But the truth of the matter is, he's in a games condition, and the truth behind that truth is the one we're interested in, in this lecture: He can't perceive. And actually that's all that's wrong with his auditing. Because he's auditing one of his own reliable items, his perception can't bridge across that games gap. You see, it is an enemy and therefore he doesn't dare confront or read it. His perception on the subject stinks. Now, he'll do two things with that perception – as you know all things will invert – he'll read a good wave and recognize it as a bad one. In other words, he'll have – this pc will feel good and the p – the auditor will actually invert the interpretation. He'll get an inverted interpretation.

In other words, the pc's sitting there – the pc's sitting there and saying, "My, what a wonderful session. First session I've had for days."

The auditor – says, "Oh, my God, I'm killing him!" You'll see this happen, too. Well, what is that? He can't perceive it. So he dubs it.

Now, the manifestation of dubbing is writing script. That's where you get the auditor's figure-out, the auditor's think. And the more bridge, more gap, the more games condition there is between the auditor and the pc – the more of this there is – the less reliable perception there is and the more substitute perception you will find. And that substitute perception takes the form of *think*. This is a case of "look, don't think." You see?

Well, this guy doesn't look, he thinks. And he writes script! And he'll come to some of the most remarkable conclusions you ever heard of. Pc is sitting there, feeling as smooth as a banana split, see? And the auditor says he's got an ARC break. Well, that's how this perception gets invalidated. It's – only gets invalidated by those people who are to some degree in a games condition with what they're trying to audit or perceive, because they do a think, not a look.

You see, it – the reason they can't perceive is because they can't confront. If they can't

confront something, how can they perceive it? So if they can't perceive it then they must get a substitute perception – and this is a think, a consideration. They write script. They figure it all out.

Now, it's true in guiding a pc down through such a thing as the Goals Problem Mass, you have got to consider which way this thing is going to go and how this thing lies. You can't stand up and guess at all this, because it's a highly complicated track and it requires metering, and it requires this and requires that. Even on a Problems Intensive, you're going to run into trouble to the degree that you don't absolutely, mechanically ascertain this. One of the reasons for that is, is you're reading aberration; the pc can't read it either. You see? Aberration – it doesn't emanate. So you have to have highly mechanical means to attack this sort of thing. But as far as the pc is concerned, you should be able to read him pretty directly.

But if you can't confront him and if you don't want to confront him, you don't want anything to do with him, you're going to get a substitute in there, and that substitute is think. So you're going to go into a consideration of what is going on. And now we've got script writing at its worst. And the pc will be sitting there smooth as glass and the auditor insists he has an ARC break. The pc's got a horrible roaring ARC break and the auditor insists everything is going – and he's got it all figured out that the pc is just being mean today.

The auditor takes some fantastically weird action as far as the pc is concerned. Why? Well, it leaves the pc aghast and it leaves everybody else aghast and pretty soon it'll leave the auditor aghast. "How the devil did I start driving down that road? You know? Gee-whiz! We were going along so nice, and here I am running down this road and what happened? What happened?" Well, what happened is his perception dropped. See, he wrote some script. He made a bum guess. It'll be as clumsy as this, don't you see.

For instance, I find out that on a demonstration audit, my perception of the pc is worse than my perception of a pc in an ordinary session. That's because I have the additional action of trying to protect the pc, keep the pc from embarrassing or damaging himself in some way, make the session look good, make the pc look good, and hold it all under control under a rather extraordinary environment, see? Well, that splits up your attention. You're actually liable to make more mistakes and do less reading of the pc. So the pc originates and you tell him you will do it. See? You miss. You miss the TR 4, see?

You'll suddenly make a mistake. The pc says, "I think that list is too short." And you say, "All right, I will add some items to it." Oh, man! See, it's by giving demonstrations and that sort of thing (rather high-tension auditing situations) that I've come to realize what a short-perception auditor – the mistakes he makes. See, that's a curtailed-perception situation. The pc didn't want you to add anything to the list. The pc wanted to tell you that the list was short! And what's the matter with you that you didn't say, "Good. Thank you," and go on doing what you were doing?

You wouldn't permit a communication cycle to be originated by the pc. It's very embarrassing to me when I do this. I know I've flubbed across the boards. Every once in a while the pc looks up and I – in a demonstration, something like that, very brightly – and this happens sometimes with more with some pcs different than others – looks up very brightly and says something-or-other, and so-on-or-other, and I say, "Well, let's do something about it," see? I could step on my tongue the moment I do it because I've gotten a misread intention. I read the intention of the pc as just directly interpreted from his words, meaning I should do something and therefore I do something. In other words, I wouldn't let a communication cycle exist.

Actually, once you've done that, the next time you're likely to *have* a demand that you do something. Do you see what the gradient is? See, you didn't let the pc originate, so now you're going to Q-and-A, and now this is going to result in the pc demanding that you do something, because the pc is already on a kind of an auto-audit.

The number of times that you Q-and-A with the pc is directly related to the amount of auto-audit that the pc is going to engage upon. Because you've shown him that he is not in communication with you and therefore you've broken down the third dynamic situation. You've also reduced his, you might call it, theta potential, or something weird like this. You – well, he isn't emanating – although he isn't emanating anything anyhow – but he isn't emanating to the degree that he is. His mind isn't free, you see. He's clouded up.

You can't read him as easily. That's about where that goes. See, you cut down his horsepower, his wavelength or his megakilotrons or something, see? So he isn't transmitting so good. You've dropped him a curve.

So therefore you're going to make a worse mistake next time, see? Compounding the felony, he's walking out into an auto-audit. You eventually have two individuals conducting a disrelated activity. One fellow is busy nulling the list and the other fellow is trying to keep his rudiments in. That's a totally disrelated activity, although you've looked on it as a rather common activity. It's very common for a pc to try to keep his rudiments in while you're nulling the list.

What's he trying to keep his rudiments in for? You're trying to null a list. Well, let me guarantee, to that degree, you've Q'ed-and-A'ed with him. See, you've done something that interrupted his communication cycle.

Now, this might not have happened in the session. It might have happened between sessions, it might have happened in living around this person or being his roommate or numerous other conditions. But you have Q'ed-and-A'ed with that pc. And that pc tends to individuate to the degree that you have Q'ed-and-A'ed with him.

He walks up and says, "Oh, I feel terrible! I got a telegram this morning from my grandmother and she was dying of lumbosis."

And you said, "Where's she live?"

Well, of course, you aren't his auditor and so forth and this is not very offensive and so forth and this is the way Homo sap communicates and that's it. But you didn't let him get something off. The fact that you said something told him that he hadn't blown it. A lot of auditors go around thinking that if a pc mentions something, then it's – he has to do something about it so the pc can blow it. No, it's a communication activity. It's all communication, the auditing is. It's a communication activity. And being a communication activity, when it's communicated and the cycle of communication is completed, it's blown. You understand that?

Now, the degree he can't blow things is the degree he's been Q'ed-and-A'ed with. That's a direct relationship. Some individual has been Q'ed-and-A'ed with and Q'ed-and-A'ed with and Q'ed-and-A'ed with, you find out he can't blow anything. He has a hell of a time.

Now, after You've Q'ed-and-A'ed three or four times in a session, what the hell's the use of trying to patch up the session? There isn't any way you can patch that up. What are you doing Q'ing-and-A'ing in the first place. Ah, but we get a bunch more rules now, don't we? How to cure an ARC break. You do this and you do that and you do something or other. Oh, yes, it cures the ARC. What the hell were you doing getting an ARC break? Do you see my point of view?

See, I'm writing a bunch of rules now on how you get out of a swamp. Well, *what were you doing in the swamp?* Here's a corduroy road marked with tape on both sides of it, and arrows, and it's bright daylight, and there you are over there a quarter of a mile away standing in the middle of a black swamp. And you say, "Ron, give me some rules. How do we get out of these swamps?" So I say, "All right." And I Q-and-A with you and I give you some rules. Or I even say, "What the hell are you doing in a swamp?" that sort of thing.

And, of course, you can hope for the day that you say, "Hey! How do I get out of this swamp?" You've asked a question, don't you see? And I don't answer it at all. That would be a sad day. But you've asked a question, I'll give you an answer. But I get a chance to originate at that point, too, to make it a complete cycle, which is, "What *the hell are you doing in the* swamp? How'd you get there? Auditing must seem like a very complicated activity to you if you're over there in the swamp. How many rules did you follow that got you into the swamp?"

Now, an ARC break occurs anywhere from fifteen minutes to an hour and a half before most auditors perceive it. Now, that's a hell of a condemnation. Because I can take a pc who is in the middle of an ARC break and find the auditor trying to cure up an ARC break which occurred anywhere from fifteen minutes to an hour and a half *after* the ARC break.

Now, let me give you a very fast one here. I want to give you the data on this. I've talked to you lengthily about this, but I think it's important to you. Let me give you an illustration. Now, this, what I tell you is true here. It's an hour and a half, half an hour, fifteen

minutes, something like that, after the pc has had the ARC break, that you'll find the auditor trying to clear up the ARC break. He isn't trying to clear up the ARC break of an hour and a half ago, he's trying to clear up the ARC break of one minute ago! Ah, but it doesn't exist there! Why is he trying to clear it up there? This ARC break's an hour and a half old. He's cleaning up an ARC break two minutes old.

It's one of these remarks of, "What the hell are you doing in the swamp?" You understand? There's an ARC break that occurred an hour and a half ago and the auditor is trying to clear it up as having occurred two minutes ago. Ah, but there's an ARC break one hour and twenty-eight minutes before the point the auditor is addressing it on the track. And I get this kind of a weird feeling: What the hell did the auditor do, go stone blind? How did he miss this?

Well, the first time he missed it is he just wasn't on the pc's wavelength, that's all. He just didn't feel something very peculiar about this session. And he almost always committed this deadly sin if he's in trouble: The pc found out he had an ARC break before the auditor did. And that is inexcusable! Absolutely inexcusable for a pc to find out he has an ARC break before the auditor did. *Where is* the auditor?

Well, look at what the criticism this is of the auditor's perception – look at the criticism. Here's a pc mired down and mucked up in a bank with more perception about what is going on than an auditor who is sitting across the auditing table from him. Oooooh, man! You mean the auditor's perception is no greater than a pc who is totally mired down in the bank? Just think of – over that for a minute.

The auditor is supposed to be there all bright and alert, see? And the pc finds out about this ARC break before the auditor recognizes there is one. I'm not kidding you, this is *unforgivable.* It's never forgiven by the pc. You just check over the next ARC break you see in progress, no matter who it's between – you and the pc or another pair – and just go in there and check it over and you're going to find this to be the case: If it's really raw, roaring, screaming ARC break, it occurred an hour to an hour and a half ago – the actual incident – the auditor is trying to clear it up as though it happened a minute or two ago, and the pc found out about it before the auditor did. And those unforgivable circumstances, of course, are not forgiven by the pc because it's been proven to him conclusively that he's not in a third dynamic situation. It's proven to him conclusively that he hasn't got an auditor, that the auditor is individuated.

What is the auditor doing, not noticing this ARC break? Do you see how that adds up? Well, I couldn't say it too emphatically Now, you understand, I'm saying it's an *unforgivable* situation because the pc doesn't forgive it – not because I don't forgive it. So, of course, you have an awful lot of trouble with pcs if you're always noticing the ARC break after the pc does. And if you're trying to clean up the ARC break when it became vocal and visual, and you pick up that point of the track to clean it up, you're always in trouble. You'll always

never have sessions, you'll just have dog's breakfasts spilled on the deck. You won't ever have sessions. And you'll wonder why you get so little done.

No, if your Martian antennae – which I'm sure you have a facsimile of; somewhere on the track you've worn antennae (off one of your favorite items) – is just properly tuned in or, better still, you are alert, you'll find out ages before the pc that something is wrong.

Now, if you're in a state of writing script and imagination, you'll start badgering pcs. The pc hasn't got his hair combed right or something like that, so you start saying to the pc, "What's wrong in the session and what's wrong in the session and what's wrong in the session?" There isn't anything wrong in the session except you're asking him what's wrong in the session. See how he could read this out, see?

But, at the same time, you'll get pretty good on this sort of thing. If your own perception is up and the pc is sitting there and – it isn't any way the pc looks, it just doesn't feel right to you – you say, "What's – what's happening? What's going on?"

And the pc says, "Nothing."

"Well, you think something here recently – something come up there?" You're not getting in mid ruds, or jamming him around on it, just two-way comm. "Something come up there?"

"Uh-no-no, uh-uh. Oh, well, yes. Hey, yeah. As a matter of fact, you're reading the wrong list." Nothing wrong with you making a mistake in the session. The only thing that is unforgivable is the pc catching it before you do.

Actually, you see, perception comes above technical perfection, because you can always handle a mistake if you find out about it before the pc does. But you could be doing "flawless" (quote) (unquote) auditing and be reading the wrong list. And the pc finds it out and man, you're not going to clear that up in a hurry. That's just going to ARC break all over the place.

The degree of the ARC break is related to the *number of* ARC breaks which have directly preceded the apparent ARC break. The first ARC break the basic on the chain for any given session, is quite previous to where the pc thinks it is. And that's another law, is: The pc never notices where the ARC break really starts. The pc always picks it up late. And that is true in lists. You're running down the lists and saying, "Waterbuck. Catfish. Mack Sennett cops."

And the pc says, "I got a pain, pain, pain, pain, got a pain, pain, pain."

Aw, what are you doing? You put it down after Mack Sennett cops. Waterbuck. You start tracing it back. One of your smart things to do is say, "All right. Mack Sennett cops. How's-how's the pain on that?"

"Well, that didn't get any worse."

"Catfish. Catfish. Catfish. Catfish. Catfish. How's the pain?"

"Oh, it isn't any worse."

"Waterbuck. Waterbuck."

"Haaa! Gh-uh-1-1-ha, uhll-uhll-uhll. There *you-uh-ull ...* There you did it again." See? He's always late.

Pc is monkeying with an instantaneous reading bank and he's always slower than the bank. That's what you can count on. Pc is always late. He's always picking up the item after the right item. He's always picking up the ARC break which occurred after the ARC break. See? He inevitably wrongly attributes what's happening, because after all, you're dealing with somebody who's attention is fixated on this, that and the other thing all over the bank and all mixed up in the middle of their items, and it's a wreck. And to ask him to think anything at all is miraculous.

Of course, a lot of auditors never recognize the pc as anything but old Joe and old Joe is always pretty quick on the draw, and doesn't realize old Joe isn't sitting there. He's auditing Mick Slan, Commandant, Sector 89, Extraterritorial Empire, whose *penchant is* killing small babies. This guy is being more that than anything else.

And all of a sudden you say, "Hey, hey, hey, hey, hey, Bill."

"Uh – Bill. Um – Bill?" You know, it takes him a split second to disconnect, you know? "Da-oh! Where? Yeah, here! Ha! Here! AN What the hell? What's the matter?"

It's very funny, you know? You whistle the pc up to present time. Very often if you don't say "Hello," they get an ARC break. Did you know that? Of course, you don't practice that these days, because they're not going down the track and coming back. This is quite remarkable – after you've gotten rid of an item and you've gotten this and that out of the road, and so forth, and you got the pc into the room and so forth – if you said, "Hello," how acceptable that hello is to the pc.

Now, I'm not telling you to do that as a practice. But he's gone somewhere. He's into something. And that is out of time and space than where you are. And you expect this guy to be an auditor, two hundred thousand years before he ever heard of it, it's no wonder he's a little bit slow. But he's always – almost always slow – almost always slow.

He will sit there and explain to you carefully that the ARC break that he is talking about is the fact that when he asked you if it was cold in here, you said, "Shall I close the window?" And what he wanted to know was if it was cold in here or if it was a somatic that he was in the middle of ! And if you'd answered him, why, then he would have known whether it was a somatic that he was in the middle of and that was the cold he was trying to

locate! And that's what he's ARC broke about. And he'll tell you again and he will tell you again and he'll tell you again.

What's really remarkable is how many times they will tell you without it blowing. And somewhere along the line you should get suspicious that you aren't dealing with the basic on the chain. And you're not. You say, "Well, before that, were you trying to tell me anything? Was there a question I didn't answer before that?"

"Well, yeah, yeah, I uh

And you'll find out there's a question about ten minutes before the session started. And he asked you something and you didn't answer it. And that has been the source of all the upset and ARC breaks ever since. And he's pointing to one that is an hour late. Isn't that remarkable?

Now, you're only a knucklehead when you don't recognize the fact that the pc would not need an auditor if he knew what was going on. Why does he need an auditor? See, if he was always right, it would always blow. But it doesn't always blow so he can't possibly be always right and that's why he has to have an auditor. And that's why you've got to have ESP and a few dozen other things in order to ride this track.

The various rules of the game is that it is a session, that auditing is based on communication, the basic communication formula is much simpler than Homo sap makes out. "I originate and you invalidate" – I think that's a Homo Sap communication. "Then I evaluate and you negate." No, it's just a pure communication cycle and that the pc who is sitting in front of you is the pc you've got to audit. You can't audit a meter and get a Clear pc – can't be done.

You try sometimes to put a GPM series of items together without asking the pc where they belong. Just try it. You're not going to get anyplace. You've dug them all up for him, but the final step of matching them up can only be done by the pc. You could test them and figure out and so forth. But if you had to fit them all together in the end, they wouldn't be the GPM. The pc wouldn't be blowing the GPM either. And it would have no value for you to do so. So sooner or later you have to face up to the fact you're auditing a pc.

Now, if you go consistently and continually on the basis that if the pc says it, it isn't true – this is just another Homo Sap evaluation and invalidation on the communication formula. The pc very often is right. And there are certain things that only the pc is right on. ARC breaks aren't one of them. The pc is never right on a *misemotional point – never right* on a misemotional point. But where it fits and what the score is and if it's the item and that sort of thing – yes, he's right.

You could do a meterless assessment of an item, by just putting the meter aside, taking a list and then going over that list, very carefully asking the pc to tell you every pain that

turns on, go over it and sort out the thing against the pc until you had the one that turned on the most pain and ask the pc if that's it and the pc says that is it, you have found an item. And if you put it then on the meter, you would find that it would rock slam if your question was correct in the first place. Are you aware of the fact that it is that easy? It's that easy.

There's no substitute for putting the pc in-session. There's no substitute for giving him an auditing session. You're going to get yourself tangled up in 8,765 hundred rules. Well, that's just that many rules between you and the pc that are forbidding auditing. If those rules are being used – those rules are quite valid – but if they're being used by you to prevent a third dynamic, to interrupt or upset a communication cycle, or to get out of auditing the pc in front of you, then those rules are not for that session. There's many ways to audit pcs, there's many styles of auditing, but there is no substitute for auditing.

What does the pc consider auditing? Actually, an alleviation of his upsets and reaching his basic purposes and driving that road down between the GPMs – those things are auditing to the pc. Oddly enough, he won't let you near his bank and won't forgive you if you don't run it out. Nevertheless, you audit the pc, the pc is getting someplace, the pc is making gains, the pc would take *anything off* of you. Your auditing could be apparent technical perfection, with the last word of the finger held just right and you're not using that technical perfection to get anyplace with the pc, you'll have nothing but a busted-up, ARC broke pc the whole way. Interesting, isn't it?

Now, there is a right way to audit. It's good, direct, straightforward, audits the pc. And the basic patterns of auditing that you are using are very, very refined patterns. As you're sitting there auditing the pc, you're in a very fortunate position of not having to develop auditing. The test of a good auditor is when he has learned this. He just uses the tools he's got and carries on down the line, and he uses them sufficiently well, the pc is getting auditing, he's getting something done.

The bad auditor doesn't know that these things exist. He thinks there are thousands of ways to audit and that he's got to dream up a thousand-and-first one, right in the middle of the session. That's just another way of figure-figuring your way out of giving somebody a session. There are right ways to audit. We're teaching you the right ways to audit, and you'd be surprised how many rules have been lopped off of auditing. But the most direct approach to auditing happens to be the very pattern of auditing and the equipment of auditing that you have right at the present moment. And there is a way to audit.

The more you embroider that, the more you add to it, the more unnecessary stresses you put on it, why, the less it'll work. But you could sit down and say to a pc, "Start of session," – just this, no R-factor, nothing, you understand? You just say, "Start of session," and pick up the list you were doing in the last session and start in the middle of that list where you were – stopped nulling, and go on and nulling, you know? "Waterbuck. Tiger. Catfish. Crayfish," so forth and so forth, right on down through the end. And as long as you were

technically perfect and you were – in doing just exactly what you were doing, as long as nothing else went astray, you wouldn't have a bit of trouble. There are a few things that could go astray, you handle those one way or the other before you start the session, because they can go astray and make it tough on you, you understand?

But oddly enough you would be better off doing that than you would be to take a two-hour session and use an hour and fifteen minutes of it to get rid of a Q and A which you shouldn't have put in in the first place. Do you see where the emphasis of auditing is? There are right ways to audit, there are right things to do, the auditor who audits according to pattern in the smoothest way gets the furthest in the long run, so long as he isn't violating those three basic rules that I gave you in this lecture. I invite your cooperation.

Thank you very much.