

RUNNING THE GPM

A lecture given on
2 May 1963

Thank you.

Well, here we are at the what?

Audience voices: Second of May.

We've arrived at the 2nd of May. Gee-whiz. We got through another May Day, 1963, AD 13. We celebrated, last Wednesday, the 2nd anniversary of the Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, and the course is into its 3rd year as of now. And we turn out better auditors all the time. Turn out better auditors all the time. Even you! And our successes are-of the past aren't even comparable to the successes that we're going to have up the line here.

Now, today I'm going to talk to you severely- Ordinarily I jolly you along, you know, and everybody looks ...

Well, I hate to be this severe, but you are on the edges of the great adventure. And this separates the sheep from the goats, man. And separates the children from the characters who can do it. And you are adventured upon a period of auditing which requires far more precision, auditor presence and TRs than any auditing we have ever had.

There's certain ways to do this right, and there's certain ways to do it wrong. The number of ways to do it wrong far exceed the ways to do it right. Any time you have somebody in training, he can always invent some new ways to do it wrong, but it's very, very funny that he never invents-almost never-some way to do it right. Because the odds are very bad. The truth of the matter is that the auditing which you are embarked upon is in actual fact simpler than you would believe and simpler than you will believe for some time. And the main thing you are doing with it is far too much complication. That's all. Just the complexities you're adding into it are defeating you. And you're taking too much time to accomplish what you're accomplishing.

And the only difficult thing that you must learn- and I can assure you this is not easily learned-is with total, excellent ARC, totally control the pc in session. Now, that is asking a lot. Because the pc is walking-you know, these, the Hunha Kapunah Unah Unahs had -that's a tribe that were bred by the Hunahs after they were defeated by the Punahs- and they used to walk across live coals and other tricks like this. But man, this pc, he isn't just walking across a live bed of coals, see, he's walking across eternity. And he feels it.

And the least-the least rancor, upset, unsmoothness on the part of the auditor ' -records itself very heavily on the pc during Routine 3. And you say, "Well, we'll be a good fellow and we will just audit permissively and go along with what the pc says." See, that's one answer to not making the pc upset. You've got several answers, you know. And one of them is just to sit there, you know, and be agreeable. And that is the worst answer.

Because the pc will dig himself into and get more ideas about digging himself into and get himself dug into more trouble if you follow his advice exclusively, than you can easily repair. I assure you of this. If he tells you that you ought to re-list some item and if he-if you do that, that's all right, you-very often you have to take his-the statement of what item it is that's bothering him, you see. But you do this and he gets dissatisfied and he says it's some other item and then he says it's some other item, and then you follow through and you do this, you see, and then you say some other item and so forth and all of a sudden you notice the pc is in a state of total collapse.

Well what put him there? The pc? No, it's just the failure of the auditor to exercise session control. No good blaming the pc and saying, "Well he dug himself in." I don't know, this-you sit comfortably under the palm tree on the bank of the stream, you see, and he swims through this river full of alligators, and you didn't tell him to go upstream or downstream, and he goes upstream and gets "et" and you say, "Well, he did it."

No, you're there to tell him how to get across the river, see. If the pc digs himself in, it's the auditor's fault. And it's nobody else's fault. There's nobody else to blame in the session. If the auditor fails to take the pc's advice, and gets into trouble thereby, it is the auditor's fault. If the auditor does take the pc's advice and gets into trouble, it is the auditor's fault. If the pc gives good advice, it's the auditor's credit, but it's his fault. Understand? And when you look at a session, don't look at it as a dual activity of mutually shared responsibility, in the great togetherness of all us wogs, you see? I mean, that's wogishness, see.

If you want to know what is responsibility on this planet, it is enough people in the same place. And that makes a responsibility. I mean, it's as weak as that. You see, they elect a lousy president in the United States and they say, well therefore the whole population took responsibility for electing the president so therefore it's nobody's fault. I think it's somebody's fault, see. But you wouldn't get any conviction in this particular line, you see.

So if you have five people together, immediately there can be no responsibility, you see, except the group responsibility of all five. Well, you have to get out of that way of thinking. It isn't an auditing group of two with mutually shared responsibility. It isn't, man! There happen to be two bodies there, but there's only one responsible factor, and that's the auditor.

And the pc isn't responsible for a living thing. Not one thing. You go around and say, "Well, he's a bad pc, or he's a nattery pc, or he's a this pc or he's a that pc." It's very strange

that if you straighten out the points on the case that ought to be straightened out, he ceases to be a nattery pc. I think it's quite remarkable.

All right, now if he's a nattery pc or a good pc, maybe give him the credit for being a good pc, don't you see? You can go that far, but actually you can't give him the credit for being a nattery pc. Because as far as the session is concerned, why, the pc runs as the auditor says. The auditor never has the out of "the pc something or other." The only time the auditor has an out is when a pc does something out of session that he ought to be brained for. I had a pc come to session once, I had the pc running beautifully, the pc came into session all caved in. Been all right during the last session, but was all caved in when he arrived at this session.

Well, the pc had taken it-had taken this interesting action. Had decided that something was it and had listed it. So happened that it was listed backwards, and no advises on this, you see, pc had no advises. And had listed about 10 or 12 pages backwards on an item, you see, and thought, "Just a little more listing now and it'll be all right." But of course you start listing one backwards, a little more listing makes it that much wronger. And I didn't half-clobber that pc, see? "You chuckleheaded idiot," you know? I mean, this was the general course of my existence. The pc didn't do it again.

But what was I doing? I was exerting, then, auditor control out of session for auditing being done out of session. And the only way I could do it is, "If you do this just one more time," you know, blank, blank, blank, blank, blank, see. The only way I could do, you see, was to impress the pc that this must not be done. Did. We never had any more trouble of that particular kind.

But it wasn't the auditor's fault if a pc gets themselves wrapped around a telegraph pole between session by some self-auditing action, except to this degree: In this case the auditor had not been expressive enough to meet that eventuality and had not smelled the fact that the pc was going to do it.

Now, you say, that's pretty-that's pretty far. Well, actually it is pretty far afield. That is stretching it just a little bit. Auditor responsibility is just being stretched a little bit. But the next time it didn't happen because auditor responsibility at that point asserted itself, and so this pc is doing things out of session, that are interfering with the session, therefore we must lower the boom and-took responsibility and lowered the boom.

Now this lowering of the boom can actually also consist of, "If you have just one more fight with your wife, if you talk to your wife just once more about your goal I'm going to give you the wrong top oppterm and list you on it for hours, you understand? So come off of this because I won't stand for it." That's asserted auditor responsibility, don't you see. You're perfectly within your rights to assert your responsibility that way.

You aren't responsible for the pc having walked back into the third or fourth session you gave him all spun in because they went home and told the wife, "My goal is . . ." and the

wife said so-and-so and so forth, you can't be held responsible for suddenly realizing that he was liable to go home and tell his wife his goal and his wife was liable to invalidate his goal and et cetera. That's asking just a little bit too much. You see? But it is within your zone of responsibility that you find out he's doing such things, to lower the boom, see? Give him a heart-to-heart talk.

You don't give him these heart-to-heart talks in session, by the way; you end the session. And when you've given him the heart-to-heart talk you start the session again. But the point I-then they can never accuse you of having broken the Auditor's Code.

But this will go quite a distance. This will go quite a distance. You find out that somebody is doing something outside of session that is upsetting your auditing. Well, it isn't up to somebody else to tell him, it's up to you. Now, you can tell them persuasively or any other way, don't you see, but you've got to make it stick. That's lacking responsibility for the pc in extremis-anymore-"every Monday you come in here, every Monday you come in here walking on both sides of the room. What's going on? What do you do weekends? All right, I'll pull a few of those withholds. We're not in session. See? This is not a session. I'm pulling a few of these withholds, and just so-and-so ... All right. Okay, so that's what you do, and that's why. All right, now listen: I'll let you in on something. You're not going to do it again, you hear me?" And make it stick. Because they're getting in your hair as an auditor. Now, you have a perfect right to do that sort of thing. But how do you do it so that the pc doesn't hate your guts forevermore. This is where diplomacy comes in. So many people have died from it-that's ... All casualties of the last two world wars.

Now, these points of out-of-sessionness and so forth, well, take them up with almost any rancor that you want to. But the truth of the matter is, you start controlling a pc misemotionally, while he is running Routine 3, and this is a horse of another hue. You can just start looking mean during a session and you'll practically spin him. He can't cope with the bank. And it comes back to the old Original *Thesis*, those rules and laws in *The Original Thesis*: auditor plus pc greater than pc's bank, you see. But auditor plus pc's bank versus pc, you see, auditor plus pc's bank is greater than the pc, and you cave him in.

So it's an interesting point. How do you control a pc without enturbulating the pc or pushing the pc underneath the bounding billows? How do you do this? Well, it's a very smooth level of control. It's extremely smooth control that is required. And there is a type of control that works in it, which doesn't Q and A. And yet which doesn't leave the pc sitting out on a limb either. You follow the formula of acknowledging completely everything the pc says. You understand it and you acknowledge it.

Then you say, to the effect that, although what he is saying undoubtedly contains great validity, it happens at the moment that it is necessary to take this other course. But that if anything needs to be done which he said, you will take care of it afterwards. Or at some later time. You got the idea?

Now, actually, that isn't just a casual series of phrases I have strung together, it has a very hard-bound formula back of it. Pc says -doesn't matter what the pc says. Pc says, "There is a goal-there's a whole bank between the bank we are running and the last bank we ran."

And you say, "All right, you can see it, huh?"

"Yeah, oh, yeah, yessir, yessir. A whole bank in there, and we've just missed it clean, cold and it's it. And we're now running the next bank below that, and we shouldn't be there."

Now, if you adjudicate this on the basis of, "Should you do what the pc says, or shouldn't you do what the pc says" or, "The reason why you mustn't do things is because the pc said to do them," you'll make as many mistakes you see, as in following the pc's advice. What you must do is treat anything the pc gives you as data. And that is all it is. It is never an order, it is never an invitation, it's never a this or never a that. It's just data. And it's quite valuable data. Make a mention of it on the auditor's report: "The pc says there's a bank between these two banks."

Now the only reason a pc is going to become upset with you is not if you don't immediately find that intermediate goal and run it instead of the bank you're running, but if *the pc thinks you have missed the information*. Now you can underscore that. If the pc thinks you have missed the information, you now get into a very heavily ARC broke situation. Pc says, "But I told you there is a bank, a whole bank sitting there!" And he starts asserting the existence of the bank and he'll start keying it in.

Well, the wrong way to handle it is to just say, "All right, yes, all right, I know-I know-I know, well, go on and answer the question which we are doing right now." "Yes," he says, "but there's a bank, I've just seen it. It's -you know, it's between here and so on and the whole thing is caving in on me and it's terrible. "

And you say, "Yes, well, thank you, thank you, good, all right. Now, just go on and answer the question which I am asking, you know. . . "

And the pc now, he says, "But I *doo-rrraa-paa-rrreh*. . ." *Bow!* See?

"Well," you say, "well, why is he so upset?" Well, he's so upset because you have evidently missed the information. He's not sure you've got this information. So your-just your ordinary toss-off, "Yes, okay, fine, thank you. . ." That isn't going to work. Because it'll create what is in essence a missed withhold. And the pc explodes accordingly and he explodes bank-sized missed withhold, see? Now, the way to handle that is to look at what I told you in the first place, you see.

"Oh. Oh. All right, I -all right. I got that. A whole bank. Okay. All right. Let me make a note of that." Put it on the auditor's report because it might be very interesting, and you might not go on auditing him for a long period of time. Draw a square around it, you know, so that it stands out plain. Say, "All right, I got that information. Any more about that?"

“Yes, so-and-so and so-and-so. I could even tell you its goal.”

“That's very interesting. All right. Says the goal is 'to catch catfish.' All right. Good. All right. Good.”

Now, this is possibly an approach, but I myself would not use it, so I'm giving it to you as where you could again perhaps fail. You say, “Well, is it all right with you if we keep on running the command which we are running now?” And I've heard so many of you use that that I'm injecting it as an-“Is it all right if we do that ... T' I never ask the pc if it's all right. He sat down on the other side of the auditing table from me, I just assume that at that moment he has said that it's all right if I do anything I do from there on in that session, see. I just assume if he'll sit down there to be audited-the only pcs I have any trouble with is that won't be audited and won't sit down. You see? I assume if he's sitting there, it's all right.

So I never ask him, “Is it all right if we go on doing what we are doing and do something with that later,” see, I don't go into that gambit at all. I say, “All right, tell you what. It so happens we've got our hands on a . . .” tell him the truth, see. “It so happens we've got our paws on this goal and we're this far into this bank. If we leave this at this particular time. . .” it'd have to be the truth or I wouldn't tell him this-“. . . if we leave it at this particular time, why, we're so many in, I don't think the other goal would fire. So I'll tell you what, this is probably going to be very uncomfortable, we know the other bank is there and so forth, and when we finish running this one, we'll get that one. All right?”

Pc will say, “That's fine.” He'll go on with the chest mass falling all over him and having an awful time, but he'll go ahead and run that bank for you. You understand? It's on a basis of truth. And you treat anything the pc says as valid data. That is the secret of it all. Anything the pc says as valid data. Because he's the one who is observing it.

The pc is right far - about the data - the pc is right about the data far more often than you suspect. Right about the data. And about what to do with it, is a hundred and -not just a hundred, but a hundred and ten percent wrong. See, so you learn to differentiate. You learn to differentiate between an order to do something and just data. And you always be very happy to get the pc's data, and you pat him on the back about his orders. The diplomacy all comes in under the heading of orders, not about data.

If you handle the data this way, you never have to have any diplomacy, and actually, you won't get into orders. He only gets into orders when he's sure that you're not going to do anything about it.

Now, you better know this trick well. Because you're about to embark upon something-and I've prefaced this lecture on Routine 3 with this diplomatic approach to auditing, learning the lesson of controlling with a steel paw in a velvet glove. Learn that lesson well, because the only real troubles you're going to get into is feeling so insecure about what you're doing that the pc says to do something and you do it. And he's not a hundred percent

wrong, but a hundred and ten.

Remember his data is always right, see? He tells you that there's an item "glumpsluks," and it's in a foreign tongue, and it lies immediately on the southwest corner of the item you're running. That's data. Good, fine. Now, it's just a question now of do you need this datum or don't you need this datum. That's the only thing. And what you do with the datum is your business, but just make sure you get the datum.

Now, if you-if you let a-this can go too far. If you let a pc start describing all the still pictures that are turning up, you will also wish you hadn't, because one of the ways of getting the pc in an engram is having described the largest object. It was the rule of the last largest object. "What was the last large object you saw in that engram?" He'll tell you and he's right back in the engram again, don't you see?

Well, you don't want him in an engram, so he's giving you data that it's there, I'd be more likely to turn it off something like this: "Well, now, we'll go on running this, -and you tell me if it changes. Be sure and tell me if you-if it changes any." And he promptly forgets about it. I don't go on and ask him for details in those stuck pictures, don't you see. He's liable to give me all sorts of data about the lineup of the bank and how many items we've missed and how we should go-and-but here's where it goes: "I'm very happy to hear that we've missed a pattern of four items that are lying someplace." There they are, he sees them, they're black. Everything else is gray. And he sees this patch of black.

And he says, "There's three or four items there."

I'm very happy to learn about that. I'm liable to make a little notation on the line plot. "Pc says there's four items here," see. "Four untouched items here." I'm liable to make that. And where I get in trouble-where I'd get in trouble, and where you would drown, is just right here: go back and get them. Take his order. "We had better get these now, because this is what's causing the ARC break that I've been having."

Oh, cut your throat, man! It's a much easier existence in the next few hours just mopping up a little blood. You differentiate the difference here? Pc says, "We've missed four items." They're right there, he can see them. Fine. Cheers. And his next following remark is, "We had better get them because that's why I am so ARC broke." Cut your throat, man. If you take that order, you've had it. Not because of the mechanics that it throws him in control of the session and on self-audit, but it's just because it's not the thing to do! You see? It-you mustn't do that.

Now, if you-now, here's-listen to this: If you fail to take proper note of the data and understand it, it will almost always be followed by an order to do something about it because your failure to acknowledge the pc has thrown the pc on self-audit. And that is possibly what you haven't seen in the mechanics of this. You understand that? Your failure to take that data down or into account, or pay attention to it or acknowledge it, makes him feel that you're not

in control of it. So he takes the session control out of your hands and orders you to do something about those items. See, so when you've failed on receiving the pc's data and paying attention to what the pc is telling you-you will then get your barrage of orders. And any time a pc starts giving you orders, you must realize that you have failed to take into account some data. And one of the ways to shut off the order flow, since the orders are, oh man...

Let's take somebody in the middle of a tar pit, with the tar all over him, don't you see, and have him direct the redecoration of the Louvre, see? It'll be just that silly. He isn't even there. He can see, but what he sees, we're not too sure of that. But we can take that because there's nobody else looking, don't you see. We're not any skull-looking there. Let's take the other thing of, however, he's in a state to audit? Oh, no. Uh-uh. He sure isn't. And the way to cure him of giving you orders is to find out what data you didn't receive. And you're liable to get a wildly it-he's been very mildly ordering you to do things-you're liable to get a wildly vituperative number of things which he has been unable to communicate to you. See? You've got your missed withholds, straighten it out. You'll find out there's some vital data connected with it.

This is-this is one way of taking a pc's grab-control of the session back off of the pc. See? That's one way of returning session control to the auditor. This is find out what he hasn't found out about. Of course, you do this mechanically by just mechanically pulling missed withholds off the pc, but you should appreciate that you also have, "Well, just what have you tried to communicate to me you see, that I didn't understand?" or "What data here haven't I paid attention to?"

And he usually starts in at-it's very interesting to see a normally mild pc say, "Well, you silly idiot, you. . ." see, and here he goes. What he's doing is relinquishing session control. He gets it off, squared up, all of a sudden, why, he's brighter.

So, smoothness of auditing is how do you control the pc without ARC breaking the pc or chopping the pc, and it also includes, then, doesn't it, getting control back from the pc if you've lost it. And actually, that's the whole story of getting control back from the pc. Find out what the pc wasn't able to point out to you that he then has to do something about. Because his doing something about it is all wrong. He will never do the right thing with it, I assure you.

See, you could give him-you could give him the next five items, and say, "All right, all right, just-just add them up and move the charge down-down the bank, with these five items. And if you check up what he's doing he will have opposed half of them backwards and forgotten the other half, you see. He's just not in shape to audit. That's all. I wouldn't even point this out to the pc. The question of his auditing would never come up. But if I found a pc giving me orders as an auditor, then I would simply try to find out what the pc has not succeeded in communicating to me.

I could do that with the meter, I could do it with persuasion; it might have happened in earlier sessions. But I would square that up right now.

Now, although the pc may be in an ARC break from other causes and reasons, I am likely to take that as the first step. Because the data connected up with this ARC break might be of great value. I would also do an ARC break assessment Routine 3 to find out what I had missed, but that is purely technical. Although it cures ARC breaks.

This other, how do you get control back from a pc, will very often form a considerable problem to you auditing in Routine 3. Pc is telling you, "You've got to do this, you've got to do that, you've got to -and we've really got to run into a later bank because this early bank that we are doing now is too much for me and we should run it later on the track, and we should do this and I've already told you that I've cognited on my goal in present time, and you should take this goal in present time and the top opptersms of it are 'catfish' and 'catfish-no-catfish.' And we've got all that and so forth so you really ought to be kind of running that now, because after all I've told you and told you. . . " And you'll notice that all of his orders have got "I've told you and told you..." running through them one way or the other, see. All of his orders have.

Well, all right, if his orders have got "I've told you and I've told you," let's find out what he told. He very often wasn't articulate while he was doing the "tolding" and you'll finally find out that he actually is heading for the-for the early bank because he hasn't been able to communicate to you, he thought, because your TR 2 might have been poor at the moment, or you didn't make note of it or something of the sort, that there's a whole slab of the material you have been doing he is in great doubt of. He just doesn't believe it, something like that. And he's gotten desperate about ever understanding it. So he's made a decision there that he'd better get an early bank that he can understand. And of course to do that would be utterly fatal. But the datum there that he hasn't understood it might come as a brand-new datum to the auditor. Oh, yeah? "Well I told you!" The hell he did, man, he never said a word about it. He was sitting there going on just as nice as you please, you see.

"Oh, yes, yes, yes, absolutely catfish, yes," he's going on about it, you know, "Oh, yes . . .1~ "Oh, yes, yes, I understand. Yes, yes, yes. Eager catfish. Oh, yeah, I understand that you know, oh, yeah." Now he tells you he hasn't understood a single one of them. Not only that but he tells you that he's told you he didn't understand a single one of them.

All right, so your reality is betrayed. Remember, he's running in the least reality, he's running in the exact hurricane middle of the reactive bank. There is nothing goofier than where he is at. It isn't that he is-is or isn't goofy, but the area where he is at the moment hobnobbing is Spin Corner, man! Crazy Avenue goes up in one direction and Dementia Praecox Boulevard runs in the other. You're going to take this guy's orders, huh? Heh-heh-heh! This is silly. His data, always. His orders, never.

Very important for you to realize that, and the orders come when you haven't taken the data.

Now, we realize that banks are hard to run. Go ahead and realize it all you want to, and treat them with respect and so forth, but there's one thing you mustn't do. Now, you're going to misinterpret this and everybody's going to misinterpret this and get it all wrong. It'll be the source of argument here for years. I can see that, unless I make myself absolutely plain on this subject. Now-now, the wording of this is very carefully worked out, so don't write it down or quote it carelessly. Never rerun a partially run bank. Never rerun a partially run GPM. And that first word was "Never." And I point your attention to "partially." Now, let's get this real straight, because I don't want this datum to go in anybody's head goofywise, because it could be interpreted as "Never rerun a GPM," or that there's something bad about rerunning a GPM. There is nothing bad about rerunning a GPM. There is everything deadly about rerunning a partially run GPM. That one you mustn't do. Don't rerun a partially run GPM.

If you've got your paws on it, fur, claws and all, and you can continue it in the run, you continue running it right straight on through to the bitter end. What's the bitter end? The goal as an RI at the bottom of the bank, listed fifty items beyond the last RR and R/S. And when you've gotten that far, you can consider that the bank can now be rerun. You don't have to null that list to make the bank rerunnable. You understand what I mean, now?

Only then is it safe to rerun a GPM. Now, this means a great deal, it means a lot more than you think-you think of at the first matter. Means a great deal. You say, "What if it's wrong? What if the pc's ARC breaking?" I don't know, what if spring comes? What if the law of gravity works? Sure, a pc will ARC break. So what? They'll spin if you run it-rerun it. *Uhhh!*

You're going to get in nothing like the trouble you get into by running wrong upside-down backed-up mixed-up items, as rerunning a whole area to get the items right. Because that makes the bank more charged than it was. And it's then much harder on the pc. Charge in a bank runs from the top of the bank to the bottom of the bank. In consecutive order. And any time you take an area that you've rerun without running the rest of the bank-you take an area that you have run, and rerun that area, good, bad or indifferent, right or wrong, or anything else -any time you rerun that area, you just stack up a stiffening of the missed withholds. They're good and missed, now.

But there's a charge factor involved here. Because the charge runs from the top of the bank to the bottom of the bank, when you back up anything beyond a pair of items-quite allowable a pair of items because you're always working on a pair of items-you go any further back than that and start rerunning something, and not entirely understood by me at this moment-I'm simply telling you the empirical finding. This is not a theoretical finding at all. This is learned the hard way, you know? Any time you go back a few items and decide to rerun that little span again, without running clear to the bottom of the bank, you sort of let the

water back in the battery, you know? Something weird happens. Just let me put it that way rather than try to give you a theoretical explanation that might not be right. Just something weird happens. The bank gets stiffer. Sort of like putting-you wash this shirt, see, and you wash this shirt, and you look at it, and by golly the collar's still dirty. Well, in ordinary washing this wouldn't happen, but you wash it again and now it's too stiff to wear. It's very curious, curious; it's a phenomena.

It's as though the second wash water always adds a couple of gallons of starch. The bank beefs up. I can give you lots of explanations for this, but just take this as an empirical datum. The bank will beef up. The pressures will become greater on the pc. The stresses will become greater on the pc. The actual physical might of the bank apparently increases. Just take it as a datum.

Let's run-let's run from the top oppterm down to the goal. I'll give you an example, see? These are very concrete examples. We go from the-from the top oppterm down to the goal, I don't know, something, a matter of a fifth of the bank or something like this, see. Now, we've gotten the goal as an oppterm and we're going to go ahead through the rest of the bank. And all of a sudden-now these other remarks get very, very pertinent because we get a hard sell is liable to go on here-the pc's-this is visual, gets visual to the pc - he sort of looks up the bank and he says, "We've got uh - we've got uh -'want catching catfish.' And that's wrong. That's wrong. That should be -that should be 'wantably catch catfish.' Oh, look. That's why I was ARC broke. Yeah. Yeah, look. I -that- that-yeah, that-that's wrong, so that makes the-no, the uh-that's wrong, and uh-oh, and there's a couple above that. A couple a-oh, no wonder I was so ARC broke. Look-a-there! You got about five items missing there, right in a row, you know? And uh-you must have given me the wrong item. Uh-'cause there it is, and so forth."

And if you sit there casually listening to all this and apparently don't take it down any, and don't do anything about it, then the pc's going to start giving you orders about it. And the pc will say, "Well, we should go back up there-go back up there, to 'eagerly caught catfish,' and we should smooth that out and pass the charge down to where we are. Because if we keep going like this, why it'll just for sure mean additional ARC breaks."

And you say, "All right, thank you very much, well, we're going on now, and so forth. . ." And you see, that was-you've been practicing "die-plomacy," not diplomacy, and you're going to about get it, right in about two seconds, see. And you say, "Well fine, that's it, thank you, and we'll go on now, and we'll go on down the rest of the bank," and pc will say, "But look, I'm trying to tell you-I'm trying to tell you, there's this 'wantable-wantable caught catfish,' and that's wrong. Because actually there are about five items in that area and that's why I ARC broke in that area."

"Yeah, well thank you very much, well, we'll go on with this..." Of course his brains start spattering all over, and he says, "You've got to go back. Now I'll tell you what you do. You go back and-you go back and you catch that now. . . "

The next stage is, when you don't follow those orders, is he will go back and say, "See if this reads now: 'wantably caught catfish,' 'wantably caught. . .'just-just look at your meter. Get your eyes on your meter." See what your inevitable cycle is? He not only gives you the orders, but he starts carrying them out! And that's because somewhere along the line you haven't handled any of this.

Now, I'm actually giving you two data which go hand in glove, but they could form entirely separate lectures. The-don't rerun a partially run bank.

There are other reasons why you mustn't follow the pc's orders, but this is amongst the chiefest of them. Did you ever run an engram or a withhold

they behave the same way-on somebody that wouldn't discharge? And seemed like the more you ran it, the stiffer it got? Why? Actually the answer is in Book One, and you'll find the answer's in the withhold system. You ain't got basic on the chain, that's why. The funny part of it is, the more you go over it the worse the pc's going to get with it.

You get this pc telling you about this withhold, see? He stole this car, see. And my God, every auditor he's had has had this withhold, and it's apparently getting up to be-you know, he's getting this withhold off, it's getting to be a total obsession. It's what's known-it has a technical name, it's the recurrent withhold. He gives it to every auditor and it comes up every third session, see? It's a recurrent withhold. He just keeps giving that withhold.

Now, if you were to look at that withhold very critically, you'd find out the pc is getting more and more obsessed with this withhold. That withhold is beefing up. Because hitting it causes all of the earlier withholds to be missed. It excites and activates the whole chain of stealing cars. And the more you try to get this particular car, without getting the first car stolen, the more you activate those lower ones and get missed withholds. Therefore, actually, no Prepchecking, or no Sec Checking can be done in total ignorance of the withhold system. You just can't do it, because on any given pc-of course, the key-out factors, anything keys out usually within three to ten days, but where a person is being consistently audited on the same item, same item, same withhold, same engram, same this ... Oh, I- in the old days we used to have certain engrams, the pc would always come along with the engrams. The same engram, see. It just wasn't the basic engram on the chain, that's all. Basic was still on there. It's enough to get out just the basic engram on that chain. You don't have to get the basic-basic engram of the case off, don't you see?

Well, because of the repetitive nature of the bank, in a goal "to game," you would have the word "game" being repeated the length and breadth of the bank. "To catch catfish," my God, "catfish" are all over this bank.

Well, oddly enough, you can get away with-and get some success on discharging a withhold or an engram on a one-pass. You know, you can always ask the auditing command once. You know, you can always- actually, you can always ask it a couple of times. But you

can always ask it once. You can always pull the withhold once. See, you can always do it once. And the pc'll feel better, see. Oh, you can-you could get this one, Freudian analysis, poor devils, they must run into this constantly. Because they dig and evaluate in these things, you know.

This guy would all of a sudden-which was-gave them their thing of-all of a sudden remember that his mother used to sing "Tipperary" in the bathroom. Ah! And he remembers this, and it cheers him up, see. Feels great. Feels great, you know, ha-remembers this. Ha! What the-what do you know! Oh, wow! Gee. Terrific! It's all right, man, this Freudian analysis really works.

Now the analyst says, "Now, what significance can you read into this, about that? And you give me a few more data, and give me some of your dreams so that we can integrate them with this Tipperary so that this Tipperary, we can make some sense out of this, see? Now. . ."

And all that gain goes, just like that. It's gone right now, see? It's out. Never to return. It's the wildest phenomenon you ever cared to do. I'm just talking about empirical actions now, that you can do as an auditor.

You say, "Well, what's the earliest recollection you have in your childhood?" see, something like this.

And the person says, "Oh, that's pretty good. Graduating from college."

And you say, "Well, now, all right, that's -that's -that's fine. That's fine. What was particularly notable about that?"

"I was embarrassed when the dean gave me the diploma. Ha-ha! Come to think about it, I was. Well, what do you know? I feel better."

Fellow auditors, leave it alone. Let it drop with a soundless thud at that point. You see, this is so late. The fact that he got any gain or send out of it at all is miraculous. But just tapping it bled a little charge off of it, don't you see? But to hit it again will reactivate it. And then it'll hit all this chain of embarrassment. And you could go back into this incident and sometimes when it doesn't have a chain, you could run it as a little engram or as a lock, you see, and it'd clean up beautifully. And most of them don't have chains, so therefore you would get the idea eventually that you could run almost anything, you see, as an engram.

But let's say it's that unlucky chance that this one has a chain. Embarrassment goes all the way back to Freud, see. And you-you're going to hit this one, see? The dean gave him his diploma and there it was, and he's going to run that. And this one's got a real beefy chain on it, you see? Right along side of it you could have caught oh, incident after incident that you could have run, don't you see, because they're not in chains. And you get this one, and you run it, and he sees less to it now. Run it again, it seems more sticky. Seems more difficult to get to.

He does it again, and he starts worrying more about this now. And he does it again, and he finds some more in it, but if you ask him about mass or if he knew about mass, you'd find the mass was beefing up. Why? You're hitting too late on the chain.

In other words, you could hit it for a moment, you could bleed the charge off of it and you could get out of there and you're okay. We know this from a long time auditing experience. On anything which has a long chain, similar actions, you see, repeated, repeated, repeated, repeated, if you don't get the basic on that chain, the chain will not blow. And trying to work later than the basic on it will cause a beef-up for lack of a better word, a strengthening of the mass, a increase of pressure, an increase of energy masses connected with it. You can run one of these things till everything gets three-dimensional, man.

Now, it's only to basic. You don't have to have the basic-basic for the whole case to dispel this illusion. You only need the basic on that chain, which is embarrassment, let us say, in this lifetime. The first time you were ever embarrassed. You get that, the whole thing will tear up. But if you keep hanging around with this late incident of embarrassment, that chain is not going to tear up, that is going to get beefier. Now, I don't say that we are dealing with exactly the same phenomena when we deal with the GPM, that would be too great a conclusion. I'll merely tell you the same phenomenon is present in the GPM. But you can knock the charge out of items A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J, K, L, M, N, O, P, in consecutive order. You can find the item, you see? You can list for the item. Everything is going to go along just very nice and so forth. You can get the random items off of them, you see, and blow the rocket read off the thing, and move down to the next one and so forth.

And if you go back, and you go back over A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J, K, or you just go back over G-let's adjust G. Let's go back and get the pc shadowboxing trying to find the right G when we've already got Q, see. You find this pc start to get desperate after a while. And if you did this very consistently, you would find that there was greater mass on his case now. You would increase the amount of apparent mass. Actually you haven't increased the amount of mass, there isn't any increase in the mass, you've simply made him more aware of the mass that was there.

For instance, if it made him slightly deaf going over A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J, K, L, M, N, O, P-I know my alphabet, anyway-made him slightly deaf, you know, to go over those. Now, you go back over G, you know, H, I, J, he gets-starts getting a heavier ear ring. See, you got away with it before, but now it's kind of rrrr-rrrr. And you go over these things again, you adjust them out.

Now, you will feel that this isn't true because occasionally you over rerun a little section and straighten it up and bring the charge down and you apparently will get away with it, because the pc was ARC broke because it was missed, see? Actually, you won't have gotten away with it at all. That area has increased because you've reactivated the bottom of the bank. That's where the apparent greater charge comes from. You see, you start hitting, and

you hit it again and you hit it again. Well, if you were just coming along taking the charge off as you went on down, it doesn't have a chance to get activated, see. But by hitting this area, getting stuck in the quicksand, in other words, of this area, you keep hitting that and not taking any charge off the lower and hitting it and not taking any charge off the lower, then all that lower charge is getting into restimulation. And just about blows the pc's head off.

So you never rerun a partially run bank. You just don't do it. No matter what persuasions there are. You can go back and adjust a couple of items.

You very often have to adjust a couple of items. You're already adjusting one, at any given time, while you're running. You can-you sometimes find you have to adjust the item just before that. It just won't discharge; it just keeps on sporadically rocket reading or something like that. It wasn't right in the first place and that's why you can't get your next item. You keep trying to get this next item and trying to get this next item. You can't get the next item. Then we get bright and read the item just back of it and find out the thing's rocket reading. It's very embarrassing. Extend that list and adjust that and then take her from there and you're all right. That's a perfectly normal action, providing you don't take more than two thousand hours to get the right item just back of you. That's said in sarcasm.

There's your-there is your-the essence of the situation. Go back a block of six, six RIs? Oh, brother, cut your throat. The same thing. Because none of these RIs are ready to run. At no time are you ever running an RI that is ready to run. They're never ready to run. They're supposed to be there forever. See, they've lasted this long, and so forth.

Well, the funny part of it is, is you can discharge the basic of the bank. Now, this means then that there's only one direction that you can run in a GPM. It also forces you to run in this direction, and that is from top to bottom. You cannot run from bottom to top. You think you're running from bottom to top sometimes, and then find out you're running from top to bottom anyway. Oh, he's getting the items all backwards, but try to run a-the pattern in reverse sometime if you want a picnic. You've got all of these words now, in sequence, and they're in the proper sequence, so keep feeding them to the pc, and try to move up in the bank.

He-the pc starts going *aaaah-uuuhh*. What are you doing? You see, you're moving away from basic. See, the fundamental RI on the bank of course is the goal at the bottom of the bank. And that's holding everything in place. In order to get it discharged you've got to discharge the rest of the bank. Well, that's done with the once-over -lightly, don't you see? You discharge every item in rotation as fast as you can and as well as you can, and on to the next item and discharge that and as fast and as well as you can, and on to the next item. And you'll win the whole way, charge will be blowing off, and the pc feels fine. That's necessary charge to remove.

Now, all of a sudden you go back, you move back. Let's go back a dozen items, and

you're going to correct the bank, because now you have found correctness is necessary. You've had it. You start moving down that channel, now, yes, they will all fire again, you ought to consider that's mysterious, we were all over these things once and they're all firing again. It's because the basic charge on the bank hasn't been drawn, of course they'll fire again. Only, where are they getting that charge? That's leaking up from the bottom. So here we go.

Next thing you know, the pc's sort of looking very haggard and the eye circles get-first they come down to here, and then they come down to here, and then he's just-doesn't have a face any more, he just has one large eye pouch. All that comes from rerunning.

Now the one thing therefore that I have to teach you on the thing is, in handling auditing, to be very adroit and don't get yourself into a situation where you have a whole bunch of missed, bypassed items, and this and that and the other thing and so forth and a bunch of ARC breaks. You can become technically accurate enough so that you don't do that. But even if you did bypass some items and run into an ARC break, so that you can handle the situation well enough as an auditor, telling the pc, "Oh, well, yes, oh, oh all right, all right, that's wrong, huh? Okay. Let me make a note here, pc says it's wrong, and all right. You say there's five more items up above 'want'? All right. Let's-pc says these items need to be corrected, all right. The next time we run this bank down from the top we'll correct them. How's that, huh?"

Pc says, "All right. Okay. Okay. All right, fine, fine." Right on. Don't try to overwhelm him with the fact that you're now going to go on over his dead body, don't you see?

Teach you those things, it becomes necessary that you know them well. There are many reasons why you should know them, but the principal amongst those reasons happens to be this fact about you can't rerun a partially run GPM. Can't be done. You get into trouble, pc go upset, oh yeah, you can get the right items, oh, yeah, you can get it all corrected, oh, yeah, *uuuuhhh!*

Of course it'll all come off, and the consequences of having done so will all straighten out when you get to the bottom of the bank and so forth, but you'll have a very rough and uncomfortable time of it for a while.

You can't get the top oppterm-*you've* got a pair of items. Well, you can fool around quite a while with that pair of items. You can fool around quite a while, but if you can't get anything to fire after about five hours, man, you'd better cut in with the goal as an RI, oppose-as oppterm, you know, the goal as an oppterm, cut in and cut the bottom of the bank off of it. Tell the pc, "This is going to be very uncomfortable. The mass is probably going to follow you all the way down. We've missed all of those items. I think there's about fifty of them above where we're operating, and we've missed all of them. I'm sorry, but there isn't anything else we can do. And when we come back and get this, why, you'll get your top

oppterm easily.”

But let us suppose we just took the goal as an oppterm area out, and then so we've taken enough charge off the bank, now we're going to go back and find the top oppterm. Ohhhhh. Oh, no. That comes under the heading of rerunning a partially run bank. You must always run a bank *down*. If you start at any point, you must go south. There is no north running. For instance, if you cut it in as the goal as an oppterm, it's uncomfortable, fine, run it all the way down on the pattern but get it right on down to finding his next -doing his RI oppgoal as an RI opposed. But don't null it, because he'll get the next goal. And he'll be interested, and other things will happen that are catastrophic.

Now, I've tried-I've tried all versions of stopping short of doing just that, and the only step that-I give you this very seriously-the only step that can be omitted is nulling that final list to find the next goal below or earlier than the goal you're running. That can be omitted. If the list is complete, the pc will not ARC break, and all-you run the risk of his cognite-cogniting on the goal. Because practically all he's got to do is look over his shoulder and he can tell what it is.

But the pc will tell you what the goal is, and if you're plum foolish, you won't take enough note of it, and won't make enough-you know-receive it hard enough, make a note of it, and all that, that you've got that, that's fine and the pc will then assert that he's got to run it. And then if you still don't receive that well enough according to the pc, he'll run it. He'll start giving you the top oppterm. It's all under the heading of assert.

And you've got the top of your bank-of the one you just left isn't run. Now you want it, and everything's going to -ha-ha! No, thank you. No, you've got to go back up and finish the top of that off and pass your charge on down the bank and get that well discharged.

That, of course, is not as good a program as starting at the proper top and going all the way to the end, but is preferable to spending seventy-five hours trying to find two top oppterm. Because that soon gets into a position of rerunning a bank. It'll activate those lower RIs and it'll get more and more uncomfortable. The absolute time limit on it is something like about five hours. And if you can't find it in then you have no other choice. You've got to cut from under and get lower and go south. And then come back and get that top, cut the top off. Even though you have to pass the charge on down to the bottom again, it's a better plan to do it. And you will-takes you less time to do it that way.

Yes, it's uncomfortable to run a pc with a fifth of the bank unrun above him. Yes, it's uncomfortable. It's far more comfortable than to rerun and rerun and rerun and try and fffzzz. Got to teach you one thing, is to overcome the sales tactics of the pc and his orders, so that you won't make the errors which he himself is bound to make. That's a definite professional liability, because he sounds so reasonable. Teach you the mechanics of that, and we've got to teach you also that the bank itself must be run, not fooled with. When you start running it, run

it. When you get your hands on a bank, go man, go. Keep going.

Now, there are some here whose cases I have used to see whether or not these laws were generally holding true. And so forth. That is, I wasn't restraining them from going. But it's followed through consistently. They would have been better off in any case to have cut into that bank anywhere. They would have been better off just to have run a series of locks off the top of the bank than to have fooled around for the top oppterm.

“Well, what's the top item for this bank?”

“Well, I've got one here that's 'someone who-who coughs-who-who coughs.' Yes, 'someone who coughs.' Yeah, that's part of the goal 'To catch catfish.' “

“All right, that's fine. Now, is that a terminal or an oppterm? All right. Well, that's a terminal, 'someone who coughs.' Very good. Now what-who or what would someone who coughs oppose?”

“Oh, well, let's see, there's, 'dreamy days.'“

“All right, that's fine, that RRs.”

I'm not kidding you. I'm not kidding you. It'd be better to go through the bank in that fashion. Of course, that's terrible to go through the bank that way, because you'll get strays and you'll skip. You'll all of a sudden find items like “steam locomotive,” you know.

There are many ways you could run a bank. But the way you mustn't run one is to partially run one and then rerun it. Don't ever rerun a partially run bank. Don't ever try to repair a partially run bank. Only repair and run wholly done banks. Don't spend any time finding top oppterm-if it seems impossible, cut in and run something. I've got to teach you that when you get your hands on a bank you run the thing. You go, you know? Don't stand around man. You go.

I've had a lot of- a lot of cases, and done a lot of work on this and adjudication on this, I've got subjective-objective cases like mad, and that's the conclusion I have finally arrived at-finally arrived at. One, that the auditor has to be a sufficient diplomat, as to not find himself in a position-he's got to be able to handle a situation then, even though it is wrong, and keep going. You see? Becomes a requisite, see.

Tell the pc, “All right. Yeah, I-well-all right, okay, I got it. All right.

These are-we've missed those withholds. All right, we missed all those items, all right, well, we'll get them on the way back, is that all right with you?” Settle the ARC break that way, you see? You know? Learn to handle it without-without having to redo it. And the other thing is, once you get your paws on a bank, go! Don't stand around, man, don't do it. Go! Get the next item and the next item and the next item and the next item-oh, so he can't start in at the top of the bank and find the item and the next item. All right, man, skip the top of the

bank. Get in there and go!

You-it's something like walking across crust ice, see? You must not linger. And the pc will just shine if you do it rapidly and fast. And he will bog to the degree that you redo it.

Accuracy is absolutely imperative, so long as you run. But accuracy only and without item after item after item being found in good order-out. Pc ARC broke. Bah, the pc'll just go into a complete apathy. The pc is getting loses, the pc feels upset, the pc isn't up to getting in there and pitching now. The pc's enthusiasm is gone. The pc doesn't have the lift necessary to rise superior to this bank because he's being crushed by the fact that he's not getting anyplace, see? You mustn't just stand around and mill. Find a place you can go and go. And do it right when you come back through. You understand?

You get the right rocket reading items, of course your pc-you'll have no trouble with your pc at all. You've got the pattern of those items now, and that pattern's getting more exact every day. In fact I even know the exact words. Isn't that horrible? And it's getting so there's nothing left. It's "wantably" and "wantable." Ever hear of those words? I never did. Anyhow, they're in the bank.

Probably the character and the high-toned character of the bank and its parts of speech is what keeps modern language as what it is.

Anyway, well, there it is. I hope you can learn those things, but it-but take them to heart. They're the essence of running a GPM.

Thank you very much.