

EFFECTIVE AUDITING

A lecture given on
9 November 1961

Thank you. Thank you. This is 9 Nov. . . Russian year, 9 Nov. Kapluskov. I invite your curiosity to the behavior of a needle on the E-Meter. There is only one thing that can make an E-Meter lie, and that is a bad auditor. A bad auditor can make an E-Meter lie.

We had some character running around the States about a year ago and he couldn't read an E-Meter and he was asking everybody if they'd ever been pain-drug-hypnotized. And, of course, each one of these words fell on the meter, he never bothered to compartment the question and it wasn't till I started proving to people conclusively that they had been pain-drug-hypnotized by cats, dogs, mice and so forth, that somebody woke up and said, "What do you know. The auditor has something to do with making an E-Meter read right."

Yeah, he does. And similarly, you cannot get a false goal or a false terminal or a false modifier or anything else on an E-Meter if you know how to run an E-Meter. You just can't get one. You couldn't push one off on an auditor. You can't receive one. The E-Meter tells you the truth in the matter.

For a number of years we have had difficulty in auditing because auditors were very leery of actually believing an E-Meter. That's because the auditor in practicing his skill uniformly had withholds. And having withholds, of course, he didn't want any withholds off anybody else.

We got a Central Organization right this minute . . it's getting all nicely straightened out . . but we had somebody in the Central Organization as a . . actually, it was an auditor that was auditing staff. Fortunately, it wasn't anybody important. (That's a joke.) And this auditor just kept sitting there and kept sitting there and you know, the needle would knock on a withhold and the auditor wouldn't get the withhold. And finally, why, the staff member was just getting worse and worse and feeling badder and badder about it all.

And so HCO Secretary took a lance out of the umbrella stand, couched it properly, and went at solid charge in the direction of the Association Secretary and said, "What is this?" And the Association Secretary spoke to the Director of Processing, and the Director of Processing mentioned it casually to the auditor. And the next day it went right on happening Why?

Well, that particular auditor and that particular Director of Processing had some mutual withholds from the organization. Not only would the auditor not get a withhold off somebody else, but of course, with her partner in crime involved, the partner in crime would not even force her to get a withhold off somebody else.

So it's, "Let's all be down here in the mud with these nice withholds." That is the motto of all of that. Interesting, isn't it? Whenever you see somebody . . I just take this as a forthright thing

A person refuses a Security Check, they've got withholds, see. A person that won't get withholds off another case has withholds that they have never divulged. This is about the way it looks. I mean, it's quite a technical fact.

This particular HCO Secretary, by the way, had just written me a letter which I received this afternoon begging me to come over here and let somebody give her a one hundred percent run on a Joburg and get all of her withholds off completely so that she would have no diffidence on this particular line and then let her go back and saw into the staff. So that if it started out with just one person with no withholds, you see, this would then get contagious, which was an interesting suggestion. I didn't take her up on it. Because a class member here, very shortly, will be going back to that organization. And they better have all their withholds off by the time they leave and everything will be fine.

You see how this goes, though? You see how this goes? A diffidence is based also on this fact. It is accompanied by withholds because a person wouldn't be this way unless they had withholds. But they are very afraid of what they might hear from the pc.

And when they get very afraid of what they might hear from the pc, they won't ask for withholds. They might hear some gossip about themselves, you see. Well, pcs are always willing to oblige, particularly on an auditor that can't security check well.

You say to the pc, "Well, all right. Now, are you withholding anything?"

"Oh, yes. Yes. I'm withholding the fact that yesterday in a coffee shop, why, I heard three people talking about you, huu-huu-huu-huu. And these people said and I'm withholding it from you."

The hell he is. He hasn't withheld it yet. There's been a lapse of time of about six hours between the incident and the session. When did he have any time to withhold it? Oh, no. When I hear somebody start that one, I always can get pay dirt. I can always get pay dirt. Because he's about to say, "I heard."

And I say, "Good. Fine. Thank you very much. Now, let's find out what you have been up to lately."

"Oh, well, that's something else. Ha-ha. Well, no. But I heard. And actually, I won't be able to get in-session, you see, unless I get the."

"Well, fine. You're in-session. Now, what's the withhold?"

Now, you would be utterly amazed how far you can go and what you can get away with in auditing. You invalidate somebody's goal, you invalidate somebody's terminal, you upset somebody on the subject of his auditing progress in some way or another and you deserve to be shot. That's for sure. But . . . you fail to accept the pc's answers. You do these various things and it's very upsetting to the pc. He feels he can't talk to the auditor and so forth.

But how far can you go within the framework of these rules? Actually, I don't invite you to do such a tactic. But we have been boxing around with a withhold that keeps falling on an instant read and we can't get it . . . do you know the pc feels better if the auditor even went as far as, "God damn it, what is it?" Do you know that?

The pc says, "Uuuuh! It was a so-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so."

You say, "Thank you. Now, good."

You see? It's the same thing as you would lay hands on a pc if he tried to blow the room. See, the pc feels under control.

Now, you can ask. You can persuade. You can be quite forceful. You don't have to be angry or upset. I'm just giving you an extreme, extreme, extreme example. But you can be very pressing on these things, you know.

"Yes, yes, yes. I know. I know. That's all very interesting, but what did you do?"

And the pc says there, "You know, there's some session control around here. By George, you know, I'd better not look up too much because there's liable to be a controlled session going on here."

You have asked a question. You want to know what that fall is, and the pc doesn't give it to you. Now, the pc may not know. May not know. That is the time to be very helpful. Get your help valence on. And you say, "All right. Now, let's just sort this out. You say you don't know what it is. All right. Let's just sort this out." And now you ask a great variety of questions. A great variety of questions.

"Have you stolen anything from the firm?" And we've gotten a knock and the pc says, "I don't know."

All right. Well, let's just try like mad to help this pc sort it out. Let's don't immediately assume the pc is holding out on us and does know, you see. Pc says he doesn't know. He looks puzzled. He looks a little bit upset. He's actually sitting there trying to figure it out.

Now, you're an auditor, and you can tell when somebody's sitting there trying to figure it out. So you help him out. "Stolen something. Well, could it have been property? Could it have been some item? Could it have been some perfectly worthless item? Could it have been some very valuable item? What could it have been?" You see, "How about paper, stationery, stuff like that." You're watching the meter all the time, you see, "Paper, stat " Pong,! Pong! You say, "What the heck is that?"

"Oh!" the person says. "Oh, yes. I've . . I've been customarily taking sheets of paper home and I never realized it was stealing." They could . . must have realized they were stealing, you see, or they wouldn't get a knock on the E-Meter. But there it is. And there it is and you say, "Well, what was it?"

"Well, about . . it seems like for a long time now I've been taking sheets of paper home. And yes, the first time I did it was a long time ago. I remember I did have a twinge of conscience the first time I did it." You know?

"Yeah. All right," you say, "Good. All right. Now, have you stolen anything from the firm?" Dead. That's it.

Now, that's one proceeding. You see, you're being very helpful, and you compartmented the question. You see . . you know, you've moved the question around. That is to say, "Have you stolen anything from the firm?" you know? And we find out that it is just "firm" that is falling. "What's this about firm?" You know? "Have you stolen anything?" is null. "What's this about 'firm'? Firm? What is this? Firm? What else about this firm?" You see?

The pc says, "I don't know." You help him out.

All right. There's another point of view about all this. See, 'there's another point of view.

You say, "Have you been cheating on your girlfriend?" you know.

And pc says, "No."

And well good, and you say, "There's a fall here on the meter. What could that be?"

And he says, "Well, no. Must be false. Must be on something else." Instant read.

And you say, "Well, have you been cheating on your girlfriend?" Bang! Instant read, see.

And he says, "No. Nope."

And you say, "Well, come on. Tell me about it."

And he says, "No, no. There's nothing there. There is nothing there. No, I have not! As a matter of fact I resent your inquiries into it because it's accusative. And you realize the Auditor's Code doesn't permit you to be accusative."

I say, "Well, the Auditor's Code isn't covered for the E-Meter. E-Meter isn't bound by it." I say, "All right. Now, tell me all about it now."

"No, I haven't been and so on. And I think it's very mean of you to ask me and actually you're trying to destroy my reputation. And it's probably something I heard about you and . . ."

"Now, all right. That's fine. What is this withhold right here about your girlfriend? With whom have you been cheating on your girlfriend? Tell me!"

“Oh, that . . . it’s just nothing. It’s no fair. I mean, you’re picking on me. Just taking advantage of your position as an auditor.”

“All right. Tell me now. I want to know. Who is it?”

“Oh, (sniffs) Isabel.”

And you say, “Good. Now, do you feel better?”

“Uh, yes. Well, I am. But you really shouldn’t be so accusative.”

“What else? What other one?”

You see, you’re justified there at that particular type of withhold because the fellow has gone into a games condition with you. And he doesn’t think that you can do anything about it, and that you won’t do anything about it. And he knows you’re all bound down, and you mustn’t dare talk turkey to him, but it requires some sense. You know, it takes some sense on your part. It takes an ability to look at the pc and to estimate the situation. And when you estimate the situation, you have to make up your mind, is this just willful heels? Or is this actual confusion or upset or what is this? Or is it the question which is almost on or it’s some part of the question that’s reacting Or is this pc just in a fog from something else that has been going on in the session? What is this all about? The rudiments have just gone out crazily or something has happened here. That’s for sure. We know something has happened. And as an auditor we go ahead and take care of what happened.

But we cannot say the blanket solution to every time you get a fall on the meter is to ask the question this way, this way, this way and you do it every time and so forth and it’s all here in the rule book and so forth. No, no. It requires you. It requires your participation in the session as the auditor. It takes you.

Now, if you developed a nice, calloused dead mask in lieu of TR 0; if you think that a tremendous deadness, a tremendous woodenness, a tremendous, “I will now repeat the auditing question. One, two, three, four. Thank you. Good. Thank you. The next auditing question is . . .” See. I sneer.

That is taking a refuge back of a ritual. The ritual is for your use, not for your protection. If you need a ritual, why, go to a session with a bulletproof vest on. You’ll feel better.

But it’s all under the heading of all you’ve got to do is audit the pc you are auditing and the technology you have is to assist you to do that. The rituals you have is to assist you to do that. Everything in Scientology is to assist you to process the pc.

Now, for you to just throw your bare chest out against the howling north wind and say, “Here I stand all alone, naked and scathed. Me, personally, processing this preclear. Ooooooh, that’s pretty adventurous. No bulletproof vest, no protective screens, no pat textbook answer to fit every single turn of the road. No.” Well, just get brave. That’s all. Just get brave.

And sometime, if you ever have a tendency to just follow the ritual and be very wooden about the whole thing and never do anything off-line, and just go on down the line, down the line, down the line and never get curious about what the pc is doing and just sit there and reel it all out and give them the auditing questions and so forth and the needle knocks and you say, “I’ll repeat the auditing question,” and the needle knocks and “I’ll repeat the auditing question,” the needle knocks and “I’ll repeat the auditing question,” the needle knocks and “I’ll repeat the auditing question,” and the needle knocks. Do you know after a while somebody, including the pc, will begin to believe that time is stuck at that point. You see how that could be? Well, if you find yourself doing that sometime or another, get a brilliant idea: You audit the pc for a moment.

Maybe your rudiments as an auditor are out. But the way to get them in is just audit the pc. Audit that pc in that instant of time that you are covering right that moment. The pc is going “Boo-hoo-hoo, wow-wow-wow. I don’t want any more of this. This is too much, and so forth. I can’t face it. Now, I just

don't remember anything. And it's horrible. And you're just torturing me," and so forth and so on. And there doesn't seem to be a textbook answer to all of this, you know.

All of a sudden sort of relax and look at the pc and look the situation over. Even if it takes a little time. Pc won't forgive it, but that's all right. He won't give anything right now anyway.

And look it over and say, "What is going on?"

And you know, he's liable to tell you. Because you asked him. You see, you asked him. That's different than a ritual question. Just try it sometime. The pc will all of a sudden wake up and sort of come out of it and think it over and then tell you what's wrong And you go on and you clear the thing and you'll find your session swings right on in.

Do you know that with one single question which is heartfelt and meant by you, you can put all rudiments in just like that? It's an interesting thing, but there is no substitute for a live auditor. There's just no substitute for one. And this is particularly true in Security Checking.

Now, when I say this to you, it opens you up on . . perhaps some of you might get the idea that what I mean is that you should be sweet or you should be kind or you should be inviting or something of the sort. No. No, no. There are times for the mailed fist in the auditor's glove, believe me. It might be a time for you to get human as an auditor and express exactly what you're feeling about the thing And it might put the reality right back into the session.

You maybe have gone as far as this: "Look, Joe, you've been sitting here now for a half an hour giving me motivators. Don't you think it's time you gave me just one little, teensy overt, huh? You know? Don't you think that'd be a better proportion?"

And you know, the pc is liable to think it over and decide you're right and give you one. And it starts the ball rolling.

Now, the odd part of it is, is you can do any of that within the framework of modern auditing. You don't have to throw all the rules away to suddenly become an auditor. Because actually, if you are really auditing, do you know the rules all go into place click, click-click-click-click-click? That's what's interesting about it. The more and better you know your business, the easier it is to apply your trade and the more human you can be.

For instance, I talk to pcs. Oh, there's no doubt about it: occasionally I go too far. They always come up shining at the other end of the session. Sometimes I go too far, that's for sure. "Look, I've only got another half an hour to get this. I'm trying to get your rudiments in. Now, are you going to help me or aren't you?" That's going a little bit too far. See? A guy could be bowled over by that, you think.

"Well, let's just shortcut this whole thing, and you tell me exactly what you think is going wrong right here, right now. Now, what is going wrong right here, right now? What do you think is upset?"

Pc just, "Oh, uh . . well, there isn't anything going wrong. It's what was going wrong"

"All right. All right. Fine. Well, is there anything going wrong now?"

"Well, no. Well, there was something going wrong."

"All right. Let's just lay that aside for the moment and carry on with this Sec Check." In go the rudiments.

End of session, of course, you have to go back and clean it all up.

You know, the more you sin, the longer it takes you to end the session. You realize that. An auditor always pays for his sins in terms of end rudiments. But do you know that there are times when you pay for your omissions? You didn't commit any sins. You weren't direct enough. You weren't real enough. You were just kind of wobbling around. "Well, have you ever raped anybody? All right. Thank you. All

right. I got a fall there. Have you ever raped anybody? It says here. Uh . . you . . uh . . thank you. All right. Have you ever raped anybody? Okay. All right. Here's the next question. Let's see, what is it? Oh, yeah. Have you ever sung in church? Yeah, have you ever sung . . have you ever sung in church? All right. Well, we can skip that."

And you know the pc gets the idea that you're not doing anything? He does. Pc does get that idea. He gets the idea that you're not doing a thing. Which I consider quite remarkable in view of the fact that, of course, you're in there industriously! You know, you're right in there pulling those withholds. You're right in there looking down his throat. You know exactly what's in the bank. You know exactly what the E-Meter's saying, and you know where these questions are going, and you know what you're trying to do with the pc.

Of course, out of such a session, he gets that idea, doesn't he? Never. He says, "Well," he says, "the mice could accumulate in the belfry, and the cobwebs stretch across the door, and not a breath of air would ever stir the dust in this Stygian gloom."

He doesn't even restimulate his withholds.

Now, of course, you can be far too overwhumping with withholds. I'll show you how you really overwhump a pc. You say, "Well, have you ever sung in church?" No reaction on the meter at all.

And he says, "No."

You say, "Well, have you ever sung in church?" No reaction on the meter.

He says, "No. No, no. I never have. As a matter of fact, I never go to church," and so on.

"Well, have you ever sung in church?"

"Well, no, I . . ."

And do you know you can have a pc crying and sobbing in no time if you keep that up? Do you know that? You can get the pc actually sitting there shattered. You can make people stammer. You make people so they can't talk. Just with that kind of idiocy.

All right. You say . . here's another way to do it:

"Have you ever sung in church?"

Pc says, "Well, yes, I did once." You're adjusting the meter, you see.

"Have you ever sung in church?"

Pc says, "Yes, I did once."

You say, "Good, well, have you ever sung in church?"

"Um . . ."

"What is this reading here? Yeah. All right. We're ready to begin now."

Pc says, "Begin? How about this me singing in church?"

"Oh, well, that was just a test question. It didn't have too much to do with it."

You've set up a withhold situation. You have forced the pc to withhold. See, you can Q-and-A with it so you force the pc to withhold. Well, how? By not accepting any of his answers, so of course it's all unintentional withholds.

Now, I wouldn't break out laughing or something when the pc gives you a thing As a matter of fact, startled once by an auditor who looked all of a sudden . . it had all been going . . you know . . it was the change of pace that did it, you know. All had been going about "Have you ever poured water down a drain pipe? Thank you. Good. All right. Now, have you ever poured water up a drain pipe? Thank you. You know? And have you ever washed any horses? Thank you," and so forth. And "Have you ever stolen any horses?" and so on.

And I said, "Yes, as a matter of fact, I have. Stole a horse, and . . ."

The auditor said, "You did ?"

You know, there was this tremendous gleam of interest, you know. It was all going along . . knocked me about five feet out of the session. Last thing in the world I ever expected to happen though. Gradient scales are of use. So if you're going to be interested in the pc, be interested in the pc. Don't fade from complete interest to total disinterest to mild interest to vivid, enthusiastic interest to no interest and so forth. If you're auditing a pc, just audit the pc. Because they recognize these things as quite false.

But you, the auditor, have rights too. The pc suddenly comes up with one that is an incredible type of withhold that you've never heard of before. Nobody asked you to put on a death mask at this point, so it startles you. But don't just leave the pc in the dark about this and then try to put on a death mask afterwards, you see.

The pc says, "Yes. Well, as a matter of fact, I rowed a boat up a drain pipe one time." You know?

And you say, "You did? Oh, really?"

And the pc says, "Well, yes. What's so unusual about that?"

And you say, "Well, I was just startled. Did you row a boat up a drain pipe? How did you do that?"

"Well, I did this so-and-so and so-and-so and such-and-such and so-and-so and so-and-so."

And you say, "Okay. All right." And he gets the illusion that he has satisfied this startled curiosity. See, because you've got to be satisfied to the degree that you were curious. You see that those things are direct in their relationship. I mean, if you're going to say, "Nooooo!" you know . . well, at least, get your acknowledgment up to that level of enthusiasm, see.

"Well, all right. Hey, what do you know. All right. Okay. I really got that," you know? Pitch your acknowledgment up to match the other, you know.

You say, "You did? No kidding!" And then say, "All right."

Now, the funny part of it is it takes some auditor to make an auditing session. Some auditors have too much auditor there. Now, the way you have too much auditor there, however, is simply distracting the pc's attention, giving him change of pace, startling things, dropping the E-Meter, fixing the cans while you're in session. You know, if an E-Meter goes out on you, just for heaven's sakes, leave it alone. Don't even move it. Don't bother to look at it anymore, but just leave it alone. Do you realize that?

Your E-Meter all of a sudden is out and your E-Meter isn't registering anymore and by the usual movements by which you regulate an E-Meter . . usual movements by which you regulate one . . you all of a sudden see that is a very, very dirty meter. Don't even move your hand on it. Don't take the electrodes out of the pc's hands. Go on with the session as best you can. That is it. Not another quiver out of you. Do you hear me? That's very important. Much more important than it would appear to be because E-Meters do go out.

Pcs start gesticulating with electrodes. They can pull the plug out. And they can rip the connections up. They can actually break a wire. They can do something of this sort. And if you pay any attention to it . . .

Well, let's say the pc just tears up the E-Meter cans, you know. Just rips them up, rips them right out of the sockets and that sort of thing. And he's sitting there with the E-Meter cans and he all of a sudden notices the E-Meter cans are broken and he says, "What's this?" he says, and so on.

Why, just say, "Well, that's all right." And ask him the next question.

"Yeah, but what's this? The E-Meter's busted."

Just take them out of his hand and put them on the floor and go on with the session, you see.

Don't ever fix a meter. Don't fiddle in a session. Don't fiddle with ashtrays, electric fans, windows, doors, that sort of thing Leave it alone. If you're going to do something about something, end the session. Just go right on into end rudiments, end the session . . even though you do it rapidly . . and declare a break. And then go ahead and do what you please and adjust the doors and adjust the people rushing up and down the hall and adjust anything you've got to adjust, you see, and come back into session and open up a brand-new session. You'll find that the break, however, is probably more upsetting than the disturbance.

And your fiddling with the E-Meter can cause that tone arm to go up as much as two divisions. All of a sudden you see the meter isn't working, you see, and you get over here and you start cranking it, you know, and you start balancing it and you . . it's just about the worst thing you can do to a pc.

Now, how do you run . . how do you run a Sec Check? How do you run a Sec Check . . if . . with a busted meter on a very tough pc who's got lots of withholds and your meter busts and you're busy sec checking like crazy? How do you do this? Well, you don't. That's easy. And you say, "Well, do you think you have any more withholds on that?"

And he says, "Well, so on and so on and so on."

And you say, "Well, we'll look into that. Right now I'd like to run some of your Havingness and Confront. And here we go." And we run some Havingness and Confront and so forth and finish off the session. Or if there's a lot of session to go, we simply end the session, repair or get another meter and complete the Sec Check. But we don't do it in the full flight of a session. We never distract the pc's attention out of the session, see? Just don't do that. Now, you can put the pc's attention on the auditor with an auditor's interest because he realizes this is with him.

The way you knock the pc out is by irrelevancy. You can be as interesting and as interested and so forth as you please, as long as you are relevant to the session and what the pc is doing Your interest, your pressure, your this, your that, anything of the sort . . as long as it's relevant to what the pc's doing, that is fine; you can do almost anything you please. You can actually get up to a shout, you can get down to a whisper, you can be terribly active, you can be very histrionic without really upsetting the pc because it's all relevant to his case. Now, you'll see this I'm sure. What upsets the pc . . what upsets the pc . . is an irrelevancy to his case. That's all that upsets a pc.

It is not what you do. It is how relevant your actions are. Now, you start doing things which are not relevant to his case . . your watch is run down, so you sit there fixing your watch while you audit him, see, and he'll go blooey. He lights a cigarette in spite; you start to light one. Irrelevant. He'll go blooey. Your attention is patently on the E-Meter, not on him. He'll go blooey.

Something wrong with the E-Meter . . you see, it's irrelevant. It's on the E-Meter, not his case via the E-Meter. You can inspect an E-Meter all you want to, you see. "Yes, yes. Huh-huh. Yes? Oh, yeah. All right. Uh-huh. Okay. Let's see here. Now, you say so. Are you sure that that is all there is on that question? I'm looking at the meter here. Beware. Now, I'm looking at the meter when you answer that. All right. Have you ever swum up a waterspout? Ha-ha. There it is. Ha-ha-ha. Yeah, ha-ha. There it is. Ha-ha-ha-ha. All right. All right. All right. Now, you tell me about that. You tell me. It was an instant read, too. Come on, come on, come on, come on. Come on."

Never affect a pc. Never in a million years. He'd say, "Ooooooh, you know. Waterspout. I did. I did. I did swim up a waterspout and so forth. I did, oh gosh."

"Hoo? When was that? When was that? It's right here. Come on. Come on. Come on. Come on."

"Oh. If it says there . . it must be there. I wonder what it is and so forth."

"Now, come on. Don't kid me about it. Now, don't monkey with it because I want to know right now. Right now. Come on. Give me it. Now, what is that?"

I'm not giving you this as a model. I'm giving you this as rather corny auditing. It won't upset him . . do all of that.

You say, "Well, let's see. What's the meter reading here? I mean, what's the matter with the tone arm? Uh-oh, uh-oh, uh-oh." Next thing you know the tone arm is reading at 5.0. And you say, "How did it get there?" Well, it got there because your attention was on something else rather than the pc. His terminal demands attention and the only thing a pc will not forgive is not getting any attention from the auditor. And the auditor could practically dance a jig as long as it was relevant to the pc's case.

The pc said, "Well, we used to have these dances, you know. We used to go up and down the temple floor," (this would be horribly corny auditing) and the auditor can get up and say, "Like this? Or like this?" And sit down in the chair again, and the pc would be quite fascinated and say, "Well, it was actually like that. It was actually like that first one you did."

Yeah, and he'd go right on talking and telling you about it and so forth.

But the auditor has danced a jig. See? It isn't what you do in a session. It is how relevant it is to his case. As soon as you learn that, you can shed a few shackles in auditing. You can feel a little less braced, a little less plaster of Paris model auditing, you see. "If I twitch my left cheek a little bit, the plaster of Paris will crack. I mustn't permit my eyeballs to dilate more than an eighth of an inch because that's proper TR 0."

I'm sure you could do all that like an Indian. Some of the schools in India practicing hypnosis can stop or start blood from flowing from a cut vein. You know, I heard about that in America one time and I was absolutely fascinated. Absolutely fascinated. In Chicago, they rounded up every doctor in Chicago who even . . was inspecting an Indian who could make blood start and stop flowing from his veins. It's marvelous. He could make the blood do this.

But what was fascinating is that America didn't know it could be done. I didn't ever know it couldn't be done. You see, you can get several sides to every opinion. See, I was real startled because I didn't know it couldn't be done.

Now, you're similarly going to get startled someday at the fact that you ever had any trouble with auditing. You know? "What? You know, I had some . . I was nervous about it or I was upset about it or I was diffident about it or I'd held myself in a brace about it and so on. It's rather nonsensical." And you feel quite natural while you're auditing.

Drink a cup of coffee; audit. I mean, no more effort either way, because you gradually learned what you can get away with and what you can't get away with and you feel perfectly comfortable because that's it. And you say to the pc, "What you think?" As long as it's relevant to his case and isn't a challenge to him. You know, an invalidation.

It's pretty rough on a pc when an auditor starts in on him on the basis, "Well, you've been a creep all of your life. How can you expect to level with me now?"

That sounds awful rough, you know. "Have you ever done one decent action in your whole life? Now, tell me. Have you? Have you? Have you ever? Just one. Tell me one, one, one decent action you've done in your whole life. So you see, you can't. All right. Now, let's get the withholds off." That'd be awful rough on a pc, wouldn't it?

Well, get your order of magnitude. Do you know that it's ten times as rough on the pc for you to get rattled about your E-Meter and start fiddling with your meter as for you to do that? Get your perspectives in. Why? Because any crack you make at the pc, believe it, is attention. That is attention for the pc. You're interested in him.

And do you know that some pcs won't believe you and . . well, Susan Hayward, for instance, hated me like poison for a long while, years, until one night I was in a particularly vicious mood. And she brought up some picture. Her husband was sitting there and her husband looked at me. And he'd warned me never to flatter this girl about her acting or anything. She was very upset about it. And I was feeling in a very vicious mood and said it stunk. The last one I'd seen . . you know, almost that bluntly, you know. It stunk.

And she said, "What did you think was wrong with it particularly?"

And I said, "You were false."

You know, she was my friend forever afterwards? She knew I was sincere. She knew I was sincere. That was her whole measure of whether or not somebody was her friend. An enemy is somebody who flatters you. A friend is somebody who criticizes the living daylight out of you.

We've had people around occasionally . . one or two guys around . . and all I would do would just give them a studied insult. I'd never say hello to them. I would say, "Well, I see somebody has left a door open again." And they'd get this immediate sensation: "He understands me."

This sounds mad, doesn't it? But these are acceptance level. Remember the old acceptance level? And a person who's in grief will accept a sad remark. And a person who is in degradation will accept the degrading remark. The only reality is the reality of the Tone Scale on which they're sitting.

Well, nobody asked you to compromise your reality. I'm just calling to your attention that it isn't so much what the auditor does, it is whether or not the auditor is being effective with his attention relevant to the pc. Is he being effective with his attention relevant to the pc's case? And that is all a pc ever demands of an auditor . . that he's effective and that his attention is relevant to the pc's case. And that's what, basically, an auditor violates when he gets in trouble with the pc.

He's sitting there woodenly. He's asking questions disinterestedly. His attention is on something else. The pc is aware of the fact that the auditor has an appointment at three o'clock. And that it's getting toward three o'clock. And that the auditor has a present time problem. And the auditor keeps glancing toward the door and looking at his watch.

Oh, man, if you want to form some ARC breaks, the whole pattern of ARC breaks is actually totally on the basis of the pc ceases to believe that the auditor's attention is relevant to his case. And that is the whole background of ARC breaks. There is no other background.

Now, we're up there. If you remember the Philadelphia lectures, the highest level is conviction. All right. Well, right up there, that is above agreement. That is above communication and mechanics, and so forth. That is a belief. The pc must stay convinced that the auditor is interested in auditing him and interested in auditing his case, and auditing his case. Not necessarily Interested . . at that point of the Prehav Scale . . but just auditing him effectively. And the auditor's attention is on the pc. And as soon as that has been achieved by the auditor, he gets no more trouble with rudiments. But it's something to achieve. And it is not anything very arduous to accomplish. I assure you it's not arduous to accomplish. It's very easy to accomplish. The first requisite is if you know enough about the mind and if you yourself have enough reality on its mechanics, then you are never debarred by the mystery of it all.

The pc doesn't look to you like a big mystery. He only looks to you like something that can be resolved. You want to know the ramifications of the thing so that you can do something about it.

But if you yourself know the basics of how his mind operates, you aren't backed off to a point where it's all just a total mystery and you go into a disinterest. If you know the actual mechanics of how he operates, you know that he has engrams, you know he's got a time track and you know he's got circuits and he's got valences and you know these various mechanics, you know how he responds to these, you know the overt act-motivator phenomena, you know about goals terminals, you know about these various things; you can look at somebody, they're doing something, well, you can understand what they're doing. It must have something to do with some of these. Well, this brings you immediately close enough to an understanding of the pc to form an ARC with the pc. It's an ARC that's formed. But it's formed by your understanding of the generalities of his difficulty. He has a generality of difficulty.

Now, your attention and interest is on the particularity of his difficulty. The specific parts that refer to him out of your knowledge of the general picture the pc presents. If you were comfortable and . . . If you can go down the street and you see somebody limping along and you know he's limping along and he's having an awful time there, and he seems to have a great big bandage on his right foot, you know; an uninformed person looks at him and says, "Somebody has injured his foot." You look at him . . . and don't tell me you don't because I know that you do . . . you look at him and you know that he's kicked somebody or he's stamped on somebody's toes at some time or another, you see.

You know the basic mechanic . . . the overt-motivator sequence . . . and he couldn't possibly have a bunged up foot unless he was a specialist in bunging up feet. See? Therefore, you aren't invited into a supersaccharine sympathy about it at all, but if the fellow were to say to you, "You know, I got an awfully bad foot," you would be very happy to do something about his foot, you know. Even if it was just, "Look at my fingers," you know, and throw some somatics around for him. Why go through the histrionics of, "All right. How did you hurt your foot?"

"Well, foot was run over by an automobile wheel, and it's been very bad, and so forth."

You say, "All right. Stand there and kick an automobile wheel. Thank you. Kick an automobile wheel. Thank you. Kick an automobile wheel. Thank you."

You got some twenty-five percent chance of just knocking it out. Just like that, see? Twenty-five percent. You know, it's a small percentage, but you'll get your percentage. That's for sure.

Give him a Touch Assist. Do this and that. You can do lots of things about this foot. All right. If you can do things about the foot, then you aren't in awe of this foot and you also can be interested in the foot without getting totally interiorized into the horrible mysteries of the foot and how horrible it was that he got this terribly bad foot. And how could he possibly have gotten this foot? Isn't it terrible of the police department to drive the police van right straight across this man's foot. And we ought to change the government, shouldn't we. See, you're not off to the races here; you know exactly what's wrong with the man's foot.

You say, "What's it feel like?"

And he says, "Well, it just . . . it feels like it's in a boot, you know. It just feels like it's in a great big boot, and it's not, you know, but it feels like it's in a great big lead boot." Well, that communicates to a Scientologist. It doesn't communicate to him. You're in the favored position of knowing far more about it than he does.

Now, knowing that, actually, that alone . . . just without your saying anything or doing anything . . . that you know about that reflects immediately. It forms a superiority on your part where he is concerned.

You don't have to do anything from that point there on. Somebody who understands life can talk about life, and other people know that he understands life even though they don't know what he's saying, which is a great oddity. Very possibly, some of you at one time or another have been overheard in a discussion with somebody or other and had somebody sort of looking at you kind of. . .

Well, they don't really know what you're saying, and they don't really understand you maybe, but they certainly know that you know what you're talking about.

I had a fellow on an airplane one time, some big company executive, and somebody was chattering to me, some four-striper in the navy. And I was giving him very banal replies. I was not trying to impress him even vaguely. And this fellow sitting across from us, he all of a sudden . . . it was in the bar . . . and he was getting very interested and so on. The guy next to him started to get very interested and they said something to each other. And there were three or four people there, four or five people there on the other side. And they'd get talking to him and they'd look over. They were listening to this conversation. They were absolutely fascinated. We weren't talking about anything that had anything to do with the price of fish as far as I was concerned. But this four-striper had problems and all I was doing was giving some offhand advice. You know, hardly anything to bother with. I was trying to explain to him a few little minor things, you know.

And these guys were looking at this, you know. They didn't understand what that was all about, but they knew somebody knew something about a life over there. And finally, one of them, as he left, "Say," he says, "who are you?"

And I laughed at him and went on back to my seat. Left him in a total mystery.

But this sort of thing communicates to the pc. Because you're outside the pc's bank and are not being influenced directly by the pc's aberrations, he of course recognizes . . . even though you're equally trained . . . he recognizes that you could know more about what he's doing than he does. See, he recognizes this instinctively. It's true, you see.

Now, when you . . . equally trained or better trained or worse trained or anything else . . . are there and you are not looking and you are not interested in doing something about it in a session, that itself is an ARC break. Just like that, see. He's been cut. He realizes that you with your skill could get right on down there to the bottom of the pile and pull that bottom over and there'd be a clinkety-clank of breaking glass all over the place. And you don't do it.

Well, actually it wouldn't matter how you did it as long as you did it. And it's quite interesting. As long as you did it . . . that's the only thing which he doesn't forgive is not doing it. That he won't forgive. People do not forgive no auditing. People do not forgive being ineffective. They just don't forgive these things.

The best answer for it is to audit the pc yourself and always to some slight degree be effective. Now, you've got enough tools and weapons now to be effective to the end of your days. I mean, you never catch up with the human race with how much you know now. I mean, the human race would never catch up with you. I mean, God 'elp us. There's two billion five hundred million pcs out there right this minute.

There are wise men all over India. There are hakims and sad apples and Sufis and bug-jumps and jujus and AMA doctors, and bums and tramps amongst the witchcraft and so on, medicine men amongst the Indians, all this sort of thing. And not one of these experts knows as much as you do about mind or about life. Not one of them. You give them cards and spades and still whip them every time. Medical doctor says, "Well, there's something wrong. Every time this fellow . . . every time we examine him, he sits there and he starts to tremble and so forth. And he starts to tremble every time they examine him. And I wonder what this is. Is this a locomotor nerves in the pocomocus and so forth? And shouldn't we operate and snap a couple of tendons or something here in order to keep him from going this way, and so on." You listen to some of the wildest balderdash.

Well, he's being the expert. It's quite remarkable. You are diffident about it because you're so schooled to believe that he's the expert, so schooled to believe that the man is interfering.

If you'd have walked over to him, slightly in his lingo and said, "The man's suffering from a psychic trauma. He probably has some reaction to an examination. Ask him if he's ever been an examiner."

And the medico says, "What?"

Oh, but he says “What” very interestedly. You must have said something there. He’s liable to be kind of nervous about you, too. You know? But a different . . . entirely different . . . atmosphere than what you would expect would arise from the situation, because he knows he is talking to somebody who knows. And that can’t be missed. It isn’t how you hold your pinky. It isn’t how you balance the saucer on the end of your nose. It’s just whether or not you know.

And your confidence and skill, of course, is in direct ratio to your certainty of knowledge. You know these things are true. You know they are true, and that’s it. You’ve had it. You sit down in an auditing chair. You look at the pc. He feels this.

And the only other thing the pc demands is attention on his case, not on something else. You start telling that pc sitting in the auditing chair about your case, you’re going to form one of the wildest ARC breaks you ever heard of. Try it sometime. Pc sits there in an auditing session and you say, “Well, that reminds me of an auditing session I had once.” And you talk about a totally dissimilar action to anything you’re undertaking, see . . . and anything . . . has nothing to do with his case whatsoever. And carry on for about twenty or thirty minutes in that wise.

Man, if you can get the rudiments back in, in end of session, I’ll tell you I’ll give you a medal. It’s . . . it’s marvelous. And yet you actually have been very polite. You’ve been very kind. You’re trying to reassure the pc. Anything you could put it down to, you see. It still wouldn’t make any difference because it violates this little rule.

You’ve got to be effective, and your attention has got to be on the pc’s case. That’s all he demands. He’ll even forgive tremendous numbers of things if you do those things. He’ll forgive things all over the place. He’ll forgive dropping the ashtray and everything else. He’ll forgive running the wrong process 895 hours even, if you all of a sudden start running the right one on him.

Aw, you haven’t seen anybody particularly ARC broke about suddenly bringing up modifiers. I don’t think anybody’s been cursing about it. I felt a tiny bit chagrined about it that it’s taken me some months to find out that there were tails and middles and beginnings on some of these goals, you see, that was holding them up. I know right now why Clears go unclear so suddenly. Just a modifier clicks, just like that. They’re all cleared up, but there’s that little tag end of disappeared modifier and it has enough charge on it to make the case charge up again.

Well, how do you patch up a Clear who has been Clear and then who has this charge. All you’ve got to do is go back and clip out the modifier that has been hung up there. This has been quite a mystery because a certain percentage of Clears lapse.

One down in Durban the other day, perfectly Clear, checked out Clear, everything was beautiful, and 90 forth. Went outside and BOW! You see, the bank falls in. She reads stiff on the meter. The meter up to 5.0. You know, all just blwaaaaah! Everybody down in Durban being terribly reasonable about it, see.

They’re saying, “Well, all right. Let’s see, the . . . the pc couldn’t confront the environment, cleared on the first dynamic, ability to postulate, caved themselves in and so forth. And maybe after this, why, the pc was feeling bad about being a Clear and was self-conscious about it and so on. And that caused the environment to do so.” See, all the figure-figure going on, see. Some auditor has just been handed a lose. Fortunately, why, the Marines were landing right at that moment. Halfway between here and South Africa at that moment was 7 November 61 bulletin. See, all they got to do is get hold of this girl and say, “All right now. Let’s see. First goal you were audited on was to sew socks. Fine. Let’s find the rest of it. To sew socks and

What’s the rest of it? Go ahead and complete the sentence. Go ahead. To sew socks and . . . Good. Complete the sentence now.”

“And fill them full of holes. Oho. Yeah.”

You know, your needle goes bang, you know.

Now, you say, "What was the goal to sew socks?"

Bang! Big surge.

"All right. Full of holes." Tick.

"All right. To sew socks." Tick.

"All right. Full of holes." Gone. Gone. Gone. And just take each goal they've had right on up the line, bring those tails and middles off of the thing and so forth and they'd settle out straight. Interesting, huh? Might take a little more patch-up work or something like that because it was such a shock to them to go Clear and then un-Clear so fast with the missing link. We've really found the missing link now, haven't we? Yeah.

Anyway, I don't know. Maybe somebody around here said, "Gee whiz. Well, I audited on the wrong goal all of these hours."

No, you didn't. You were on the same goals chain and so forth. But I'm much more interested in your case than I am my face. And you know that. So you've taken much worse than that from me. But people get upset about my building fireplaces and buying ships. Why? You see? It adds up.

Makes a little ARC break. They don't know that I do that on my time. They don't think I have any time. And it's true. I don't. All I have to do is tell them, however, all the time I'm fixing up ships, I'm thinking about cases.

And only if that were true, however, only if it were true, would that wipe even that away, you see. You see why this is?

All right. A pc can form a considerable amount of ARC with an auditor. And the ARC, according to some schools of thought, even in Scientology, is only formed by sweetness, kindness and nice, humoresque on the Stradivarius. You can make a pc hate you with that. You're always sweet and kind and understanding and never effective. The pc is going out of control. The pc knows he's going out of control. And you're sweet and kind. I never had a pc in-session so much . . . or actually ever had any ARC with one pc so much . . . as I did after I had practically picked her up by the nape of the neck and carried her across the room and set her down in a chair with a terrible thud. With a real thud.

I said, "Let's not have anymore of that right now. Now, pick up the cans." You know, the pc tried to blow. The pc was not ARC broke. This all registered on the basis of: "Hey, you know, he really means to audit me. He really means what he is doing He's not kidding What do you know! Hey! What do you know!"

Now, the reason student auditing is often slow is because everybody is studying auditing at the same time they're doing auditing So all of the auditors could come into the category of "just auditing me in order to learn and practice." So that would modify the definition "effective and interested in my case," see. They could be effective and not interested in the case and have a hard time keeping rudiments in. You see how that would modify it?

"Well, whatever we've been learning lately has nothing to do with it. What do you think has happened here that you have a tone arm up at 6.0? Well, just what do you think happened? Well, how come your tone arm went up to 6.0. It's been stuck here for about two weeks."

He says, "Well, I don't know. I don't know. Taken off the process suddenly, and . . . and I guess . . . or something . . . I don't know. Really. It's true though. I felt different for the last two weeks."

"Now, how have you felt different? And what have you been doing now that's different?"

"Well, I've just felt different and so forth."

“All right. Well, anything went on two weeks ago that you were in violent disagreement with in some kind or another? Were you in a fight with somebody around or something happening and so forth?”

Well, we all of a sudden find a postulate that they're going to keep the rudiments in now, and they're not going to let the rudiments go out so that they can be properly assessed and so they can go Clear and get out of here. And nothing is going to affect them in any way whatsoever.

Ah, but they give this up to somebody, you see. They give this up to an auditor who is asking about them. Asking about them individually. Not as an example to something else. You know, the fellow wants to know, and he asks them.

I am actually maybe opening the doors on the hordes of hell because an auditor can use this as an excuse just to do anything in a session. You can practically do anything in a session as long as you're effective and interested in the pc's case and your attention is on his case and what you do is relevant to the solution of his case.

Now, that tells you that if you really want to chop up a pc and get the pc overwhelmed, is use an auditing session to secure an advantage over the pc. Ah, that's not being effective, is it? And it's not really being interested in the pc's case but interested in using the pc's case. And even though the pc'll go into a kind of a thralldom thereafter, and so forth, man, they're really never quite on your side. You have a hell of a time with them.

So some auditor carelessly goes and sleeps with his pc. “Aw,” he says, “well, this will make good ARC.” Great day in the morning It'll make good ARC all right. Why didn't he cut his throat. I mean, as far as the auditing session is, it's finished. He's not going to get any auditing done. Not after that. It's quite interesting, isn't it? Because it violates this idea. He's not interested in the pc's case. He's interested in the pc's body. Well, that's not being much interested in the pc.

Women can actually figure it out so that if you're interested in their body, why, you're interested in them. They actually will put this together and make a mishmash out of it. But it won't work with them in an auditing session. You can always tell a girl going along, “You look very pretty today.”

That's fine, she may accept this, she may not. But she thinks of that as complimentary. And of course it is. But in an auditing session, if you sat there and described to them what a pretty body they had and how nice they were to look at, and how well dressed they were, they'd go some little distance with this. Then all of a sudden, it'd suddenly go bzzzzzt. And you couldn't quite figure out why it went zzzzzt. Of course, a body isn't a case.

You're an auditor. Therefore, what you're doing isn't effective. All things just boil down to that. Every skill that you have in an auditing routine . . . Sec Checking, your elements of Model Session, Problems Intensive, it doesn't matter which or what of these you're practicing, has of course a certain form. This form rather guarantees interest in the person's case. It rather guarantees that. Don't let it ride on automatic because now it sort of compounds the felony.

The ritual is interested in the pc's case, but the auditor isn't. And I think you've seen that, haven't you. The ritual is interested in the pc's case. Well, then, the auditor looks kind of funny, you know.

The auditor asking if it's really all right if he does so-and-so, and the auditor doesn't care whether it's all right if he does so-and-so. And it makes a kind of a lie. And the pc gets weird unreality about the whole thing. No, what you have to do is be interested in the pc's case and determine to do something effective about it. And then, through the media of the ritual and E-Meter, you give him the auditing commands. That's all.

That's . . . those things serve . . . they are secondary. They're a very vital secondary. You shouldn't come off of them and so forth. But unless they're backed up, they're as empty as sounding brass in the tinkle of the temple bell. They are nothing.

And in Sec Checking, if you don't get to the pc as an auditor, if the auditor does not become visible or real to the pc, no withholds knock. How do you like that? A little voice in the far distance is saying, "Well, have you ever swum up a waterspout?" Doesn't mean anything to the pc. Nobody there. "Have you ever swum up a waterspout?" the little voice says in the far distance. Hasn't anything to do with him. It's not restimulative.

All right. But the auditor is real to him. He knows the auditor is there. He has an idea that there is somebody auditing him and that this person is going to be effective and is interested in his case. Now, it doesn't much matter what the fellow does . . . what the auditor does at that juncture . . . as long as it satisfies those points.

He can say, "Have you ever swum up a waterspout?" And he can get some knock on the E-Meter. But if he's got good presence, he says, "Have you ever swum up a waterspout?" And the . . . you get a pretty good fall on the meter. You don't get a fall on the meter in direct ratio to the volume of your voice. You get a fall on the meter in direct ratio to your reality to the pc.

So I look at a pc sometimes and I ask him very softly and quietly and so forth, if they have ever swum up a waterspout or sung in church or some other crime. And the needle falls off the pin. I turn it over to somebody; they don't even get a knock. And this is true of assessment. I assess somebody, the needle falls off the pin. Turn it over to somebody to check out. It's gone. It's nulled. But that's because nobody is asking him. It's no more mystery than that.

Now, your presence is as poor in the pc's opinion as you have to keep the rudiments in. An auditor has a direct self-criticism mechanism. Your presence is as poor . . . not as much as the pc objects to you. That's all balderdash.

The auditor is as real and has as much presence to the pc as the rudiments stay in and has as little presence as the rudiments go out. Because you're using terribly powerful forms. Terribly powerful commands. Very challenging questions, all said from a nobody there. See, there's nobody saying these things. There is no presence delivering these things. And these tremendously overwhelming forms are being thrown at the pc from a nowhere. He hears the words, you know, but there's no music. It's the auditor that's the music that goes along with it. He hears it, but it doesn't mean anything to him. Actually, it can be disturbing to him.

He has just gotten through robbing a whole peach orchard. He knows it was a crime. He not only robbed the orchard, but as he went through the thing he broke off all branches. And then he didn't want the peaches for anything; he fed them to the pigs and the whole herd of pigs died. You know, I mean, this is quite an overt, as we stack it up. And it's all very complicated and intricate of some kind or another. And from a nowhere, he hears, "Have you ever robbed a peach orchard?" See? "Have you ever robbed a peach orchard? Have you ever robbed . . . ?" It's hard to get that disinterested, you see. "Have you ever robbed a peach orchard?"

Yes, he's robbed a peach orchard and he's scared about it, too. Nothing matches here. There's nobody really interested and you don't get much of a knock on the needle. It doesn't restimulate it at all.

But when you, a living being, a living presence, look at him right in the thetan and you say to him, "Have you ever robbed a peach orchard?" Oh, oh, somebody is knocking on the door. He has a suspicion that he should answer that one. He just better answer it. He just better answer it. And your Sec Checking, goals finding, levels finding, speed of delivery, all become very easy on these bases.

Problems Intensive . . . you say, "Well, have there been any self-determined changes in your life? All right. That's fine. All right. List the self-determined changes in 1956 and so on, so on, so on. All right. Now, we're going to assess these changes. All right. 1952 change, well, bought a new hat, in 1952 you bought a new hat. And 55 you bought a new hat and 61 you bought a new hat and so forth. And you're going to buy a new hat. And that's the changes in your life."

And you come around and you say, "You know, there's no changes in this person's life?" No? You got the volume of change to the direct volume of auditor. They're "matchly" tuned. The quality of your auditing was buying a new hat, see. Get the idea? You mean, your presence was so faint on the line.

All right. Now, you're interested in it. You're being effective. You're right in there pitching. You want to know about this thing and you say to the pc, "All right. What self-determined changes have you had in your life?"

And the pc says, "Well, what do you mean as self-determined change?"

"You know. You make up your mind to change. Now, how many times has that happened to you in your life, do you suppose?"

"Well, quite a few."

"All right. Now, tell me one of them. A self-determined change in your life. Self-determined. That you decided to change. Now, tell me one. All right. Tell me one now. All right."

"Oh, and it's . . . yeah, yeah. Well, there's so-and-so, and I decided I couldn't stand my mother-in-law anymore and shot her. Yes. That's a change. And other changes, and I decided this, and I decided to bathe only in borscht. Yes, I've always been mystified about that one."

And you get a wild list. And you get it rapidly. Now, of course, the bank, the pc's bank, is quite responsive to your auditing and is responsive to your presence. And you can handle it, of course, to the degree that you are handling it. You're real to the pc, you can handle his bank. It's odd that you can handle his bank better than he can. And this is what he means by being effective.

So when you never order his bank around, you're sunk. He doesn't think you're auditing him. Nothing happens. You sit there, irresponsible about the whole thing, bang! Nothing happens.

But you say to him, "All right. Now, are there any more self-determined changes in your life?" You're looking at the E-Meter. It doesn't knock. "All right. That's fine. That's the end of the list." It's that easy.

All right. "Are there any more self-determined changes in your life?" is asked.

"Well, are there any more self-determined changes in your life?" It doesn't fall. Couldn't be any more.

And with just a little more presence, just a little more interest, "Are there any more?" And it restimulates and you've got another one. You get the idea?

The more presence you have, the more you get out of the pc. It's quite interesting as a mechanism.

Now, your deadpan auditing asking a pc . . . or accepting withholds that don't fall, by the way, is one of the wildest things you can ever do. The pc tells you the withhold. And you see this, and nothing happened. Nothing happened to the needle. Nothing happened to the tone arm. This must be about the flattest question there is. You ask him again. Ask him the question again just for form sake to get off the question. "Have you ever swum up a waterspout?" No. It's null. Off of it. On to the next one.

But you sit there and use auditing form to demand answers to your auditing questions and you'll get all sorts of created universes. Now, the trick is be effective, you see. Only ask for withholds when you see that they are there. Only start pressing when they're obviously there. Only start getting frantic and histrionic when you just can't get them off and it's quite obvious that the pc is sitting there with a clenched jaw with his hands locked behind him, won't touch the E-Meter cans and says, "Don't you dare ask me that question again."

Well, what would you do at that point? Well, whatever you do, do it effectively. If that's your signal for throwing your auditor's pad down on the floor and say, "God damn! I've had just about enough. Are you going to answer it or aren't you?"

If that's what you think you should do at that point and that's the only way you can possibly conceive that you would get an answer to it, why, by all means do it. Because you've come to that impasse situation, don't you see?

Or if it's down to this basis, "Oh, come on, George, come on, come on, George. You can answer it. Come on. Come on. You can tell me. You can tell me. Come on. Come on. It's all right. It's okay. You can tell me."

“I don’t know if I can tell you or not.”

“Aw, come on. Come on. It’s all right. Just tell me, and we’ll get onto the next question. Huh? Just tell me and we’ll get right on to the next question.”

“Well, all right. But something tells me I shouldn’t.” He gives you the withhold. Clean it up the rest of the way, he’s back in-session again. But the way to get a pc in-session is to audit him. And that sounds like one of these horrible truisms. There is no way of talking a pc into session. There is no way of wheedling him into session. There is no way of pleading him into session. The way to put a pc into session is audit him. Audit him. Be effective. Put your attention on what he’s doing, what he’s thinking about and so forth.

You know, a pc would even forgive something as corny as this: “Now, just sit there and shut up for a minute and let me think. Let me think. You presented me here with a rough one and I’m not quite sure which way I’m going on the thing. So just be quiet for a moment and let me figure this out. Shut up now. Hm. Well, Jesus, you got a rough case. All right. This is what I’m gonna do. see.” And lay something down. I mean, that’s awful corny. But a pc would accept it because you were trying to do something about this situation. Pc would sit there for an hour waiting . . you figure out something about his case. It’s actually true.

But beware of mechanical distractions of all kinds. And it's by definition. What is a distraction? Well, a distraction is something that is not relevant to the pc's case and is ineffective. And that serves as a distraction. If you want to knock a pc into a cocked hat in a minor sort of a way, all you have to do is find a very effective process on him, ask him about three questions of that effective process and then change the process.

You're obviously being ineffective. Because he knows the process is effective. He can feel this thing bite. He can feel the fangs go straight in, see. And you've asked him three questions, and you say, "Well, what is not known about a ruddy rod?" And the meter goes bong! and the tone arm swings.

And, “Ooooooh, I don’t know if I could ask that. I don’t know if I could answer that. I wouldn’t ever ask anybody that. What is unknown about a ruddy - . Oh, boy! Ooooh. Ooooo. Uh-uhuhuhuhuhuhuh mmmmmmmmmmmmmmmmm. Got a somatic.”

“All right. All right. Okay. I’ll repeat the auditing question. Now, what is unknown about a ruddy rod?”

“Well, it’s a uhhhhh. Uhhh, its length.” See?

“All right. What is unknown about a ruddy rod?”

“Mmm. Mmuuuuuh-krooooow!”

And you ask three questions with that response, and then you say, “Well, I think we’d better get on to auditing your terminal now.”

See, it violates that part of the definition of what is auditing in being totally ineffective. This thing is biting like crazy, you see. He's getting action, action, action. And all of a sudden, here you go.

Now, unless you could demonstrate to him that the next process was about three times as effective as the one he was just running, you're sunk. You know, pcs will sit around and mourn about having been audited in 1954 by something or other, and they were run on a process of "Jump over the moon. Thank you. Jump over the moon. Thank you. Jump over the moon." And they really knew that one. It was never flattened, and it really bit. And nobody has ever flattened the process.

And it'll come up session after session after session. You ask for ARC breaks. "When was the first time you had an ARC break?" And they go back to this unflattened process. It isn't the process was unflat. It was that the auditor was being ineffective.

The auditor shifted off an effective process to an ineffective process, and the pc practically never forgives it.

Now, if you think of auditing as an activity concerned with deportment, well, you'd have something vaguely true. It's vaguely true. Yes, it has something to do with deportment. Ladies shouldn't put their heels on mantles while they're being auditors in the auditing chair. There's various things you shouldn't do. You should wash your teeth before you process a pc. At least, wash your teeth once in a while and so forth. And if you don't change your socks often, why, don't take off your shoes and put them in the pc's lap.

There's various little courtesies of this character that one should follow. But you notice that they're all irrelevancies to the pc's case and your being effective. That's what makes them irrelevancies, and that's what makes them bad. It's not codes of deportment that makes them bad. It's whether or not they're relevant to the pc's case.

Now, you lay it down to the pc that you're going to audit the pc, he expects some auditing. The pc can be absolutely screaming in a session, just practically screaming, and wind up at the end without hardly any ARC break at all, as long as the auditor was totally effective all the way through the thing. And as long as it just wasn't ARC breaks and irrelevancy that were causing the screams, you know.

Pc says, "Uuuuuuh. These bullets are going by and . . oh, wait a minute, wait a minute. You shouldn't be running this process at all. You shouldn't be running this process because you've got bullets going by! Bullets! They're real live bullets in this thing!"

And you say, "Good. Fine. All right. Let's have another basketful of them."

He can think of you as being the most cruel, heartless person he ever heard of and say so, but if you want an ARC break, turn kind at that moment. Become ineffective at that moment and you have a honey. That ARC break will be catastrophic and it'll be hard to find too because it's obvious that you did the right thing. You didn't. You became ineffective.

The way out is the way through. The pc was walking in the shadow of death and you, by golly, didn't keep shoving him along. And you said, "Okay. There you are. We will all gather round, brethren, and will sing this hymn." It had nothing whatsoever to do with his case, you see. Buuuuuuh!

So you're damned if you continue and you might try to figure your way out of it this way: "Let's see, I'm damned if I go on and so forth. And he'll just get worse and worse and so forth. Maybe I ought to stop because it's too painful." Well, of course, that's just totally ineffective. The only way out is the way through.

No, regardless of how rough it gets, you've got to ride it on through to the other end. There's where your judgment comes in. Run a process that is the proper process that is the right process and runs the pc through as smoothly as possible and you don't get to these points of judgment where you say, "Well, ooooooooo, is it better to kill him or cure him at this point?" You really don't come across those things if you're auditing straight and your processes are all right and you're auditing goals terminals and Problems Intensive and doing what you should. It's easy.

Now, in your auditing, then, the one sin which I adjure is not auditing It all boils down to that. That's the only sin that you can pull.

Now, if a pc is demanding that you audit the pc, you can say no unless you start, see. You can say, "No, no, I'm not going to audit you. I don't want to give you any more auditing I'm . . very full schedule, and I can't do anything about it." Well, you'll get some ARC break. That's right. You'll get a mess, a bit. But if you start auditing him and stop, then that becomes absolutely fantastic because you've got the pc in-session and what you're doing now is irrelevant to his case. So you're sunk.

No, deportment begins and ends on the one question of: is there auditing taking place. If auditing is taking place, gains are being made and so forth, then the deportment must, by definition, be perfect.

Thank you.