MODEL SESSION REVISED

A lecture given on
21 June 1962

Thank you.

First lecture, June 21st, isn't it? Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

Okay. Tonight's lecture is on the subject of Model Session, revised. It's revised and amplified in Saint Hill lecture 21 June 62, the one which you're about to hear. Oh, you didn't get that as a gag—boy, you're really slow. Look, come up to present time. Come up to present time.

Now, if you have any confusion, if you have any confusion about this Model Session, it's actually HCOB 23 June1, is the date on it. Actually, it's HCOB 21 June, but it's marked 23 June. Why? Well, because 21 June is today's Thursday bulletin. But this didn't go out as the Thursday bulletin. You see? It's HCOB 23 June, as a special designation. And that is MODEL SESSION REVISED. You're going to live with this one for a while. And you're up against throwing everything away that you knew, you see, because Ron has changed his mind again.

You most—you hear Ron has changed his mind again most prevalently on people that didn't know there was any stable data in Scientology, you know? If you hear somebody say that sometime, ask them for, "What's Axiom 3?"

You know, "Axiom? What axiom? Axioms?" We're talking about Scientology. You know? They actually don't know their basics.

The fundamentals we're working with remain relatively unchanged. But the further we reach into the never-never land of aberration and life and the mind and this universe and God and beings and catfish and kings and coal heavers and other odds and ends which you find about—not only in your reactive bank but in the actual universe—the smoother we can make it.

And this Model Session actually will make auditing far, far, far, far, far, far—the last far has an underscore under it—smoother than you have seen it going before.

Now, Model Session made auditing much smoother. And the earliest Model Sessions had separate processes. In other words, you did a rudiment and then you did a process to straighten out the rudiment. And all to date did this. But this Model Session is remarkable in this one aspect: It—that is, the only extra process which you need is the pc's Havingness Process. And because that has to be found and tested on the meter, it of course can't be a canned process.

The rudiments, whether the beginning, middle or end rudiments, used in this Model Session are themselves repetitive processes. You ask as long as there is an instant read on the needle. And the moment you get a clear reaction to your question, that is flat and you go on to the next one. You don't ask the question one more time. You only ask the question twice or more if it had an instant read. You ask it merely once if it didn't react.

Now, I refer you to HCOB of the 25th of May for what we mean by an instant read. And the—let's not let this one get by us again. Eleven-tenths of the auditors in Australia, I just learned, were trying to clear prior reads off the meter. So that would have been a horrible mess, man!

The one that makes the pc feel good, the one—you know, that's the only test as to what's right—the one that makes the pc feel good is the instant read, just like it's described in 25 May 62, see? If you clean off that end instant reaction—. Let's say the sentence ends with the word "cat," and you want the instant reaction which begins with the enunciation of a "t" on the end of "cat," see? If you have an instant reaction which begins with "c," that question is null.

You say, "Well, what about it if the pc thought of it before you got to the end of it?"

What do you mean auditing a pc that much out of session? That is just all there is to that. I mean, it's just . . .

You say, "In this session have you invalid—?" Read. You say, "Well obviously, the pc knew what I was going to say, so the pc knowing what I was going to say, of course you can invalid—you get a read—that's so—figure-figure-figure-figure-figure, screw the head on a little tighter! You know, get the azimuths out . . ."

Oh, man, that is wrong! It's only one—the only read is when you have stopped speaking and you get a reaction. And if you think maybe the pc didn't understand it, you read it again, grooved. But that would be an equivocal read—that would be it was reading almost on the end, but you were not sure. was it on the end or latent? You were just a little bit asleep at the moment the thing clicked. That's an equivocal read; meaning which, you don't know whether it was which or which. Was it plus or minus? Did it react or didn't it react? That's an equivocal read and you must establish the actual read.

Sometimes the pc is so busy figure-figuring reactively—got some circuit going, you know, making coffee or something—and you got this circuit going and it isn't true that the pc knowing the question will react to the question. If you think this can happen, then you think you are auditing the analytical mind. Then you would also think that the pc knew the answer when you ask him for a withhold and therefore you'll never search for the withhold. Because you think you're auditing a knowing being. And you're not auditing a knowing being.

So therefore, a prior read which would read on, "In this session have you inva—?" Read, see. You say, "Well, the pc knew what he was going to say, you know, and so therefore, of course, the pc anticipated the question! Ha-ha. Ha-ha-ha. All right. Oh, I'll just find out what he invalidated this session."

About a half an hour later of tugging and pc out of session and everything all messed up like fire drill, you eventually conclude that there wasn't— there wasn't anything on it. No, the pc was just making coffee in the reactive bank at that moment, don't you see? What you said had nothing to do with any reaction on the meter, see? Something else was going on. It does, too. Pcs' hearts beat. Pc with very low havingness, eyeballs click to the right—the meter will fall if the pc's havingness is in horrible shape.

Some pc all of a sudden—you'll see some pc, some pc whose havingness is lousy and so forth—they'll be sitting up this way in the chair, see, they'll be sitting up this way holding the cans and all of a sudden the meter will be reading at 4.0, see. And they'll decide, well, they're not comfortable that way so they're going to sit this way now, see, and the meter will read at 3.0. You say, "What the hell went on here?"

Well, nothing went on here except the pc is such a mass that the fact that the pc moved the body put the mental masses in a different place, so you got a different read. That's right, see? You got enough black masses which are pasted down against the pc's face, he can wiggle his nose and he'd get a read on the meter, see?

Somebody's showing you that they can make an E-Meter read, why, laugh at them, man. Because, yeah, you can make an E-Meter read any day of the—you like—they'll go—and so on. But you have to have the GPM right down on you, man. And your havingness just has to

be so that it's like strung wire. The pc's nerves, you know, you strike on him and he goes high C. You could play him in a symphony orchestra if you could get him under your chin. Havingness can run down to a point where a physical reaction causes an action on the meter. That will come up here in a moment; I'll discuss that a little bit further.

But the point I'm making is, is you want an instant read. And it's the one which finishes up with the auditor's major thought. And it is right on the end, and it is no place else. It isn't prior to the end, it isn't after the end. It is right on. Invalidated. All right, a "-ted" read. See? The read starts with the last "-ted." The read that started with the "inva-" is invalid.

Don't compromise with that. Don't think you all of a sudden have observed something that I haven't seen. Of course, there—you could be using some type of meter—you could use a meter with a built-in lag that is reacting to the next-tothe-last question you asked. But that isn't true of a Mark IV.

Now, there's no compromising with this. The most amazing precision occurs on that—most amazing precision. The pc doesn't get it telepathically into the reactive bank before you say it. Nothing else is happening here. You say, "In this session, is there anything you have invalidated?" Read, see? There's no lag between the "-ed" and the read. You see, it happened simultaneously. And here's what's weird about it, is it always reads exactly in that fashion. If it reads late, it isn't a read. If it reads "invalida-," it isn't a read, don't you see?

You know, some of you, sometime or another, are going to find somebody around who hasn't had the benefit of your training; they're going to come rushing up to you and they're going to say, "But the pc always has present time problems." And you say, "Well, let's see." And you put the pc on the meter and you say, "Do you have a present time problem?" And you're going to find that the needle starts falling at the exact "e" end of "time" and that the pc has a difficulty with time. He'll say, "I never can get him into session."

Well, the more you louse up the principle I've just been talking to you about, the more prior reads you start monkeying with, the more latent reads you start monkeying with, the more out of session your pc's going to go. So an improper use of the meter and reading against this Model Session can dirty up the needle and drive the pc further out of session than not using it at all.

Do you understand? This is one of these things that has to be used properly. If used properly, it's marvelous. It's something like gunpowder. You stuff it into the right end of the musket and point it in the right direction and it is marvelous. But you use it to light your pipe with and it blows your silly head off. And that's very true of this Model Session. Therefore, it has to be used properly.

Now, it is of enormous benefit to have a repetitive command Model Session. That's very enormous as a benefit. It can't be exaggerated because it isn't changing a process on a pc all the time; you just keep asking the same question that you ask over and over and over and you'll get the same—you get the thing cleared up that you ask for. You're not then clearing up some variation of what you ask for. Do you see? "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" Well, you'll finally clear that up, see, because you're just asking him this. But the process is, "What difficulty aren't you willing to talk to me about?" And that's a process, bang, bang, bang, bang, you see? But, of course, you ask the whole thing through each time.

Now, it has this beauty, is there's no variation in what you do. I mean, if you don't get a read you go right on from the point you didn't get a read. And if you do get a read you finish the sentence. If you ask him the question and get his answer and check it on the meter and you ask the question, and you know, go on and on. I'll give you some little examples of this.

This has another virtue: It is terribly easy to do once you find out that it works. It's very easy to do. It is so easy to do that nearly everybody starting in to do it has to do something else,

because they know that anything that works this well couldn't be done this easily. It has to be done hard.

Now, if you think—if you think that the moisture has to come exuding from your brow and splattering on the glass of the E-Meter for you to look like you are auditing, go back on the track and pick up the old strong-man act that you used to do, you know? Where you took these ten-thousand-pound dumbbells, you know, and strained and your muscles quivered, you know, and you lifted it up over your head and the whole audience could sit there and say, "God, that's hard to do! What an expert he must be! Look how difficult this thing is!" See? And they keep talking that way until some little girl comes by and picks up the ten-thousand-pound dumbbell and puts it under her arm and clears up the stage and walks off. You see?

Yeah, everybody has to some slight degree a desire to demonstrate that they are an expert because what they are doing is difficult. Everybody has that desire to some tiny degree.

The real experts are the ones who fool you. I imagine if you were ever down and saw Sterling Moss in his heyday and you got a close-up of that boy driving a car you would have had the impression: Anybody can drive this car! Just anybody could drive that car. Anybody could drive that well. Anybody could drive a race, see. Gravel shooting out from underneath the tires, you know, and everything going on, but you just say man, that's just driving a car, you know? An old lady driving down Main Street, you know? Nothing to it.

And the fellow that came in last in that race, his knuckles—the bones of his knuckles have burst through the skin, you see? He has sunk his teeth— upper teeth into his lower teeth, you see? His eyes are bugged out three-eighths of an inch. You say, "Man, he's really driving." He came in last, too.

Well, the funny part of it is the mark of an expert is ease—always. Now, remember that because you're going to fool students; you're going to fool people. They see you give an auditing session and it looks very, very easy. So they're going to go through this nonsense— all of you—some of you are going through this nonsense, all of you will go through this nonsense or have gone through it—and that is to say when you first sat down in a co-audit or to audit or took the book, there was nothing to it at all. You simply sat down and you said a few things to the pc, the pc answered these things and bong, and you got a good result. It's fantastic, you know?

And you go in to co-audit, you'll see a lot of birds sitting in co-audit, you know, and they'll be saying, "From where you could communicate to a head? Thank you. From where could you communicate to a head? Thank you. From where could you communicate to a head? Thank you." See, there's nothing to it, you know, just bang! bang! bang! They actually— there's no difficulty, they're just sitting there and doing it.

And do you know they have to go all the way around the dial to get back to that point?

The second you throw them a little more complication—see, they were all right. There was an Instructor standing there. Didn't know anything was to be worried about but of course, they aren't having any trouble either. Well, there isn't anything to be worried about. And they will go all the way around the dial before they come back to that ease.

So it looks very funny to see somebody sitting there. You really can't tell whether he's—it's beginner's luck or he's an expert. You see?

But in actual fact, you, time after time, will in futures be giving a demonstration of auditing or something like that. You'll be sitting down, some other people will be around watching you audit, you see. And you'll be doing a flawless performance of auditing and so forth and they'll all be fixed with the total impression that they could do that. They'll all be absolutely convinced that they could do that with the greatest of ease.

And sure enough, they'll take something like a script Model Session, they will ask the thing and they will get along fine and then the horrible unknownness of it all, you see, starts closing down on them. And are they doing right? Are they doing wrong? Which way are they going? And which way is up and backwards? And they just become all thumbs. You know?

People do this with golf. They do this with golf. They walk out on the links and they take a club, any old club, there's the ball and they haul back— 276 yard drive. You know? Knocks the whole top out of a tree at the far end of the runway, you know. And they say, "Well, there's nothing much about this game!" And spend the next twenty years trying to make half that distance.

So the simplicity of this is a fooler. You enter into it with the idea that there must be something else to do. But you also enter into it with all the alter-ises wide open. And the expert has had the alter-ises impulses flattened. See, he has the—he no longer has an impulse that he's got to do something else or he's got to meet an emergency or he's got to be brilliant at this particular point or he's got to be this or he's got to be that. These are flattened with the expert.

Your amateur goes along fine right up to the moment when the pc says something, "yeowll."

"Did he say yes? Did he say no? What do I do now? Should I? Shouldn't I? Let me see, maybe I'd just better avoid the whole thing. I'll go on to the next question." So on, so on and so on. Not quite right. You get the idea? He doesn't know.

So the next time he comes by this thing, he alters. And he alters badly. The pc said something different at this level so there might be something wrong with it. So this time he makes absolutely sure. "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" So he's got the word "difficulties" and he knows the difficulties and the pc told him—has told him several times that difficulties are something he shouldn't really be talking about because it—that is a charged subject and that it's really all right to audit, you see, be audited by the auditor but difficulties is a separate and different subject. See? He knows this. So he says, "Well, let's put another one in here; let's—is it all right if I audit you?" That was an old one, see. So he says, "Well, we'd better go back to that one because the pc has so much difficulty with difficulties." And he gradually shifts things this way and shifts things that way and the next thing you know he doesn't have the benefit of the workout and he's having an awful time.

He discovers various things as he goes along, you see. He discovers things. And as he discovers these things he normally does something else. He actually has—a person who is new at it is nervous at discussing somebody's problems with them anyway and they're liable to find ways and means not to do so and they go into all sorts of variations. It—they never give it a chance.

Now, similarly, you get Q and A going about the same way. You say to the pc, "Do you have a present time problem?"

And the pc says, "Yes."

And you say, "What is the problem?"

And the pc says, "Pretty—it's a pretty difficult problem. Nobody's ever been able to do anything about it. As a matter of fact, more auditors have broken their hearts over this problem than anybody else." you see?

The guy thinks, "Well, gee, you know, maybe this is something unusual here." So he says, "Well, you can talk to me about it," and leans back away from the meter and goes into a long and involved conversation with the pc. And if he's very, very new he'd probably listen to the earnestness and worry in the pc's voice and the tenseness in the pc and wasn't reading his

meter right anyhow. Actually he didn't have a read on "Do you have a present time problem?" See. He just followed the red herring, not the path.

Or the pc with this tremendous buildup finally tells him what this problem is. That, "I'm in love with you." See, something like this, you know. God! The ruddy amateur—the grizzled veteran says, "Thank you. I'll check this on the meter," you know. The amateur has gone all these years, you see, and nobody's ever said this before, and feels guilty. Does this. Does that. Takes it up, discusses it at great length. All of a sudden says, "Well, when did you first notice these symptoms?" Q and A, here we go.

But it's just these little points, the particularly disarming points, the points that disarm the auditor, the points that hit him personally, the points which are calculated to upset him or worry him. On these points he'll go adrift, become unusual, do something else, flub, fail to handle the thing And if he gets into a habit of doing this sort of thing and if he never does conquer this impulse, why, he winds up with nobody ever getting better. So he says, "Well, Model Session can't be any good." How would he know? He's never used it.

Now, this session is built with great care, with a tremendous amount of data back of it. Now, I'm not trying to give it altitude, but I am talking now about the amount of data which is wrapped up in this. Actually, the first Model Session—the first discussion of Model Session was, I think, about 1958.

We said, "Well, you know, auditors say certain things, see, and it might be a good thing if we patterned those things and made it easier and made it sound more constant." And that was all there was to Model Session.

Then the next reason for a Model Session was if you used the same session every time it tended to run old sessions out. That's a worthwhile reason. So that was why Model Session continued on.

And then here at Saint Hill it became the earmark of a professional-looking auditor. Just no— no more importance than that, don't you see?

Ah, but it has moved up into far greater spheres than these earlier reasons. Yes, it is nice for all auditors to be in agreement on what they say in an auditing session. The R-factor on auditing comes up enormously if you use Model Session. And now, if you have every question of the Model Session is the beginning of a repetitive process which can be run as long as it is necessary to clean the needle, then there's every reason in the world to have a Model Session.

Now, this session just used exactly as it's supposed to be used without departure going on down the line will get you some very interesting results just by the use of it. You put this person into session and you take him out of session. You know, no body of the session at all. If you did that, let us say, every day for three days running, this person would be going around talking about "my auditor." See, if you did a nice, smooth job of that fact.

Furthermore, it has this unusual power, particularly gripped up with Prepchecking or Havingness. But a pc's needle tends to smooth out if—on just repeated, expert use of this Model Session. Using nothing more than this. Your expectancy is that a new pc that you have might have a rather weird looking needle. You know? It might read five times before the end of the major thought and seven times afterwards. You know? You'd think the electrodes were better connected to the mantel clock than they were to a pc. You're not quite sure what's going on, but it sure has nothing much to do with what you're doing

You're looking at the out-of-controlness of the pc. See, the pc actually isn't in-session. The pc is running on a kind of auto. They actually are not powerful enough to generate their own reactive bank. The reactive bank is just running on automatic, you see? And what you say doesn't have very much to do with it. By the time you've audited him for about three days

what you say has a lot to do with it. And you will notice that a pc sort of—a new pc quite often looks like somebody who is keeping himself three or four feet out of the water, and then he will go down to head level and swim comfortably after a while.

Well, it's actually their concern; they never work out what's going to happen. And the main concern of people is they don't—they don't know what's coming off. They don't know what's going to be demanded of them. By the time an auditor's demanded exactly the same thing of them for three days running they all of a sudden heave a horrible sigh of relief and get comfortable—just that factor alone, see? If all these lines were gobbledygook that is what it—would happen.

Supposing you had a patter that was something like this: "How are you today? That's clear." See? "Have you been enjoying yourself this week? All right. Thank you. That's clear. Are you fond of clothes? Thank you, that's clear." Didn't do anything else than this, see. "Do you like fudge?" And then your end of session—your end of session rudiments were, "Have you been comfortable in the chair?" See? "Have you thought about anything? And do you feel like yourself? End of session."

Now, by some tiny little stretch, one or another portion of these might have been slightly evanescently therapeutic but I think you'd find all of those things rather wide. And yet if you did that to somebody for three days running and you used the same patter and did it exactly the same way, at the end of the third day they would trust you more than on the first day. Their trust would be higher because they'd know what to expect. They'd say, "Now, the next question he's going to ask me about fudge," you see? They know what's coming Well, there—your R-factor's high, you see? Their expectancy. They're never startled, always that sort of thing. And they would feel more friendly towards you. And their case would be just as lousy as ever, but as far as you, the auditor, was concerned, they'd feel more friendly and you would be much more real to them. And if you were standing in a group of people and that pc came in the room you would look more solid than the other people in the room. Quite interesting. You would look more solid. There's your expectancy—just establishment of expectancy. Now, don't downgrade that as a factor in Model Session, see?

Well, this comes to this point, then, that the whole effect of Model Session, for various reasons, increases the reality of the session and increases the pc's ARC with the auditor. So therefore, don't make this mistake: don't expect any question, any one question in Model Session to suddenly straighten out everything that's wrong with the pc. See, anything more than you would expect one button to straighten out the whole case. You understand? Get them clear, get them clear, but the first time you run it you've got a dirty bzzzz, the needle is going bzzzz every few minutes - bzzzzz. And for to—unfortunately, every now and then, the bzzzz occurs instantly with where you ought to get the instant read, you see? He's zigging while you're zagging.

Now listen to me. This you actually have never heard very well. That bzzzzzt doesn't mean you can leave a question hot on an instant read if the instant read bzz-bzzzed, but it means this: that you shouldn't get so confoundedly optimistic about cleaning up the bzzzzt off a needle with any single rudiments question, by asking for missed withholds or doing anything else. You take the bzzzzzzts off and the ticks and the tocks and the clicks and the clacks with auditing, not with a part of auditing. In other words, straighten out and smooth out the pc mentally so that you don't get all these zigs and zags on a needle and brrrt-brrrt-brrrt. That takes auditing

You will find that every time you run this Model Session the needle at the end of the session will be a tiny little bit cleaner. By the time you've run three or four sessions the needle will look pretty smooth.

Now, you'll get pulled out of the datum I've just given you by the fact that now and then you will have some fantastic luck. You know, every hundred thousand visitors at Las Vegas walk in and put a dollar in one of the slot machines, you see, and hit the jackpot. The machines are

rigged so it's every one hundred thousand visitors, you see. And the thing feeds you back several hundred dollars in a jackpot. And it's very delightful because the silver dollars roll all over the floor, you know, and get into the spittoons and everything And marvelous—you know, wasting money like crazy.

Well, you're going to hit this, see, you're going to go halfway down through a Model Session one day—discount the fact that you've been working on it, you see, for a week or two—and you go halfway down through a Model Session one day and you said, "Is there something you have failed to reveal?" You know? You're in the middle rudiments or something and "In this session, is there anything you've failed to reveal?"

And the person says, "Uhhh, ohhh, uahh, maybe I'd better tell you—I've been hiding it from you every session but the truth of the matter is, is I wear boys' underwear under my dress." And all of a sudden the needle's going this way, see? Up to this time this was needle motion. All of a sudden . . .

Well, this sticks you as an auditor. Whenever that win happens you tend to get stuck in that win. Now, you just realize that you have been already stuck in that win a time or two, haven't you? You all of a sudden saw something like this happen, see. And so after that you keep going, "Let's see now, how can we find this lady's wearing boys' underwear?" See? "How can we—how can we . . ." For a little while you kind of have the impression that every time you see a stiff needle that the—the person is wearing boys' underwear. You actually get stuck in the win. And you go on and on and on this way and you'll start doing your Model Session a little differently. You know, you'll just be watching it very closely, see—trying to cover the thing, you know, clear up the whole case on any one of these questions. See, any one of these questions and this can happen. Next time you get somebody with a stiff needle, you know— oh, man! You just sweat over these things, you know? Which one is going to free it?

Oh, it isn't which one is going to free it. You didn't remember something about the boys' underwear case. There was something you didn't remember about that case and that was that you'd been auditing the person for a week. And what you did was walk it right up to the point where all of a sudden you apparently pulled it all on one button. But you didn't. You didn't. You had been preparing the case. What you got was a sort of an instantaneous improvement of the case.

Psychoanalysts just blow their brains out all over the world with this one. They—they'll have forty, fifty patients and on one of them, one day, they say, "Did you ever have sexual relations with your little brother?" or something like this. And the person will look kind of haunted and, "Yes." See? And right away they're clean, they pass their Rorschach, their Wassermann— they pass everything and they're just in marvelous condition thereafter. You'll find this poor psychoanalyst for the last twenty years has been hunting in every patient to find incest in their childhood.

Freud got hung with what he got hung with because he had a piece of luck. See? He had a piece of luck and here and there and so he just assigned that to all cases.

Well, it's quite a few things that a case is composed of. For us to be at 3GA, to have Routine 3GA and to have Routine 3GA rather fantastically bringing arms down and needles going clear is the confoundedest magic that anybody ever imagined could happen—just a hundred percent clearing. You haven't realized it yet because you haven't walked into too many cases, you haven't—but it's going to creep up on you.

One of your reactions is, when you first do this is, "Well, why the hell didn't I start 3GAing this pc when I first got my hands on him? Find the goal the first day, you see, and then write all the lists the second day and I would have had a Clear." And you kind of—then—so you try that. And you come a gorgeous cropper, you see. Can't keep the pc under control enough to keep him listing and can't do this and can't do that and they aren't able to blow anything and they're not in-session and all of these other factors are deleted from it, you see. So our

concentration is on 3GA. See? It's on the doingness, the thing: find the goal and then list the goal and that is what makes a Clear. That is an inaccurate statement. It is good auditing with the technology of 3GA which makes a Clear.

The funny part of it is if you delete the good auditing you won't get a Clear and if you delete the 3GA you won't get a Clear. Oddly enough, you won't get a pc up to 3GA unless you've got something—you won't get all cases up to 3GA unless you've got CCHs and Prepchecking either. See? So it's all a piece. It isn't 3GA that is making Clears. It's CCHs, Prepchecking and terrifically good, accurate, smooth auditing.

Well, this Model Session, then, is a piece of clearing, to that degree. And all this does is tend to keep the session predictable and present time clean enough to be audited in. And that's what this does. It keeps the session predictable and present time clean enough to be audited in. And you get an undistracted pc if you go at it in this particular wise.

Now, I'm not trying to give you a sales talk on this Model Session. I'm merely trying to say, "Give it a chance." This Model Session will be released in this bulletin the 23rd of June. Probably be in your hands late tomorrow afternoon. You don't, therefore, have to copy off what I am about to say. So I'm just going to read it off so it will also be on this tape:

It's "Start of session." Of course, these—many of these things are the same as any old—other Model Session. "Start of session." "Is it all right to—with you if I begin this session now? Start of session. Has this session started for you?" If pc says, 'No," say again, "Start of session. Now, is this session started for you?" Pc says, "No," say, "We will cover it in the rudiments."

Beginning rudiments: Goals. "What goals would you like to set for this session?" You notice there's no read on this so "for this session" can follow it. "Are there any goals you would like to set for life or livingness?" Same thing, isn't it?

Environment: "Tell me if it is all right to audit in this room." That got shorter, didn't it? Now, if you were to ask the pc repetitively, "What is wrong with this room?" I don't know that you'd ever get this rudiment in. If you have the pc's Havingness you run his Havingness if you get a reaction on the needle. Now, there's two things you can do at this point. One is simply observe the instant read. "Tell me if it's all right to audit in this room." Clank! All right. If that instant read was present you must run Havingness. Do you understand that? This one has to be cleared too. You must run Havingness. Now, how long do you run Havingness?

If you don't have the pc's Havingness, you use old TR 10, see. How long do you run it? Well, you just better check this again a few times. "I'll check it on the meter. Tell me if it's all right to audit in this room. That is clear." See? "Thank you." We go on to the next one. You see how that rudiment's handled? Well, actually, there's one in the beginning ruds and one in the end rudiments that are handled the same way. But these are the only two things where you use any process other than the exact question.

Auditor: "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" And "What difficulty aren't you willing to talk to me about?" You find that will clear it up slicker than scat. See, actually it's a repetitive question. "What difficulty aren't you willing to talk to me about?" Of course the trick is he's telling you. See? "What difficulty aren't you willing to talk to me about? What difficulty aren't you willing to talk to me about?" If you ran that as a repetitive question you'd find out that you'd get—you'd get an auditor improvement.

Lay off this idea here—and you'll notice it isn't present—"Is it all right if I audit you?" because that violates a prime principle of auditing It puts the pc's attention on the auditor. So somebody who thinks that one has to be used will find himself having to straighten up something; if he'd kept his cotton-picking mouth shut he'd never have had to straighten it up. That is asking for trouble.

Have you ever noticed that your attention goes very suddenly and sharply on auditors who drop ashtrays? Well, that's just like dropping an ashtray, that particular question, so it's been dropped as a question instead of an ashtray.

All right. "Since the last time I audited you, have you done anything you are withholding" And "What was it?"

PTP: "Do you have a present time problem?" "What is the problem?"

Let me go back one moment and say about this, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" We mustn't lose sight of this old one. The definition of in-session is: willing to talk to the auditor and interested in own case. So this is, of course, a very trick package. You're asking him, "Are you willing to talk to the auditor and are you interested in your own case?" We're asking him in the same sentence. Actually, that is a masterpiece of condensed statement. All right. And of course, every time you say your—yeah, "What difficulty aren't you willing to talk to me about?" of course you're asking him to look at his own case and talk to the auditor about it. So actually, you put him in-session, put him in-session, put him in-session, put him—and all of a sudden you ask and it reads and you're all set. You haven't got any read on it anymore and there you go. It's in.

Don't worry about your identity as an auditor. You realize—you realize it isn't really the pc that is difficult, ever. And from the pc's point of view it really isn't the auditor. See, it's his conceptions of the auditor.

Now, you want to throw all these into full bloom, just ask a pc, "Is it all right if I audit you?" Now, he's got to think over all the reasons why it isn't all right and he's thinking about you as a personality and he's thinking about all the O/Ws, so you've got marvelous opportunities to miss withholds. Instead of that, carry it over on this other line and it's fine.

All right, let's carry on with this. "Do you have a present time problem?" "What is the problem?" Now, you know, "What is your problem? What is your problem? What is your problem? What is your problem?" is an old process to run out problems. You know a pc will always give you a different answer. You know, that's an old one. So, you say, "Do you have a present time problem? That reads. What is the problem?" The pc tells you. You say, "I'll check it on the meter. Do you have a present time problem? That's clear. Thank you." And you're away into what else you're doing.

But you could keep this up this way: "Do you have a present time problem? That reads. What is the problem? Thank you." Pc tells you what it is. "I'll check that on the meter. Do you have a present time problem? That reads. What is the problem? Thank you. I'll check that on the meter. That reads. What is the problem?" You know, you could keep that up for half an hour? No pc under the sun would be able to get a read every time, though, for a half an hour, I'm sure.

You just ask it until you run into this. "Do you have a present time problem? That's clean. Thank you." See? No last half, see? And the rule is in all of this: when there's—when it reads clean there's no last half of the question.

Now, of course, your middle rudiments is: "In this session is there anything you have suppressed, invalidated, failed to reveal or been careful of?" And "What was it?" But now, that's a package question. The auditor who is lucky slides over this, this rapidly, see. He says, "In this session . . ." It's just like you've asked four different questions, but you can get rid of it rapidly. So this apparently violates the instant read proposition. But, actually, this— these are the questions you're asking "In this session, is there anything you have suppressed? In this session is there anything you have invalidated? In this session is there anything you have failed to reveal? In this session is there anything you've been careful of?" That's actually four rudiments.

Now, the second you have trouble with this, it breaks down into four rudiments. See? If it's all clean you're just lucky, get off of it and get out of there, see? Not any one of those endings read. If one of those endings read, the repeated question is the single rudiment question.

I'll give you an idea. "In this session is there anything you have suppressed, invalidated? That read. What was it? Thank you. I'll check that on the meter. In this session is there anything you have invalidated? That's clean."

"In this session is there anything you have failed to reveal or been careful of? That reads. What was it? In this session . . ." and he tells you. And "In this session is there anything you have been careful of?"

But to keep the pc from ever getting confused I handle this this way. And you've heard me handle it this way. If he gets one read I give them the next ones in singles. See? I don't care which you do, but I find out there's you—there's a possibility, I feel, that he could get confused.

So, all right, let's give you an example: "In this session is there anything you have suppressed, invalidated? That reads. What was it?"

Pc says, "Oh, so-and-so and so on."

And you say, "Thank you. I'll check that on the meter. Is there anything you have invalidated? That's clean. Thank you."

"In this session is there anything you have failed to reveal? That's clean. Thank you."

"In this session is there anything you have been careful of? That reads. What was it? Thank you. I'll check that on the meter. In this session is there anything you have been careful of? That's clean. Thank you."

In other words, ride him singles. You get into less trouble that way.

All right. Now we get—of course there's body of session. Body of session is where the middle rudiments are used. And you start a process, if you're going to run a process, you start it the same way you always have, is: "Now, I would like to run this process on you (name it). What would you say to that?" See? It's the same wording. And then you get into your middle rudiments.

And then you've got end rudiments. Now, your end rudiments have had one or two additions here—with the half-truth: "In this session have you told me any half-truth, untruth or said something only to impress me or tried to damage anyone?" And the response to any one of those that reads is, "What was it?" And the same rules apply as apply to model sess—middle rudiments in the Model Session.

Now, the E-Meter: "In this session have you deliberately tried to influence the E-Meter?" And we get a departure here. See, there was a departure on difficulties. You have a different end question, "What difficulty aren't you willing to talk to me about?" See, not "What was it?" And we get another departure here in order to get it as a process. You find out that, stretch your wits as you can, "In this session have you deliberately tried to influence the E-Meter? What was it?" That doesn't go, you see?

"How did you try to influence the E-Meter?" is the question we get answered. That follows the same rule, of course. "In this session have you deliberately tried to influence the E-Meter? That reads. How did you try to influence the E-Meter? Thank you. I will check that on the meter. In this session have you deliberately tried to influence the E-Meter? That's clean." Then we go on to the next rudiment.

And your question or command, "In this session have you failed to answer any question or command I have given you? What question or command did you fail to answer?" Now, that could require a little stirring around in your skull. Because you got a read on question and command, you'd better sort this thing out and drop the one you didn't get a reaction on. Now, I will confess to this: that particular rudiment is not as happy as I would like to see a rudiment. But "In this session have you failed to answer any question or command I have given you?" We will find out that it will read question or command as an end line.

Give me your pencil. You know, you have just seen something change.

It's, "In this session have you failed to answer any question or command? What question or command did you fail to answer?" Now, please drop the question or command out. Did you fail to answer any question—or command? You'll get a clang or a clang Well, ask the one that clanged. Okay? So it becomes, "What question did you fail to answer? What command did you fail to answer?" Another package rudiment. Okay?

All right. "In this session have you decided anything? What was it?" (Give me your pencil.) "In this session is there anything you have decided? What was it?"

Withhold: "In this session have you thought or done anything I've failed to find out about? What was it?"

"In this session have you been critical of me?" Now, we can't work that one around to the stylized wording of having it all end right on the end or it would read this way: "In this session, of me have you been critical?" And somebody would say we were "mein kampfing." They will want to put "of me yet."

"In this session have you been critical of me? What have you done?"

Now, that is the—that is the neatest package that keeps in the auditor's mind from here on, this one thing: that when the pc thinks a critical, it is normally followed with a "What have you done?"

He, of course, will say, "Well, I thought something." Well, that's doing something. We don't jog him up this way. But if this wasn't clearing you could keep asking a pc, "What have you done? What have you done? What have you done?" and he would come up with something eventually. So this one is bound to clear sooner or later. Right?

All right. "In this session was the room all right?" And of course, if the question reacts, why, you run Havingness.

Also, at this stage of the game, it might be very wise for you to get a cansqueeze test. And if you had too little can squeeze showing on the needle at sensitivity 0, to run Havingness anyway. You never go wrong running Havingness.

By the way, the first rudiments—the first end rudiments ever used, I used at 42 Aberdeen Road—oh, no, Bay Head, New Jersey—to bring a pc back to the land of the living, having been way down the track someplace. And he took it as a process. See, I just kept calling his attention to the environment. And I'd been doing that on people rather consistently and that's the original action of havingness. That is where that—where all havingness came from. That's the first genus of havingness. And you find it's wise to end up the session by calling the pc's attention to the environment anyhow. See? So even if it didn't react, run some Havingness. Who cares? You can't make a mistake on that one.

You can always tell beginning auditors, "Well, there's one rudiment on which you cannot make an error and that's the end rudiment on, 'Was it all right to audit in this room?' Because whether it reacts or not you do—can do something about it or not." It's impossible, you see, to make a mistake on.

All right. "Have you made any part of your goals for this session?" And "Have you made any other gains in this session that you would care to mention?"

And end of session: "Is there anything you would care to ask or say?" And notice that is interchanged because "ask" is actually—belongs in English construction before the exclamation point of "say." And I'll bet some of you have had trouble with that. Well, that's because they're out of order. All right, they're in proper order now. "Is there anything you'd care to ask or say before I end this session? Is it all right with you if I end this session now? Here it is: End of session. Has this session ended for you?" And so forth. "You'll be getting more auditing"

Now, we go into this just a little bit further here and we still have the end of process . . . If you're running processes noncyclical, is the same as it's always been: "If it's all right with you I will give this command two more times and then end this process." And gives the command two more times. "Is there anything you would care to say before I end this process?"

That, by the way, doesn't even apply to a hav—that doesn't apply to a Havingness command being run in rudiments. That you simply end. The less time spent on it, the better off you're going to be. Because all these rudiments and everything in Model Session is run to a clean needle. So you're going to clean the needle and then ask two more times. Oh no, you're not, not if you're wise.

All right. Now, I'm going to just give you a very brief and rapid list of the most flagrant errors that can be made in using this Model Session. And the first and foremost is not being expert on a meter. You don't know how to audit a meter and you're just making wise with a meter and you can't read it for some reason or other. And of course, everything else falls down, crash.

And the next error is, of course, fumbling with script and not knowing it. You see? Not knowing Model Session.

Three is asking a question a second time when it was clear the first time. Huh-huh. You say, "Well, is it all—are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties? That's clean. I will check it on the meter. Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" Do you know that you will inevitably, I think almost always, get a read? Because you are alter-ising the clearness of the needle. And it will read your alter-isingness. If you don't believe that sometimes, ask the question twice in a row; ask a clear question a second time and then watch it and then ask—say to the pc, "Recall my asking it the second time. Thank you." And then ask it the third time and it's clean again. In other words, you can put an instant read on a meter by reading a clear question twice. It's quite spooky. You see, it now isn't responding to the bank; it's responding in a protest.

All right. Four is not asking the question a second time when it read on the meter. Of course that—that is just—you got an instant read, see—not ask the question a second time—you got an instant read, now don't check it. Now, that's murder.

You say, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties? That read. What difficulty aren't you willing to talk to me about?"

And the pc says, "Well, I have a horrible hankering for butter cakes that turns on at 4:32 in the afternoon."

And you say, "Thank you," and go on to the next rudiment. You've missed

a withhold right there, because he's probably got another one. And you'll find as a pc grooves in on this he will expect you to ask it a second time and you'll get the added disadvantage of the fact that it now adds up to a flub.

All right. Five: Not saying you could—you—this is another error: not saying you could not tell what the read was when you couldn't. You couldn't tell what the read was and you didn't say so. See? It was going bzzzz, bzzzz, bzzzz, bzzzz and you asked, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" And then just as you said "dif-" it says, bzzz, umph, bizzz, and biz, biz, buzrp. Now, if you ask the question a second time the pc may be under the impression he doesn't know what's going on and you've hung him with an unknownness. And you have to tell him what you're doing. You say, "I was unable to read that; I will have to ask it again." I've been saying, the read was equivocal—this mystifies the pc. You've got to tell him when you couldn't tell. Now, don't try to sit there and appear so wise and sage.

Never pretend on a meter reading. Just never pretend, man. If it was clear and you thought it shouldn't have been so you ask it again, you'll foul up every time. And never pretend that it wasn't, you know—never pretend that the person got a read when he didn't. This drives a pc up the bank, you know? Up the wall.

All right. And the next one is, number six, is failing to get in the R-factor by telling the pc what you're going to do at each new step. That's very important, telling the pc what you're going to do at each new step. Now, you don't necessarily say, "We're going to have to— we're going to start the beginning rudiments," and so forth. But man, from there on you'd better tell him you're going to start the middle rudiments. And you'd better tell him you're going to start the end rudiments. And when you sit down before you start the session, why, it's an awfully good thing to say, "We're going to have an auditing session." Very good. And when you start to get the body of session you tell the pc, "Well, we're going to prepcheck today." You don't clear these things on the meter. It has nothing really anything to do—it's just the R-factor. It wipes out his mystery about it all. And you can practically drive a pc round the bend by never letting him in on what's going on.

You simply sit down and you're going to run a Havingness session. He expects to have his goal found. Baaaah! Rudiments all fly out with a crash.

Part of keeping the rudiments in is keep the environment predictable.

And number seven: doing what the pc suggests. Oh, my God, that is horrible.

And number eight: adding unusual questions or remarks or making suddenly irrelevant statements. Always upsets a pc when you make sudden remarks or statements that have nothing much to do with anything. Yanks him out of session and so forth.

All right. Patter is what I have given you already on this tape—the way you handle these questions and so forth.

This does not take very much doingness. It isn't very difficult to get used to this thing. It is very easy to use it. Most of your trouble will be trying to do too much of it. Trying to make it too much something or other, trying to do something else with it. By that I simply mean adding four or five rudiments at the wrong places, questioning the pc's answers or any other of the bum ones which I just gave you. Okay?

Thank you.

Take a ten-minute break.

Editor's Note: HCOB 23 June 1961, MODEL SESSION REVISED, was later cancelled by LRH due to changes in the exact procedure. The theory and practice of Model Session is given in the lecture. The current HCOBs on Model Session are in the Technical Bulletin Volumes.