GROSS AUDITING ERRORS

A lecture given on
19 April 1962

Well, how are you tonight?

Audience: Fine.

Well, you're progressing anyway. Some of the people who were sitting at the back are now sitting at the front. Must be some progress indicated here.

Well, we have a couple of interesting things to go into tonight on these two lectures. And the first and foremost of them concerns rudiments and the demonstration which you saw last night.

And this is what? This is the 19th—19th of April, AD 12, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. You can always tell it's a Briefing Course lecture because somebody's knocking at that door over there.

Now, you saw a demonstration last night and most of you understood what it was, although one of you thought it was a demonstration of CCHs. But it wasn't. That was a demonstration of checkouts.

Now, first and foremost you should recognize that one of those demonstrations was not a good pattern. That was the one I did on Wing. And that was not a good pattern because it tended to invalidate his items even though it instructed the auditor to get the invalidations off of his items, you understand? Going over his items at that stage, when he's just now beginning to win—where are you Wing?

Male voice: I'm right in back here.

Yeah. Ah-ha, you retreated. Going over his items at that particular stage was not an optimum action, you see, because the difficulty really did not lie with the items. But there were a couple of false items on the list. But it won't upset a pc all that much. you see? Couple of them weren't proper, because he's still in the state of getting items to join up with items, you see? And there's still a lot of things between, you know, and around, and he hasn't quite got the Goals Problem Mass item versus the Goals Problem Mass item that causes a fizzle down and a blow, you see? You see, when you get the two adjacent items, one against the other, it all tends to deintensify like mad, you know. It takes tremendous—thing to hang up. He's still getting items which are distant from items. You got the idea?

Now frankly, the recommendation I would have made to the auditor— and this is the one thing you didn't see last night—you see, you didn't see the recommendations I would have made to the auditor, nor the inspection of the sessions. Now, those are quite important. The inspection of the session would have followed each one of those. And I could have gone in and asked the pc more of what was going on in the session. And the way'I would have done that is after I'd found what rudiments were out, I would have made a searching inquiry, perhaps, into it. And possibly the whole thing could have been located that way. I would not prefer to do that however. On auditing supervision, I would prefer to observe then, the session itself.

Now, I probably wouldn't do it the first time I found all the rudiments out, you see. Following that inspection of the pc and the discovery that the rudiments were out, I would have tipped the auditor off. See, I would have told the auditor to do so-and-so and so-and-so and get the rudiments in, you know, before he went on doing something and I would have been very pleasant about it. See? Gentlemanly; pleasant—at that stage. And then I would have, however,

kept this—the GAE list—see, if I were running clinical actions, and so forth—a gross auditing error—GAE, you see? We haven't got enough mysterious terms. We have to invent a few more, you see.

And I would have taken this and I would have laid it aside. And after a couple of days I would have seen if I was getting a recurrence, see—three, four, five days. you know, was I getting a recurrence of all this. How long was this person staying on the GAE list? See, are we still getting a no tone arm action? That's all I would have adjudicated about it. See, in studying the report—the next day's reports—I would have looked for tone arm action. I possibly would have been very nice and given him two auditing sessions in which to get the tone arm acting, see? And by the next session after that, if I didn't see some tone arm action on that case, then I would have gone further than to have been polite with the auditor.

The next thing I would have done would have been stuck my nose in that session. Because I don't care how covertly you stick your nose in a session, whether it's by a microphone situated in the room in a listening post or simply walking in and letting—while the session goes on, you see. Because I would have assumed by that time that the gross auditing error was so gross that no advice I gave the auditor had anything to do with what the auditor was doing.

See, I would have assumed by that time this is terribly gross, you see, this is enormous. Any of you can get a pc with the rudiments out. Pcs' rudiments go out. you know, session ended a little bit early, they were three-quarters of the way through the list, they felt like mad. They went out of session after that and they nattered about the auditor and they ran up some overts against this and that, and they cheat-cheat on something of the sort and that made them call up their ex-wife and give her hell, don't you see? And then they decided that night they felt so bad that they'd better have a few drinks, you see? And havingness went down, don't you see? And by the time we check this pc, why we've got out-rudiments. All right, fine. Yeah, sure. But tomorrow you get the rudiments in and the pc gets to sailing again.

Now, I'm talking about when the rudiments don't go in. See, then we start to get police-doggish. Now, we don't have to bark and bite and gnaw their legs off just because one time this was slated for a possible gross auditing error, you see, because we weren't getting tone arm action. Any auditor is liable to run a session with no tone arm action. See, that's liable to happen to the best of us. But three in a row without doing anything about it, no, that's not liable to happen to the best of us. one and one-half, maybe. Two—and certainly not three. See what I mean?

Audience: Mm-hm.

Because an auditor would be a perfect stupe, he'd be a perfect knucklehead, to sit there with no waggle tone arm, and just go on and away and away it was running and feet on the window sill, you know, and having the pc light his cigarette. The thing is—the thing that must be just totally crazy, see. I mean a—because, look, look—you audit the pc in front of you, you don't audit a textbook pc, you don't audit a pc I mocked up for you—you don't audit any pc except the one who is sitting right in that chair.

And you have an oddity today—a great oddity. This has probably never happened before on the history of Earth, where the textbook solution had anything to do with reality. See, I mean, in all training—you will find all training has the common denominator of the textbook solution is never met. I remember training generals in Egypt. It was difficult. You say, "When fighting Numidians, you inevitably and invariably make very certain that your flanks are secure, because the Numidian—because of horses and that sort of thing—can very easily collapse your flanks. So one of the first things you do in fighting Numidians is make sure that both flanks are very secure. And the best way to do this is to put one flank against the seacoast. You see? And the other flank against a wadi. you see, that's the best way to do that." No general you ever taught ever fought any Numidians on the seacoast. You see, you run into these small difficulties in training.

That's typical of Earth. They're always telling you in navigational schools that what you do is go out on the bridge and you take a shot of the star, and then you take a shot at another star. And then you come back in and you put down accurately the times and angle, and then you figure it out by some navigational system, and then you've got a position. And it's always a textbook solution. The only trouble is, they never bother to tell you that the horizon can vary at various times because of heat mirage, you know, and it can vary because sometimes you have big waves, and if a fellow isn't terribly experienced in all this, he can get as much as a thirty-minute, fifty-minute error. Oh, just like that. And that, you see, is thirty to fifty miles. And that's on a good day. And on other days, when—that aren't so good he can get an error up to three and four degrees, and every degree is sixty miles. This is something on the order of finding yourself in the middle of the Sahara when you're going through the Straits of Gibraltar, you know?

Textbook solutions. They're marvelous. It disgraces all training on Earth actually, on practically every subject known to man. Because the guy on the job is always meeting conditions which are entirely different from the conditions which he has been taught to meet. Wars are full of these sort of things. All men's pursuits are full of these things. Women in all of their varied actions collide with these things.

You take a cookbook, you go into the kitchen, and it says—and somehow or another they just never—well you get this thing about a "pinch." I saw some textbooks on cooking once and you had "pinches." Please tell me how much a pinch is, you know?

Now, out in the gold rush days they used to hire bartenders with big thumbs because a drink went for a pinch of gold dust, you see? And the miner would put his poke up there to buy a drink and the bartender would reach in and take a pinch, you see, of gold dust and serve a drink. So they always got a bartender there with a thumb like a spade. How much is a pinch, you know? It comes down this far. And you get all these variations of one kind or another.

Well, it happens at this particular time and state in Scientology that you are actually up against this same textbook-solution proposition. You're not up against the same solution. The textbook solutions do. It's actually when you depart from the textbook solution that you get in trouble.

Now, in view of the fact your total experience on this planet is: God help you, if you use the textbook solution. The Marines had a song of somebody—I think Toby McFlynn, or something like that, he died with a grin, because he'd used the textbook solution, you see. And he was a great man, this is very—made it—heroic death, you see? Nobody else had used the textbook solution.

Now, here's your bone of contention. You always expect to encounter something different. See? You always expect to be—have some variation in front of you, from the textbook solution, see. And you really don't expect it to work out. And because you don't, you approach all such solutions with a little bit of variation and deviation—just a little bit. And you're always looking for something else. And that's about the only mistake you can pull in auditing today. You've got to audit the pc in front of you. That is to say, when he has cognitions they're his cognitions; those are all different. When he originates physically, he originates physically in his own peculiar way. They will all originate differently. You see?

When you get a string of 3D Criss Cross items, these items all have different names, see, they—from the next pc. See, they go together differently. It takes them longer to get a gain on some particular process, you see. one fellow he really gets somatics on CCH 1; somebody else gets somatics on CCH 3.

This tends to give you the idea that you are looking at differences. Yeah, every pc's different, see. But truth told, what the auditor does is always the same and you miss that looking at the differences of the pcs. And you start varying much from the auditing which is being done right now and you will get into trouble because it's a tightrope walk. It's a tightrope walk

that's been mapped now for a great many years. We've been getting closer and closer to walking the exact tightrope. And you've got now a situation where there are textbook solutions to everything that comes up—doesn't matter what you meet. you follow through the same way.

The amount of imagination which is required is minimal, actually. The amount of ability to communicate, almost, is the only thing that regulates the difference amongst auditors. One auditor, he's heard by the pc better than another. He's got a better ability to reach or something like that and a pc will receive these variations.

But, let me make my point here, very cleanly. We're used to having to think up some unusual solution in our old-time processes. See, get bright. You know, exert some real hot judgment right about this point. And man, you're going to be wrong every time you do. you take my word for it; you apply the textbook solution and you'll come up on top every time. And this is—makes it quite different from any training that's ever been done on this planet. See what I mean?

We're going against a series of invariables and these invariables probably look much more variable to you than they are, you see? Because you see them in different guises. Auditors wear different colored suits and pcs come up with, you know, different origins and they get different items, and so forth.

Now, it used to be we'd say, well, every pc is different. That's right. Every pc will have a different set of items and he'll have different things that he reacts on. But today we're up against the fact that every auditor has actually a limited number of things to do. And you just learn—one of the first things you got to learn—is that it's those things that you do. See?

Now, I put 3D Criss Cross out to grass. I wrote it to somebody who's ordinarily a very good auditor, on class what-do-you-call-it—Class I Auditor—always been getting good results and that sort of thing. And I put 3D Criss Cross out to grass by just writing it to this person and having this person have a crack at a pc. you know, how well could this thing be done by minimal information? Well, oddly enough, this auditor did splendidly. That's quite remarkable, you know? Did splendidly. And the pc wound up very satisfied. Auditor got about six or eight items on about three lines and the pc did splendidly; wrote a very congratulatory letter concerning all of this and so forth.

However, you get a report of these sessions, you know, and it stands your hair on end. The only thing that went wrong is the auditor did practically everything but 3D Criss Cross. I don't know when they found time to do very much 3D Criss Cross. But the auditor sat there inventing processes to cope with the pc. And the pc kept getting ARC broke and bitching around about this and that and being upset about this and that. And the auditor would just sit there and in the middle of everything keep inventing processes and doing different things in order to cope with the pc. Well, of course, this is the reason the pc was ARC breaking.

This was one of the processes that was used. This is not derogatory of this auditor; I'm just showing you this auditor was perfectly willing to do this but didn't get the idea that you didn't do anything else. See, that idea was not communicated. Don't do something else too. See, it's like the pc always sitting there—hell do the process alright, but he's doing seven other things, too.

All right, and one of these processes was, "Invent a worse way of baiting an auditor." Oh, these processes were off theory of one kind or another, kind of cross-pitched one way or the other. "Invent a worse way of baiting an auditor," to run out an ARC break. And there's apparently—the thing is salted down with dozens of these processes. I may exaggerate, but there's just dozens of these processes interlarded amongst the 3D Criss Cross all in an effort to keep the pc in-session. But, of course, the auditor never realized she was driving the pc out of session.

And probably none of these goofball processes are flat. They're all sitting there amongst 3D Criss Cross, all of them gorgeously unflat and everything else.

Now, even the best of auditors will all of a sudden do the banana peel. You know? He'll say to himself, "What the hell did I say that for?" You know, "Why don't I cut my own throat?" You know. He did something or other. The best of auditors will do this. See? The commonest difficulty amongst auditors is they don't realize that when the pc has said it, it is blown. See? They take up—this is the commonest difficulty—they take up what the pc said and that is very bad.

And that is why you think you're always up against something else than a textbook solution, you see, if you're doing it.

The pc said—you say, "Well, what is this present time problem?"

And he says, "Well, my mother-in-law is coming to stay with me."

And the auditor, God help him, says, "Well, how do you feel about your mother-in-law?" See? Oooh. No, no, his question was present time problem— did the pc have a present time problem. The pc told him the present time problem. Now, the auditor's only job at that stage of the game, whatever the pc says, particularly in rudiments, whatever the pc says—it's just whether it blew then. you see? Auditors don't give pcs credit for blowing something on mentioning it. They don't know—always are underestimating the power of two-way comm. See?

"Do you have a withhold?"

The pc says, "Yes, I was out with your wife last night." Well, that's startling enough, you see, for the auditor to go over the hills and far away, but usually it isn't quite that pertinent or peculiar.

It's usually something very innocent as, "Oh, yes I have a withhold, I—uh—as a matter of fact—I'm not supposed to be drinking during this intensive and when I killed a quart of Scotch and I—last night, and I . . ."

Hm. Now, the auditor doesn't go back and ask the meter, see, "All right, good. Do you have a withhold?" See? The auditor comes in and says, "Well, what about drinking Scotch?" Now, he's wound it up so it won't blow! See, he's killed his own release. See, that's the commonest difficulty in rudiments. The auditor won't let them blow.

This is commoner than you'd think. You've got to have something whereby the pc says what it is. The auditor has to assume, until he tests it, that that has blown it. It's that simple. You get yourself in more trouble assuming anything else than I could very easily count in terms of hours of processing and so forth. See, you get yourself in endless trouble with this thing. It all comes on this one basis: You ask the pc if he has a present time problem and the pc says, "Yes, I have a present"—of course it fell off the pin—"Yes I have a present time problem."

And the auditor says, well—he can prompt the pc—and say well, "What is it?" You know?

And the pc says, "Well, I don't know how I'm going to pay my room rent."

"All right, fine." The auditor should acknowledge that extremely well, because his acknowledgment is part of the blow mechanism, you see. And then he should ask the pc again if he has a present time problem. Not can he think he'd pay his room rent now! See, what we got going here is the pc gets rid of it and the auditor keys it in again!

And that's really the chief reason why you're not cleaning rudiments easily. You're keying them in faster than the pc can key them out. you follow me? That's a commonest auditing

error. I don't care whether you call this Q&A or whatever it is. But actually it inhibits the pc from blowing anything.

Now, the correct procedure is this:

"Do you have a present time problem?" Clang! goes on the needle here. Clang! All right.

"Good. What was that? It fell—what was that? Anything you care to say there?" That it . . . "What was it?" See?

And the pc says, "Yow-yow-yow-yow-yow," and that is the present time problem.

And then the auditor says, "Good. Thank you. Swell. Fine."

I don't care if he feels like he blows the pc out of the chair with acknowledgments—acknowledge the hell out of this thing, you see. Ends the comm. And the auditor should look at that moment satisfied that he's handled the whole thing. That's the little schoolbook tricks of the trade I'll probably never let you in on. I say there are no tricks of the trade and then I give you one, see?

But, let's sound awfully satisfied along about that time. Just acknowledge the living daylights out of it, even relief that you've gotten rid of this present time problem. See? I can put a pc over the rolly coaster on getting rid of out-rudiments so fast he doesn't know what happened.

You saw me beat one pc to death on a missed withhold here last night. I bet that pc right now knows she got rid of that missed withhold. I was—sat there because I was very happy she got rid of the missed withhold. Did you see that last night? Did you?

Audience: Yes, hm-hm.

Well, she actually did tell me what the missed withhold was. We did actually go over it. But we didn't spend any time on it, did we? Part of getting rid of it was communicating it to her, that I'd got it. And she got real convinced about this. And I must have gotten it in full, otherwise I wouldn't be so satisfied with it. Get the idea? See that? That's just auditor presence.

So, we say, "Oh, good!" Don't repeat the present time problem after him. Don't say, "Oh, well good, so you, can't pay your room rent this week. Oh, well that's fine. Good." Don't do that, see. Just say—you've got to impart it without repeating it. you see?

And the pc says, "Well, I got a present time problem, I can't pay my—don't see how I'm going to pay my room rent this week."

And you say, "Well, all right. All right. Good. All right. Now, we're going to start a brand-new. . ." Another use of the acknowledgment—"Well, we've gotten rid of that." See? "All right, now. Now, we're going to—we're going to get on to the next thing here. See? Do you have a present time problem?"

And you find out ninety percent of the time it's gone—ninety-five, ninety-nine percent of the time. There's no ghost of a clip on that thing.

If you expect it to be there, if you expect it to go on being there for the next hour or two, it'll stay. This is how you do that: "Do you have a present time problem?" And the pc says, "Uh—uh—uh—yes, I do. Room, room rent—I don't—I don't know how I'm going to pay room rent."

"Oh, your room rent. Uh, well now,"—the auditor is worried about it too, see?—"Well, now—yeah, well, all right, now. Do you have any particular solutions on this? I mean, been

thinking. . ." and so forth, "Who's that problem with? Oh, yeah, yeah. How much—how much money do you make? Oh, well, uh—you ever had this problem before? You had difficulties with it? Oh, yeah. Hm-hm-mm-mm. Did you ever have trouble with money?"

Man, we can go on by the hour! Don't you see? See, fix it up man, you can just hang up there and you'll never get any auditing done, you know. you can go on and on and on.

Well now, that one percent, that one time out of a hundred, and you say, "Do you have a present time problem?" You get a knock, and you say, "Well, all right, what is that? What is your present time problem?"

Fellow says, "Oh, well, I can't pay my room rent this week."

And you say, "Hm-mm. All right. Okay. All right. Thank you. Thank you. All right now. Do you have a present time problem?" Clang. "All right, what's that?"

"Well, it's my room rent."

That's the one time out of—out of a hundred. See? All right, well now, don't let that defeat you so the next ninety-nine times you run into the trick you run into the same chasm. No, the thing to do at that stage of the game— I'll give it to you absolutely right this time—"Do you have a present time problem?" Clang! "All right, and what is it?" And he tells it to you. And you say, "Well all right, all right. Good. Thank you. Fine. All right. Now—do you have a present time problem?" Clang! "All right, what's that?"

"Well, it's my room rent."

And you say, "All right. What part of that problem could you be responsible for? Thank you. What part of that problem could you be responsible for? Thank you. What part of that problem could you be responsible for? Thank you. What part of that problem could you be responsible for? Thank you. All right, now, do you have a present time problem?" Tick. "Good. All right. What part of that problem could you be responsible for?"

And the pc says, "Oh, most anything," so forth.

And you say, "All right. Now, what part of that problem could you be responsible for?" And you notice you're not getting much kick, see. And you say, "All right, now. Thank you. Thank you. Now, do you have a present time problem?" Nothing. You say, "Thank you very much. Is it all right with you now if we get on with this listing?"—or this Prepchecking, or whatever else we're doing. You got the idea?

Don't start a process. Don't have the Horse Guards come out, and then the Queen's own, and then marshal the Coldstream, you see? And then get a band. And then write a letter to the Times because the Queen didn't come down and—and inspect the troops. You get the idea? That's not the place for it! That's not the place for all that. That all belongs in the body of the session.   See? So let's not start and end, and mess up and so forth. You can give the last two commands for Havingness or something like that; because it isn't something you have to catch on the fly. The reason you could do that best as a present time problem or something like that, and just—you just start the process, you just end the process—that is all there is to that, is you're not giving it very much importance, don't you see. It's downgrading, and it's something you just say, "Well, this is—hell with this, we'll get it out of the road. It's good, it's important, yet at this particular time we got onto something else we're going to get. That's good."

You know, that's the whole atmosphere under which this thing is audited. Not, "Oh, well, gee-whiz you've got a present time problem. Oh, well that's too damn bad. I mean, God almighty, how am I going to get on with this session here, you see? Oh, I don't know whether I ought to take it up with you or not because, you see, we've got an awful lot of listing to do

today for 3D Criss Cross. And I hate to get detoured by this present time problem, you see, because it's going to cause us so much trouble!"

If you're going into it with that frame of mind, you're going to have trouble. I can guarantee you will have all kinds of trouble, have it by the bushel-basketful .

But by just downgrading the whole importance of the thing, you see. Ways of downgrading importance is just to brush off process. You get the idea? If you're unlucky enough to have that process not work, I don't know, you must have been doing something else in the session that would be wildly out. I mean, it'd be—have to be some invented-something-elseness, such as not reading the E-Meter in the first place to find—or trying to run a present time problem that isn't there, or something like that.

Now, you could get that all involved, you see. Now, that's the simplest form, "What part of that problem could you be responsible for?" Well, I guarantee he's got a different problem. You know and I know he's got a different problem on the second time you ask the question. And the third time you ask the question he's got a different problem than that. And the fourth time you ask the question he's got a different problem than that. And then sooner or later he comes up to present time and has the problem of getting on with the session.

All right, well clip that one out and get going. But you see, you don't have to give it any importance. Weight: the way the auditor puts weight into the processing—w-e-i-g-h-t, you see, not: w-a-i-t—the way you weight the processing You know what you're supposed to be doing in the body of the session. This is weighted, this is heavy, this is what we are doing. Oh man, dress parade, you know—plumes and cuirasses. Let's go on with this. Let's start that process and let's keep it going, and let's keep a terrific auditing discipline the while and get in your middle ruds once in a while when you have to and give it two more commands before you end it, and—you know what I mean? Oh, that's all just as precise as hell, you see? Very important.

Get to your end rudiments, see? You've ended the body of the session. Make damn sure that those rudiments are null. See? "Have you told me any half-truths? Untruths?" You see? Make sure each one is null. It isn't, "Have you told me any. . ." Somebody was doing it this way the other day, "Have you told me half-truths? Thank you. Have you told me any untruths? Thank you. Have you..." That's too much importance. See, "Have you told me any half-truths? Untruths? Said something only to impress me? Tried to damage anyone in this session? That's all straight." You tell the pc, "That's all straight." Got away with it; that's all straight.

All right, "Have you deliberately tried to influence the E-Meter?"

"No."

"Good; clear."

All right. Get the idea? "All right, have I missed any withholds on you? Have I missed any withholds on you? No. Good. Well, let me ask that again: Have I missed any withholds on you? Oh, I haven't. All right that's fine."

You can actually con-game the pc straight down to null end rudiments, you know?

All right. "Now, don't wiggle your neck but look around, just wiggle your eyeballs. Good—I got no reaction! Fine! All right! Good! Ah! Good. That's fine."

Now. When we ask about the goals and we ask about the gains, and we slide it out of session, and that is the end of it. Get the idea? And you know, you, the auditor, can actually sort of hold the rudiments in, but only, only if you do this, only if you do this: give a flawless session.

Now, all of us make goofs in session sooner or later. And they're always regrettable. They're completely forgivable. They only become unforgivable if you continue to make goofs. See, nobody's too interested in the absolute perfection. But we are very interested in an infrequency of goof.

Now, we want—we want confidence on the part of the pc. And confidence on the part of the pc is born by consistency on the part of the auditor. And any time an auditor becomes inconsistent, any time an auditor Qs-and-As, any time an auditor all of a sudden puts an odd, weird, cock-eyed variable into the middle of a set procedure, confidence goes down because consistency has dropped out. And those two things are blood brothers—Siamese twins. Confidence is born out of consistency.

You give the same session to the pc over and over, he will become very, very confident. He'll be very happy with you. And that happiness drops every time you vary the situation, every time you Q-and-A, every time you refuse to let him blow something.

See, here's a mousetrap sitting there and the pc comes along and he says, "There's a mousetrap." Well, ordinarily this mousetrap just moves away. He'll say, "Well, there's a mousetrap," and he's happy about it and he goes on in his session all right.

When you Q-and-A and insist on going on and on, in rudiments, over this same confounded mousetrap, you're insisting he put his fingers in it and trip it. And then he does and then you're in trouble and then you never seem to be able to straighten out rudiments.

And the reason you can't get rudiments straight on the pc has very little to do with the pc and has everything to do with the auditor. It is actually the tone and attitude of the auditor.

An auditor's lack of consistency brings about a lack of confidence; and then your rudiments start out.

Now, there is nothing like consistency of the exact procedure which we are doing at this moment—not subject to any changes to amount to anything—consistency in exactly what you're doing will breed confidence. So actually in along about the third session, the rudiments would just go in—just like that.

A pc notices the care that is taken with him. See, he notices this. "Do you have a present time problem? Good. Let me check that again. Do you have a present time problem? Thank you. All right, that's clean." See? That's the auditor being real careful. That really makes an impression with a pc.

You're not sure this item is in. We're talking now about bodies of sessions rather than rudiments we—at this moment. This item, you're not sure of it, you know? And you say, "Cat whiskers. Cat whiskers. Cat whiskers. Let me look at that now. cat whiskers. Cat whiskers. Cat whiskers. Yeah, well, that's out. That's out. Okay. All right. Mules. Mules. Mules. Dogs. Dogs. Dogs. Dogs. Dogs. Dogs. Dogs. That's out. Okay."

Care. Get the idea? He isn't saying, "Cat whiskers, cat whiskers, cat whiskers." For some peculiar reason the pc gets the idea that the auditor doesn't know what the hell he's doing.

So you can put another "c" on your confidence. And confidence is aided by carefulness. It depends absolutely on consistency, but it is certainly helped by carefulness.

Now, rudiments go out when unconfidence is born. you get this pc nervous about what you're going to do next. you do the unexpected. You suddenly rip a new process out of your whip—hip pocket in the middle of the pc's run. Oh, no. you do this two, three times and, my God, you couldn't keep the rudiments in with bulldozers! I guarantee it. you just couldn't keep the rudiments in. That just couldn't—wouldn't work.

In other words, we all of a sudden we're running along, we're running along and saying, "All right. What part of a government would you be willing to attack? Thank you. What part of a government would you be unwilling to attack? Thank you. What part of a government would you be willing to attack? Thank you. What part of a government would you be unwilling to attack? Thank you. All right. Now, how do you feel about my auditing there? Got an ARC break or anything of the sort?" The pc went a little groggy for a second there. "Got an ARC break? All right. Now, invent another method for baiting an auditor. Invent another method for baiting an auditor." See? And then the pc says . . .

And I tell you, the more you drive rudiments out the harder they are to get in. And they are driven out just by inconsistency, that's all. Now, I don't care how carefully you ended the process off—that you had run it at all. . . See? And we find out that isn't working too well and the tone arm has gone up to 6.0. So, of course we'd better shift it over and so forth, and say, "Well, have you ever tried to make an auditor guilty? Ah, good. Thank you. Well, have you ever tried to make an auditor guilty? Good. Thank you. Have you ever tried to make an auditor guilty? Thank you. Thank you very much. Have you ever tried to make an auditor guilty? Thank you very much. All right then. What government have you been unwilling to attack? Thank you."

Pc will get jarred, man! And I don't care what pc it is, after a while, after you've done this, just in a few sessions—it's best done at different times for different periods and sometimes for a good reason and sometimes for no reason at all. That's what's best. And then nobody can get the rudiments in on this pc. The pc is a bundle of nerves. He's run up against a—you know, what the hell? What's going to happen next? He doesn't know what's going to happen next.

You give him three sessions of Model Session and they're all nice and consistent and everything is fine. There's a few little surprises in there; he didn't know you were going to ask things in that order. By the time you give him a third session, he expects them to be asked in that order. And oh, dandy, great. And along about the fourth session, why, those rudiments are awfully in. And the fifth session the rudiments are, well, they're just in, that's all. And the sixth session, well they're very well in. Seventh session, beautifully, beautifully in. What's happening? It's just the consistency is putting the rudiments in for you, that's all.

I don't care how normally... You've always thought the rudiments as being out natively in the pc. And the auditor has everything to do with it. And you can get the most nervous and flighty pc in the world and if you were to audit the pc perfectly with perfect consistency, making no gains that would amount to anything, you know, but not getting upset about it, and just go on and give him that perfect routine. It's the auditing routine itself which is smoothing him down. After you've audited him for a little while, all of a sudden, auditing session? Well, that's dead easy, do that standing on his head, see? When he comes into the auditing session he's got tone arm action, but you didn't do anything to get him to get tone arm action. You just went over the rudiments and took up the routine process and always ran the same process with him for the out-rudiments, you see, and ran it briefly, and got him. . . And then you ran the body of the session just the way you're supposed to. By the time you've done this a few times, you don't hardly have to put them in. you check them; they're in. you see?

That's the magic of the game. That's where the textbook solution is the solution. And you'll find these rudiments do cover almost everything that can happen to a pc.

Now, of course, a pc's rudiments go out in the middle of the session. Well, actually, you want to know if he invalidated anything, and you wanted to know if there are any half-truths, untruths or tried to impress you or damage someone or if he's trying to influence the E-Meter. And that's just about all you want to know about him in middle rudiments and that's to get a list to start reading again, see?

But normally, you're the one that kicked it out. you did something You're doing something Either he can't understand what you're saying or he feels he's doing something wrong, or

something or other is going on in the session that he doesn't just get the grip of. You see? But the auditor has done something flagrantly wrong, I'll guarantee you, every time, if you have to keep putting these things in. If you have to keep using middle rudiments, there's something haywire here. See, there's a lack of confidence on the part of the pc.

Well, of course, what I say is taken within limits. There's some pcs that go scrambling off the walls and a pin drops a quarter of a mile away and you can see their scalp rise. They dramatize an old scalping incident amongst the Sioux or the Blackfeet, you see. And their whole scalp lifts off, you know, a pin drops. They can hear this. That's because environment keeps going out on them all the time, environment keeps going out.

Well, actually, environment will sort of habitually start to stay in if the auditor is consistent about what he does. Because more and more the pc will permit the auditor to take responsibility for the environment, and the pc will realize that if something bad happens in the environment, the auditor will do something about it. Don't you see? He gets the idea that this environment is not a threatening environment because the auditor is auditing him.

In fact, you could get him so that the only time of the day he's calm is when he's in session. Got the idea? And then he gets less and less uncalm out of session, but the first calmness he ever discovers is in session. You see what I mean? I mean, this gradually spreads around and he's calm regardless of whether he's in-session or out of session, about the environment. See, because you've remedied a bunch of things about his case by that time.

No, rudiments aren't something that natively out with the pc. They stay in as well as the auditor is flawless. That's all there is to it. you do a perfect job; you'll have a perfect pc. you can't help it, you see? The pc has had it as far as you're concerned. You're sitting there with all the weapons . . .

If the number of factors that are being crisscrossed on the pc in an auditing session, you know—the number of factors that have to do with the human mind, contained in Model Session, were counted, you'd probably get up in the hundreds. And every one of them is a powerful factor. And if you do all of these things consistently, of course your pc responds accordingly. He can't help it.

It's something like shooting sparrows with sixteen-inch guns, let me assure you. He 11 stay in session and then he'll improve and come up along the line and his case will get straightened out; everything will get very, very fine.

Now
, the auditing which you saw last night was research auditing, to that degree. I showed you how to interview a pc, yes. But as far as I was concerned I had a piece of research on this thing. I'm always discovering things. And isn't it interesting that there wasn't a person there who didn't have the rudiments out? Did you see how wildly the rudiments were out? Oh, yes, well probably they were exaggerated in their outness. Very probably exaggerated in their outness by the fact that the pc was on parade. But they weren't exaggerated in their outness because I was auditing them. If anything, that tended to slow it down a little bit. It would only be to the degree that they thought they might have to protect their auditor that would get an influence and I don't think any of these people were trying to protect their auditor.

So it wasn't any more exaggerated in the final analysis—maybe a little bit—beyond what you actually would have seen if you yourself had taken one of the pcs in session and asked them these rudiments questions, see. Did you notice I didn't ask them the rudiments questions with a consistency? Consistency belongs with auditing, not interrogation.

So I just asked them, "How do you like the room?" You notice I didn't use any of the rudiments wording That's to keep the pc from going into session to me. Because these things become a signal, "In-session." See. So we ask about the room, and, "How did you like your

auditor?" You know, that doesn't sound anything like, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?"

You see. It isn't the same thing You follow that? So you—I didn't use rudiments on these things.

But I showed you something. Well, I showed you how to interview a pc. And I wish to call to your attention that this—just the asking them the rudiments in some different phraseology, checking them over and asking what they thought about it, and looking at their folder and so forth, that's what you did, you're—originally were inspecting the case because it had no TA action, not because of complaints the case was making—never listen to complaints. It's just no TA action; minimal TA action. All right, so therefore the case was inspected. How come? How come no TA action?

Well, that's why you would interview such a case if you were supervising a lot of auditing. And the next action you would take would be a consultation with the auditor. "What are you doing mutt? See. What's cooking here?" And very often he'll come down with a violent vituperation as far as the pc is concerned—you know right there that there's no ARC from the auditor. One of the best things to do is pull his overts on the pc and send him back into session. That's right.

And here you can pull all of an auditor's overts on the pc, particularly under supervised auditing, because very seldom are these people of long acquaintance. And you get yourself next day's report and you look at that and see if there's tone arm action yet, and the next day's report and see if there's tone arm action yet. And now, there's no tone arm action the next day, well, God almighty. This is auditing which is being done by the auditor hanging by his heels from the middle of the ceiling.

I mean, the gross auditing error is just by this time so magnitudinous— given any kind of a trained auditor at all—a gross auditing error is so gross that you yourself will not believe it. And then, of course, the only way to find it is not talk to the auditor, talk to the pc. But you actually have got to look at this session to find out what the billy-o is actually going on in this session. You have to look at it; there's no substitute for it at all. Because they can't imagine it. you see? Because it's—this is standard. The auditor thinks he should do this so he's not going to tell you he's doing it. And the pc probably is insufficiently in present time to find out what the auditor is doing, don't you see? You can't get your data there, you've got to get your data by a microphone inspection or by an actual visual inspection. There's no substitute for that because you find the damnedest things man, oh-ho-ho-ho-ho-ho, wow. Oh, I needn't tell you to. But there's some wild ones will go on. I mean it's gross auditing errors.

But I want to point out something to you. This was the research aspect of the . . . Well, gross auditing error is the auditor just isn't looking at the E-Meter; never looks at the E-Meter. You know, it isn't that he has something wrong with the way he looks at the E-Meter—I don't mean there's a—the auditor just doesn't ever look at the E-Meter! See?

There's something like this: "All right. Do you have a present time problem? Well that's clean." See? It'll be something wild! Unbelievable. Well, the auditor's sitting there all the time eating candy bars, you know? And the pc's out of session because the crumbs and that sort of thing keep getting on her white skirt, you know?

It gets so wild—by the time it's gone four days, there's something going on there that's so wild that I guarantee you, you will not be able to imagine it. you have to go see it. It's like Barnum used to say about a circus. By that time it's getting up into the freak-show class.

Because it's too easy to do this. So a lot of new, different, strange things are happening, you see, that you wouldn't really realize were happening at all. And early in training auditors, they don't realize these things have any wrongness to them at all. So, they just go on doing them until somebody actually spots it.

But I wanted to show you something—in general, completely aside from that. These cases were selected for only one reason: no tone arm action was now occurring that you could call tone arm action. No really good tone arm action was occurring on any of the cases you saw interviewed. Although some of those cases had had good tone arm action, but suddenly wasn't occurring. And I ran down the rudiments and did you see how the rudiments reacted? See? All right.

This checkup disclosed to me this fact: that tone arm action does not necessarily take place just because the rudiments are in. But if rudiments are out—this is true, you see, that other isn't necessarily true—but if rudiments are out your tone arm action will not take place, and that is true. If the rudiments are out, your tone arm action will not take place. You could get them far enough out so that you could just have a still arm.

This means that tone arm action is proportional to the degree rudiments are in—not proportional to the case. Tone arm action is not proportional to the state of the case. Tone arm action is proportional to the degree the rudiments are in.

Now, of course that's monitored by what is being run on the case, which is the only thing that would make a liar out of this statement because you can run some line that was utterly unsuited to the pc, or some Zero A question on Prepchecking that was utterly unsuited to the pc, or you could go on running CCH 1 twelve hours and a half after it was flattened. You understand? So that's not an unlimited truth. But it's to this degree, that the tone arm action will cease when the rudiments go just so far out. you see. The further the rudiments are out, the less tone arm action you will have on the pc, regardless of the case, but with the understanding that you're running an effective process. Do you follow this?

Now, you sat there and looked at it last night. Now you've got to take my word for it because I haven't shown you the folders on these people. But tone arm action was minimal. It was your quarter of a division in twenty minutes. See? And look at those rudiments, man; they were wildly out. Now, you'd think you had to get some wild and unusual and peculiar and fantastic solution to handle any one of these cases. And that would be the natural bent. Let's find something new, strange and peculiar to handle these cases. The newness and strangeness and the peculiarness should consist entirely of the auditor doing a very consistent Model Session and getting the rudiments very nicely in. And that alone would have restored the tone arm action on any case I investigated last night—just as simple as that.

That's what I mean by the textbook solution is the solution. Now, the textbook solution of returning tone arm action to a case is to get the rudiments in. you have a reality on this. Probably any of you—many of you have seen a list go null because the rudiments went out. Well, translate that over into, "The tone arm went null, because the rudiments went out," you see, that makes it the same breed of cat. That's a little piece of research auditing you saw there. I just thought I would check across this and see if I could find a common denominator of this particular set of cases.

They aren't consistently no tone arm cases, you know. They were just taken as of that day, why, they were the low men on the totem pole. They had all gone numb just the last day or two, you see, as far as the tone arm action was concerned. Previously they may or may not have had tone arm action. You see that? They were not strange cases in other words, they were just cases of—with the tone arm motion didn't exist on. And we found the rudiments thuuuh . . .   To restore the tone arm action you would—should have—might have said, "Well, the best thing to do is to—let's see if we can't audit this person with two auditors, yes, two auditors. And let's see if we can't run, uh—CCH 14 uh—that's really best," and so forth.

And you see you could have gotten a whole bunch of unusual solutions and you could have said, "Well, invent another method of baiting an auditor," or something like that, "Invent a worse method of baiting an auditor," something like this, you see. you could—all these unusual solutions.

Where, as a matter of sober, sober, sober fact, all you had to do was get the rudiments in and the cases would have gone off like a bomb. In other words a greater consistency, not a greater randomity, would have given motion to any one of these cases. Okay?

Thank you. Take a ten minute break.