AUDITING ERRORS

A lecture given on
17 May 1962

Thank you.

Okay, I hope after this lecture there will be an upgrade in your auditing. I only hope.

All right. What are we here? This is . . .

Audience: 17 May.

17th of May 1962, Saint Hill Briefing Course and . . .

Audience voice: Sorry.

. . . that's all right, we'll give you an infraction sheet.

And, I already gave this lecture at dinner, so we can skip it! And Mary Sue was going on about what you were doing and not doing. And I feel pretty grim, tell you the truth. I mean, that's terrible.

Well anyway, this is lecture one, 17 May 1962 and I'm going to talk to you about the sins that you can commit while prepchecking And there's some vague feeling that because we have some drills, that the ability of the auditor to talk to the pc is reduced. Now, if you saw this in the demonstration last night, I was doing one of these drills very consistently. I don't know if you noticed that, you might not have recognized the drills being done right. Snide tonight! Snide.

I myself was aware of the fact when first employing this, very harshly and so forth, that it did cut down my tendency to ARC break the pc with a bunch of meaningless conversation. I noticed this, in passing, that the—and so on. But I think all those people I checked over last night, I think they were perfectly happy with that checkout, weren't they?

Male voice: Yes.

Well now, did you feel better after the checkout, than you did before?

Male voice: Yes.

Hmm? I wonder why! Must have had something to do with the fact that the pc was acknowledged and the pc knew that was square and pc had some certainty on it—in spite of the fact I did—wasn't auditing last night, I was just doing a checkout. But in order to check out, of course, I had to do a small amount of auditing.

Now, you'll find that's inevitably and invariably true.

And when you first start using this, just as I noticed last night, using it very rigorously and harshly, yes, you feel sort of, "Oh, well, I can't go on and on talking to the pc—ha-ha! What am I going to do now?" And that's because you have mistaken, as I recognized very readily, the drill for the fact of auditing.

There are two types of activity in which you engage in auditing There's just two types of activity. And they're both very definitely different types.

And one of these things is the rudiments type of activity. Now, this is the type of activity where you're not really trying to dig anything up. you are trying to straighten something out. And you're trying to straighten it out right now. That is a rudiments-type activity. And you have beginning rudiments and you have end rudiments. But remember, you also have a nebulous thing called "middle rudiments." Middle rudiments do exist. And every time you are asking the pc for a missed withhold you are running a middle rudiment. It is just a rudiment.

The other type of activity is an auditing activity. Now, just as you have the body of the session and you have beginning, middle and end rudiments, you see, there's a difference here. This is "body of the session" auditing. And it is done against a tone arm, it is not done against a needle. You do your rudiments against a needle and you do your body of the session against a tone arm. They are two different items on the E-Meter.

Now, some of you might have noticed that when you move a tone arm, the needle moves. I don't like to put that, that bluntly, but anyway, if we were to set this meter up here, so that it were. . . Now, there sits the meter. But here supposing—now just look at the needle. We get that much motion on the needle. Do you think that's tone arm motion or isn't it? Hmm? That's tone arm motion, isn't it?

Audience: Yes.

Now, when we say how much tone arm motion is your pc getting during Prepchecking, we see that this thing can swing all the way over there and all the way back again and we have about a quarter of a—of a division of motion here, on the tone arm, which ordinarily isn't recorded. We don't, in recording tone arm, record these fast responses of the needle. But they do mean tone arm motion. Your long, wide swings of the needle you can classify as tone arm motion. You can classify those as tone arm motion.

We're interested in a stability of tone arm motion when we're recording it. We center the needle, we record it. In other words, we center the needle on set. Put the needle on set. And we record the tone arm. That's for a needle read.

You see, you're dealing with a relatively sloppy action. This is not a precision action. The recording of a tone arm motion is not a precision action. Because your needle can fly around considerably without ever your recording it. you understand? It—you're stretching at gnats. You're trying to shoot down butterflies with sixteen-inch guns or something like that, when we say, "Oh well, if we kept a tone arm record and the needle was at set all the time, all the time, all the time and so forth and we had this quarter division. . ." Well, you'd work yourself silly and it's to no purpose.

When we say tone arm motion, we mean you centered the thing and read it. But a needle that drops like this—that's just one swing, see. We don't call that tone arm motion, really. It isn't anything that we record. For the purposes of the body of the session, by definition I'm just giving you, we do notice that as tone arm motion. That's what's known as "tone arm motion read on the needle."

We know we're getting tone arm motion, we know there'd be tone arm motion there if we kept centering the tone arm. I'm just calling your attention to something you know already, that if the needle is flying around, you're getting tone arm motion. It is not significant as far as items or anything else is concerned, because you're not going to read a needle flying around like this for items or something of this sort and for an ARC break or something like that. You're going to read the thing, it goes clank. You're going to read this type of reaction, see. Clank. See? Or this type of reaction. See, the little reactions. You're not going to pay much attention to this reaction. See, there's a wide reaction and you actually read while that thing is doing a wide reaction, you read its interim reaction, its internal reaction.

You say, "Do you have an ARC break?" and it—you know, it's swinging down like this and it goes—you got the idea? It interrupts itself or something like this. Or it's swinging back up.

you don't read from a motionless needle, by the way. Some of you can always tell a brand-new auditor, he sits there and waits for the needle to stop moving so that he can read it. The only time you get embarrassed on this is when the needle slides by the end of the pin. And you've started your question and it all of a sudden goes by the end of the pin before you can finish your question and of course then you've had it, then you have to repeat your question. Which is perfectly all right.

You'll see on these demonstrations, I'm fairly careful to give you a read. That is to say I'm fairly careful to ask my questions with the needle more or less slowed down or motionless, so that you can see the thing I'm not reading a needle as fast as I would ordinarily read a needle. But I'm not straining at it too hard even in that direction.

Now, the point I'm trying to make here is this motion that's going like this or the needle was coasting here at the end of the dial for a while and then came back up here and was here for a while and then was here, that's tone arm motion. Those are not needle reads, really, you see. They're tone arm motion. It's tone arm motion read off the needle.

Now, of course, if you're sitting here with your thumb on this tone arm motion, if you're sitting here with your thumb on that, yes, you could keep it centered all the time. But the trouble is while you are talking or asking questions of the pc, you're liable at the same time to be moving it with your thumb and that's very difficult to read. In fact I've never seen anybody do it yet, me included. You see. So there's no profit made.

Now, let's classify these two things. There is the rudiments-type read and the body-of-the-session-type read. Now, the body-of-the-session-type read is done on the tone arm. And the rudiments-type read is done on the needle. Already we have those two very broad distinctions.

All right, they are treated in an entirely different way by the auditor. The auditor's handling of these two things is entirely different. And what you've got to get into gear is slipping from one to the other and back again without upsetting yourself, God help us. And sliding from one to the other without continuing the other when you're doing the other.

All right, I'll give you an example of this. We're going along here, needle— needle is . . . We're getting sweeps of some kind or another, so we know whatever we're talking about to the pc is sort of hot, you see, because it's swinging around, you know, and this says, well, the subject—the subject is pertinent to something or other. And the pc says suddenly, "That's the list. That's complete. That's it. That's all the items there are. No good to ask me if there are any more items, because that's all the items there are, the list is complete."

Now, I don't care if at first you crash your gears. I just don't want to see any gear teeth flying off. But go ahead and crash your gears in trying to change from one to the other. Because at this moment you've got to go into a rudiments-type question. And this is an entirely different presence. So he's had it now, you've said—you've said, "Are there any more items?" or something You haven't even tested for it, you know.

And pc says, "No, no, that's complete."

And you say, "All right. Good." Clank-whirr-crash, you see.

Now, "Have I missed a withhold on you?" I don't care what you say, do you see. You're going to get a middle—a middle rudiment, see. All right, now that middle rudiment is handled with great precision. "Have I missed a withhold on you? Yeah, what's that? Yeah, that. That one there."

"Oh, well, ha-ha. Yeah, well I didn't tell you I'm bored stiff."

And you say, "All right, all right. Thank you, thank you. Let me check that. Have I missed a withhold on you? All right, that's clean. All right, fine. Okay, now. Now, we only have thirty

items on this particular list. And on all of your other lists you have three hundred and ninety-seven. So I think well have to do something about this. Now, how about another item?"

See
, you've shifted your gears back again. There was no "Up, Fido" drill on here, you see. you did a tsk. You're right back at it again.

And he says, "Well, I don't want to list anymore."

"Well," you say, "you can think of another one. Come on, think of one. Think of another one. Repeat one that you've already given me."

"Well, there is one."

And you say, "All right, that's fine." And you're off to the races, see. And you get him going a little more and then all of a sudden you happen to be noticing this over here and this thing appears awfully still. Appears very still. No TA action. Just looks awfully still. Or he gets a dirty needle once in a while when you speak or something, see. All right, you shift your gears, you see. And you ask once more for a missed withhold, invalidation.

You know—there—this is—this is just a note I will interject into this thing—did you know there are negative—negative middle rudiments? "In this session, have you tried not to withhold something" "In this session, have you tried not to invalidate things?" "In this session, have you ref—have you been trying not to suppress anything" See, they're done exactly the same way as any other middle rudiment. Same drill. Whatever you ask the guy, you leave by the same door.

And you find out there are two reasons why your pc starts picking up and getting more and more and more and more and more withholds. So finally every item you're picking up missed withholds. See, there's two reasons. One is you've missed a withhold, but good. See, that's one. And the other one is the pc has now become very alert to the fact that he mustn't have withholds, see. And he's busy there running the session and keeping his rudiments in.

I don't care what kind of a middle rudiment you do. "In this session, have you tried to keep the rudiments in?" Pc says, "Oh, yes, my God!" The same drill, you see, no comments from the auditor.

And you say, "Good. All right. Now, let me check that again. In this session, have you kept—tried to keep the rudiments in? That's it, that's clean." Go on about your business, you see. It's just this little shift of gears.

Now, it doesn't matter then what you use for a middle rudiment. Do you realize that you can bring a middle rudiment in like this: "In this session, have you deliberately tried to influence the E-Meter?" Perfectly valid middle rudiment, see. Sec Checking-type questions where you're running lists: "In this session, have you told me any half-truths? untruths?" see? You just use your end rudiments, see. Clank! You say, "Well, come on, what's that?"

He says, "Well, I have, as a matter of fact, I've been stringing a longbow here for some time on the subject of my sister. And I've been trying to damage her, too."

And you say, "Good. Thank you very much. Now, let me check this question again. In this session, have I missed..." And that's your shift—your shift over. It's very simple when you get down to it. When you do a rudiments-type question—now, let's get the other difference going here—when you do a rudiments-type question you're trying to get something out of the road of the body of the session. You're trying to keep the body of the session from getting upset. That is the only thing you're trying to do.

You're not trying to help the pc a bit, even though it very often helps the pc a bit, as the people I was checking last night undoubtedly felt helped by the number of missed withholds and so forth which I picked up off of them so as to carry on a check, see. But you're not trying to really help the pc with that—an—that rudiments question. You're trying to keep the body of the session going.

And don't you ever get going on a body of a session or even on the beginning rudiments and let the pc detour you on to doing something else. you clean up a rudiment. If you're cleaning up a rudiment, you clean it up as a rudiment, you clean up that rudiment and you get off of that. And by definition, the shortest, quickest brush-offs are the bestest rudiment processes. It's what gets the rudiment in fastest—that is the ideal rudiments process. What gets the rudiment in fastest. We want the rudiment in.

Because all the action—you understand, it's terribly important to have the rudiments in. But all the action you take in getting the rudiments in is robbed from the body of the session. You're running on robbed time. So don't ever set yourself up to straighten out a rudiment the long way to. Don't start in on the thing and get down to "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" and the pc says—it says, clank! And the pc says, "No," and "I'm not willing to." And you all of a sudden say, "I guess we'll have to prepcheck this." Oh, cut your throat, man! That is really the clumsiest piece of stuff and that is the favorite trap of auditors. They get stuck in this every once in a while. They find a beginning rudiment out and they immediately haul out the chessboard, the IBM computer, you see, roll up their sleeves, get three or four new extra sheets of paper to list things on. No, all you want there is a feather duster. And preferably a dustpan. See, that's the most equipment you want at that particular time. "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" Clank!

Well of course you can say, "Well, what's that all about? What's this all about here? What's that—that one?"

"Aahhah -so forth and so on."   "Oh, come on, give it to me."

"Well, so-and-so and so-and-so and, well, last night I was having nightmares about you auditing me."

And you say, "All right, thank you very much. Let me check that. Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties? Well, that's still falling off the pin. All right. If it's all right with you—and even if it isn't—I'd like to run a little process here, 'Who would I have to be to audit you?'" First question - bang-bang-bang-bang-bang. "All right, let me check this."

Pc has heaved a sigh or he has done something that looked like he had a cognition, or something like this. He didn't tell you anything, you know, you say, "Let's check this." And you say, "All right. Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties? That's cleaner than a wolf's tooth. That was the last question. Thank you very, very much." Get the idea? Just a feather duster, you know, and get it out of sight, put it under the corner of the rug.

That's all you're interested in, is a clean needle. You're not even interested in how long it'll stay clean. That's the reason you prepcheck, you get a needle clean so that it will stay clean. That's the reason you do body of session. You expect body of session to linger. The effect of body of session is going to be with us for a while. But a rudiment, a middle rudiment, we don't expect it to be with us, maybe it won't—it'll only be with us ten seconds. It was still clean, so we leave it. It'll become apparent if it goes out. Something won't be happening right so you can go in and patch it up again.

This rudiment-type question is the "sticky plaster" type of activity. And if you go and try to build a case out of rudiments you're going to be in trouble. You're going to waste time. That time is all robbed from the body of the session.

Now, if you wanted to set up a pc so that his rudiments would stay in forever, you would get that session's rudiments in and then take one of the rudiments questions and use it in the body of the session to put it in there with brass nails and tape and mahogany and anvils—you get the idea?

You can prepcheck a rudiment question and that's where you may get mixed up. But you would—you're trying to put it in forever. All right, put it in forever. But you'll only do that in the body of the session.

Now, in the body of the session it doesn't matter how gabby you get. And this is where basically you're going to get most mixed up—is shifting gears on a list-type Prepcheck. Because here the rudiment-question rule of ask it once is being used a little differently. And it's only because this Sec Checktype question is being treated kind of like a rudiment that you're going to get mixed up. It actually isn't treated the same as a rudiment. But you're going to shift gears somewhat along this way: "Have you ever stolen anything?" You're busy—you're in the body of the session now—your rudiments are more or less in. Your pc is rolling along and you get him this list and, you come to this question, "Have you ever stolen anything?" and the thing goes whip! You say, "Yeah, that. Yeah, that one."

"Oh, well, I, uh—used to have nightmares about being a thief." Well, he's said it. You're not going to correct him at this stage of the game. And you say, "Good, thank you very much. Let me check this. Have you ever stolen anything" Whip! Now, shift your gears. See, that's a gear shift the same way. You're now under no discipline of anything under the sun, moon and stars, except to make him give an overt on that Zero Question. That is now a Zero A. The first action is, after you've checked it and found out it's going to respond like mad, is get it writ down as your Zero A on your auditor's report. I don't care if you write it down by number, but put "Zero A, 16."

You say, "All right, now, let's get down to business here. This is reacting like mad on this. Now, have you ever stolen . . . ?"

"No." The person says, "I remember in Sunday school, I mean they even—even thought of me one time as the Bishop of Algiers and never stole anything in my life. Well I don't know, the meter can't be wrong, you can't be wrong"

"Good, think it over, now think it over very carefully, have you ever stolen anything? You know, purloined something that didn't belong to you, you know? Acquired equipment to which you had no title. You know, stolen anything?"

"Ah, well, you put it that way, let me see, have I ever stolen anything, anything at all...."

And you say, "It keeps clanging, see? That one? That one? Yes?"

"Oh." He says, "You're talking about that one?"

"Yeah."

"Well, I thought one time that it'd be a good thing if my friend had his car stolen."

And you say, "All right, all right, that's very good. Now, very good, thank you very much. All right, now. Let's get down to cases here. Have you ever stolen anything? That's what I want to know."

"Oh, well, you put it that way, I mean, well, it'd be very humiliating to have to tell you because it didn't amount to very much. But, uh—I once stole my sister's bicycle."

He said it. All right. You say, "All right, you stole your sister's bicycle. Very good, thank you very much. That's very nice, all right. We're going to take that up right now. Now, what

about..." Just, just test questions— "What about stealing bicycles? What about stealing from children? What about stealing from your sister? What about stealing toys? What about stealing vehicles? Vehicles? What about stealing vehicles? Does that make sense to you?"

"Aaaah-haaa."

"All right. One: What about stealing vehicles? Good. All right, now this sister's bicycle of yours, all right. When was that? Is that all there is to it? What might have appeared there? Who didn't find out about it? All right, good. Now, when was that exactly? Is that all there is to that? What appeared there? Who should have located it or who should have found it? All right."

This thing is going crazy, see, and not diminishing, you've gone through it twice, you still get—out of the corner of your eye you can see that needle swing, which is tone arm action, see. That thing is swinging around. And you're saying, "Boy, this is—this is a hot line," see. And you say, "Is there any..." It's always earlier—"Is there any earlier incident where you stole something?"

"Well, yes, when I was a little boy, I once—I once—used to say my prayers in church all the time, you know, hoping I would never steal anything."

And you say, "Good." See. "That's real good. All right, we're glad about that one, that's fine, we like that one. All right, now, what'd you steal? Come on."

"Hmm! You mean you want to know?"

"Yes. What did you steal? Yeah, come on."

"Oh, well. I used to empty out my mother's cookie jar and give it to the other kids every once in a while."

"Thank you, thank you very much. When was that?"

"Well, that was lots of times."

"Good, just give me one. Just one."

"Oh, well, that one. Well, that was when she beat me so badly."

"I don't care which one it is, but how about that one? When was it? All right, good. Is that all of it? What might have appeared there? What was never found out about it?" just for the hell of it, see. "Good."

This thing's going crazy. You say—well, we're not going to waste any more time on that particular one—"Well, is there any earlier time when you stole something" And we finally run into his robbing banks. We don't care what we run into, but we're going to run into the hot line here, and steer it back into vehicles, because that's what we want. And we find out that this individual—we don't care—we don't care when it happened or what it was all about—we find out he used to steal all the kids' toys in the neighborhood, their tricycles and things like that, and sell them to the junkman as a pastime, you see. And they used to get beaten for losing their toys and, you know, the thing finally builds up like mad. And he really had no clue of it.

Now, you make a mistake when you think the pc knew about this, by the way, just as an intenection. He didn't know about this. You've got to fish him into this, you've got to persuade him into this. He's getting into areas he doesn't know anything about. If you let the pc—weak Prepchecking is sitting there waiting for the pc to tell you and blaming the pc

because he doesn't tell you. Well, the person to blame is the auditor. That's because the auditor isn't crowding the pc at it. you see, there are various ways of doing that.

All right, that's fine. And we finally get this thing where he was selling all these toys to the junkman and the kids were all getting beaten and everything of the sort. And then he used to tell people that he saw them throw their toys into the lake and he got them all in trouble and we get this, "Gee!" You know, he says, "I never remembered anything about this."

Well, I bet he didn't. And he got that all cleaned up. It's a nice significant basic on the chain and that sort of thing and you come back to your question, "What about stealing vehicles?" you see, whatever it was.

"Well," he says, "Well, there's a lot more of those, because actually I put myself through college stealing cars."

You say, "All right, that's fine. Okay, now"—change your hat, see, —"now, let's test this. What about stealing vehicles? All right, that's fine, that's clean." And you write, "null." "Now, let's test this Zero A. All right? Okay. Have you ever stolen anything? Ah, that's null. Thank you very, very much. Okay, now." We take the next question on the Sec Check list and just give it the business. All right, so he gives you one.

Now, here's a horrible mistake. Let me—let me show you a mistake. You can be all thumbs, you get that? I've given you the whole of it now but let me give you some things about—you can be all thumbs about this sort of thing Well, you can actually drive yourself and your pc half out of their minds. One, by not thoroughly acknowledging everything the pc says. See, he says, "Well, I—I thought once about stealing a paper clip once."

Well, man, you're not going to use that for a What question; you're not going to have anything to do with it, but you certainly better say "Good!" so the pc really knows you heard it. Don't go at it like this: pc says, "Well, I thought about stealing a paper clip once." And you say, "Well, have you ever stolen anything" Ohh, because your pc's going to go halfway around the bend before you get very far, you see. Whatever the pc gives you, give him a cheery aye-aye about it. "All right. Good. Good. Now, we're looking for a doingness here. That's fine, that one you just gave me, that's fine. But we're looking for a doingness. We want a doingness. You know? We want something you've done, done, done. We want a doingness on this thing. All right, now, I'm going to ask you again." Now that we've already found the thing wouldn't clear, you see.

All right. You know, I mean pound him into it and he eventually gives you one. And then you get your What question sorted out here and your administration. You actually—the second you transfer over from this one-shot, you know, on the list—second you transfer over from this one-shot on the list over onto your Prepcheck—oh, hell—that requires administration and writing and figuring it all out and getting your What question and running it down the line, talking to your pc, getting him to go earlier, cleaning up everything. You talk about individuality, you're certainly going to use your wits in full gear during that whole activity. And the only thing you're interested in over here is—on the meter—is how much needle swing you've got. You're still getting needle swing, in other words potential tone arm swing, you're still getting it on this thing. You're getting change as you go down the line and you're getting into areas that are going to shift this case around. Is this thing getting any cleaner? You're right on—you're right on the "qui vive" all the time you're doing this. Actually you have to be good.

One, you can't accuse the pc of withholding from you. Throws him out of session at once. you got to help the pc find out about it, but if you're not very militant in helping him find out about it, he also is going to get pretty wishy-washy on you. In other words, you've got to be clever while you're prepchecking. But a Prepcheck is an activity that takes place on something that won't clear. By definition, it's something that takes place—you ask the guy, "Have you ever stolen anything" He says, "Yes. I stole the . . ."

"Now, let me give you the next question."

"Yes. Once—time I stole the whole contents of the vault of the Bank of England. Heh-heh! Yeah. Um!"

And you say, "Boy, magnitude of sin." you see, "It's tremendous here!" see. So we never bother to check it with the second question. And you say, "What about robbing the Bank of England? What about robbing the Bank of England?" Well there's no reaction on that. Of course there isn't, you goof. He blew it. Have faith! Have faith! Your pc does blow things!

The magnitude has nothing about it whatsoever. You say, "Well, have you ever raped anyone?" and the pc heaves a terrible sigh and, "Ahhhh-aaaah. Yes. Well, actually my sister and my mother and my grandmother. Yes."

And you say, "Boy! That's really a juicy line!" you know, and put your E-Meter aside—you just haven't carried out your drill, see. Because all too often you say to him, "All right, thank you. I got that. Now, have you ever raped anyone? That's clear, thank you." you never vary the drill. You see how you can make the error? So you're trying to form up What questions on things that have blown.

Doesn't much matter, doesn't much matter what the magnitude is, is did the pc blow it? Because let me tell you, if he let you in on the exact point on the chain, it has no underpinning. See, he didn't steal part of the Bank of England when he was two and steal another part of it when he was six, you see. And falsified checks on it when he was ten. And then steal the whole thing when he was twenty-two. This wasn't the way he went about it. He just robbed the Bank of England! Boom! No chain. If there's no chain, it'll blow. This is your pc—has never made a career out of missing—getting you to miss withholds on him.

See, it's a this-lifetime activity, last few years. Doesn't—isn't going to make any chain. There's nothing unknown about it, particularly. You get in, prepcheck this thing on the basis, "Has anyone ever failed to find out anything about you?" That's the last two hundred trillion years. Oh, I think that would be very fruitful. You 11 get all kinds of wild things. As a matter of fact you'd go on and on and on, prepchecking with a Zero of that particular type. After a while you're liable to blow it, too, but it'd be too gruesome. It's too wide.

You see, now, where middle rudiments are handled one way and how beginning, middle and end rudiments, bear some resemblance to that Sec-Check-question-type procedure? Don't get the two mixed up, though. Because you're always willing to do something about a rudiment if it was wildly out. But you're going to do the shortest, quickest thing and you're only going to do something about it if you can't get it to blow right now. It's perfectly— perfectly valid, to find the thing's still alive and not want to spend any more time on it. You've checked it, you say, "Was there a little more to that?" It's still knocking, see.

"Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?"

The guy says, "I had a nightmare all last night." Well, yesterday this thing was clean, so it couldn't—couldn't be very much. And the fellow says, "Oh, well, yeah, well, I criticized you all during dinner last night to one of your fellow students."

And you say, "All right, good. All right, I'll check that. Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties? Thank you, that's clear." You understand?

I mean you could ans I'll go through the drill: "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" Clang! See. You say, "What's that? That? That? What are you thinking of there? There?"

"Oh, well, I had nightmares all night last night about you."

And you say, "All right, good. Now, I'll check that. Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" Tick, tick, the thing has still—still got something on that. "Is there a little more to that? Little something else there?"

"Oh, yeah. I talked to a friend of yours last night at dinner and told him how terrible you were as an auditor."

And you say, "Good, thank you very much. Now, Ill check that. Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties? That's clean, thank you very much."

That's all you do about it, see. Got the idea? You can ask it twice if you do the drill twice. You could actually ask it five times if you did the drill five times. What I'm trying to get—drive across to you is you always do the drill. The drill has a complete cycle. These are the errors you could make. This would be an erroneous—an erroneous action: "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties? Now, that? That? That? What is that?"

And the fellow says, "Well, I—I had nightmares all night about you last night."

"Well, what might they have proceeded from?"

It's, what mousehole? See? It's which—which way did he go? The pc gets this odd feeling: "Where is it? Where'd he go? Where's the auditor?" See? That's a totally incorrect drill. If you've asked an auditing question, you expect it to be answered. And you see how antique this drill really is. If you've asked an auditing question you expect it to be answered. Now, the only thing you're doing with the meter is making sure it was fully answered. See? You ask an auditing question, you expect it to be answered. You're going to find out on the meter if it was answered. I mean, what's—what's simpler? But you did it with a drill, so this drill is your beginning, middle and end rudiments.

Now, you're perfectly willing to shift over into a process. Now, here's the other one. If you're doing a beginning, middle and end rudiment-type question, it is with some trepidation that you shift over into a process. You're not going to process it unless you're practically beaten with a club. You're going to do this precise drill. You're going to do this drill at least twice before you give up all hope, see. And then if it was diminishing, on just what you were doing, for God's sakes, don't get in and do something else then, just repeat the drill again. And all of a sudden it's as clean as a wolf's tooth. Pc's satisfied, you're satisfied, everybody's satisfied. So don't lightly shift into a process when you're doing a beginning, middle and end rudiment.

But when you do, shift in fast and get out now. Don't hem and haw about the thing Don't go rolling up your sleeves and giving the pc. . . You know, don't—don't say, "Well, all right, so you've got a present time problem. All right, present time problem, let's see here, now. Just a minute, present time problem. Now what'd you say it was about? Oh, that's the one. All right. Now, let's see. Let's see—well, we don't need that. What—is it all right with you if I run this process on you? What part of that problem have you been responsible for? All right, that's what we're going to run. That's what we're going to run. Is that all right with you? All right, good. Now, what part of that problem have you been responsible for? Thank you. What part of that problem. . ." And on and on and on.

Now, you get toward the end of it, "Now, I am going to give you this process two more times and end it. If that is all right with you. Is that all right with you?" "All right. What part of that problem have you been responsible for? Thank you. What part of that problem have you been responsible for? Thank you. Is there anything you would care to ask or say before I end this process? Thank you. Thank you. Well, that's all right. We won't take that up just now. We'll take that up later. All right. Now, now we're going to go into the body of the session."

Now, that is entirely the wrong auditor atmosphere. The way you want to handle is quite different. See, now, you're just doing your rudiments, you're going right on down the line.

you say, "Do you have a present time problem? We've got something on that. That. Yeah, that. What are you looking at now?"

"Oh yes, I wonder how long the session is going to last, because I have an appointment . . ." so forth.

"All right, thank you, thank you very much. Do you have a present time problem? That's—still getting a read on it. That."

"Oh. Yeah, well, I had a row with my husband last night about Scientology."

"All right. All right, thank you. Check that now. Do you have a present time problem?" You see, the thing is not diminishing. It's not diminishing. And you say, "Well, have you—have you—are you satisfied that you've made a statement of this problem? Is this problem satisfactorily stated to you?" so forth. "That. Yeah, that one. That one. All right, now we're going to check this. Do you have a present time problem? I'm sorry, but that is still reading—about having a fight with your husband about Scientology. All right, that's—that's it. 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 very much. All right. Now, do you mind if I check that now? Do you have a present time problem? That's clear, thank you very much, that was the last question." Pssswww! He went that-a-way!

Pcs will actually very obligingly get rid of things, by the way, that they don't think you think are very important. You can actually do a tremendous, you can do a tremendous amount in weighting—w-e-i-g-h-t-i-n-g—a session. You can weight the thing up like mad. you know this pc has got scintillion overts of some kind or another on the subject of "vimenk" because every session he has come up with a goal for life or livingness, "To kill all the women I've known." And you know that he has some overts on this subject in this lifetime. Something has told you this. In other words your most fruitful sources of adjudicating whether your pc is getting there or not is check over his life or livingness areas for his PTPs. Because that isn't life or livingness goals, that's his PTPs. A wonderful list of them. Only never called them to his attention, until all of a sudden, you see, that's really getting there and you're into a Prepcheck of some kind or another, that's your body of the session and all of a sudden, wonder of wonders, he says, "Well, women. Yeah, I suppose I have done a few things to women in my time. I suppose." You can weight it.

"Ah, you have? Well, all right. Very good now. Let's—let's see if we can't check into it a little bit more here. All right, what was the Zero Question?" You've already seen the thing didn't clear. But you weight it, you see. "Women, all right, I think we'll be able to do something about this, now." you look at this very carefully, you see. "Been waiting to get to something like this on your case. All right, now. All right. Now, we want an actual overt. We don't want any of this thinkingness stuff. Now, we want something you've actually done to a woman. Now, give me, give me a good one. Something that's really significant, here. A good one. Good one. What have you—what have you done to a woman? All right. Oh, you soaked one's head in a rainbarrel. All right. Very good. Very good. All right. Uh—what—uh—what women have you drowned? What about doing something to women's heads? All right, that's it, brother. And we've got it now! What about doing something to women's heads? All right. Now, you've got this rainbarrel thing, now. All right, when was that? Yeah, that's good. All right, let's get, let's really get this now. All right, when was that?" you know, important.

The pc will say, "God, I guess I'd better dig on this, you know? That guy is all ready to fire, you know? No telling what's lying underneath this! Maybe—maybe I'd better get interested in this subject after all these years! I thought it was a natural thing to drown women and—apparently there's some social mores has been introduced since I came from Saturn!"

And he all of a sudden starts rolling it off and his responsibility level changes. In other words, by apparently taking responsibility for the pc's overts, just to the degree of being terribly

interested and thorough about getting them, when they really got on a hot line, it throws an element of responsibility into the session. They all of a sudden will come up with more data. These are just tricks of the trade. That's just trickery. But it works!

Now, you'll find that your greatest difficulty is shifting from the one-shot over to the process. Now, in a rudiment, you shift—you one-shot, you've checked it out, it didn't check out, for God's sakes, ask it again. Newly. Not on the checkout question. But you know, press it home. Say, "Well, it's dirty," you know. "What was it? That one?" You see? Check that one out. you got the idea? Take three complete cycles at it, at least, if it isn't cleaning before you surrender. And then move over into the process that you're going to do on it, like a startled rabbit and move back in again, you see, as though you have a complete allergy to it and it's totally unimportant to go on running it, you see.

All right, that is quite distinctly different from the one-shot question of the Sec Check form list, see. There you're going to ask him once, it is not clean and, boy, that's the one you've been waiting for. That's—your whole atmosphere is built up into; that is the one. We've been sitting here the whole session waiting for you to come up with this one, see. Now, we take that down, we prepcheck it, we check our What question, boy, this is dress parade, see. And we really clean that chain from one end to the other. And you get terrific resurgences on your pc if you do that. So they slightly bear resemblances to each other but they're different, they're different actions entirely, do you understand that?

Now, what you want to do, is get your pc flying Now, the thoroughness with which you do these various drills gets your pc flying. At first, perhaps you find yourself a bit tongue-tied in doing it. you feel terribly restrained. "Oh my God, I've got to ask the same question as I asked in the first place and the first question I asked was, 'In this session or any time during the last twenty-four hours...' What the hell did I say?" You know? If you didn't . . . Why, I pulled a gag on you last night, I asked the pc what I said, just to give you an idea. He told me and I asked him and he was satisfied. Even though it looks like you make a fool out of yourself, come out right—come out right at the other end of this thing.

And get that down. But a drill is a drill. It is done with great precision, it is done without any variation. But that doesn't say that your ability to talk to the pc is totally curtailed. When you want to find out something from the E-Meter, when you want to get a certain specific thing done in a session, well, for God's sakes, your direct address to the situation with the drill that does it is certainly your best way to make it happen now. Not to vary it off, but that says don't—doesn't say anything about don't talk to the pc. This doesn't say don't ever coax the pc. It doesn't say anything about, "Rule A is to get as inhuman as possible." It doesn't say anything about that whatsoever. Of course you can gib-gab with the pc far too long and you can evaluate for the pc and suggest things to him and wrap him up in knots. But, as long as you don't do it in the middle of one of these drills, when you're trying to find out something, it'll still be all right. You won't upset anything.

And the amount of talk which you have to do to get a pc slid over into the right What question, may be considerable. The amount of histrionics which you sometimes have to exhibit have to be considerable, too.

Pc says, "Well, there isn't anything on that at all. Never had anything to do with little boys in my whole life."

And you say, "Well, this is rocking What's it knocking on? I'll check it again. Did you ever have anything to do with small boys? It knocks. Here we go. I can sit here as long as you can. What is it? In fact I can sit here longer than you can, because you're worried and I'm not. Dig up something, I don't care what you dig up. And I don't care how phony you think the E-Meter is, just dig up something! Ever done anything to small boys, that's what we want to know, man. Go on, talk. I'm waiting Now, there's nobody under the sun, moon or stars that you could tell this to better than to me. Have you ever done anything to small boys? That's all I want to know. Now, I'm waiting"

"Mmm, oh, all right, you've told on one once. That's pretty good. What'd you do just before that, huh?" "Oh, all right. Very good. Now, thank you. I told you, you could. Thanks a lot. Now, let's get busy on this one right now. Here we go," see. We're off to the Prepcheck races.

Takes a lot of steering, takes a lot of doing. You think a drill cuts down. No, a drill leaves you more mind with which to handle the pc. There is the best definition. Okay?

Audience: Yes.

Thank you. Take a ten minute break.