

BASICS OF AUDITING

A lecture given on
21 August 1962

All right. This is lecture number two, 21 August AD 12, the Basics of Auditing. The Basics of Auditing.

Auditors keep asking me for rules, and they ask for more rules, and they ask for more rules, and they ask for more rules, and they ask for more rules. And then they goof in session, and they ask me for more rules. And then they goof in sessions and don't apply those rules and ask for more rules.

I think it's about time I gave you a lecture on the subject of the basics of auditing. This is very fundamental material I'm about to give you. It is probably more fundamental than HPA. But, it's a very strange thing that fundamentals usually come at high ranges of training. In other words, the fundamental auditing can be understood only after one has audited perhaps by rule for quite a while, and he runs into what the fundamentals are.

Now, that I'm giving you this lecture makes a fundamental change in training. Training from Class Y on up remains completely the same, you see, but training of the W and X units are shifted by this. That is your very low basic training, and HPA/HCA training is shifted by this.

Let me tell you what an auditor should be able to do and thereby you will understand it far, far, far, far better. An auditor should be able to get another being to be interested in his own case and to talk to him. That is the way that is. That's what he should be able to do.

Now rules and tricks and all kinds of things of that particular type — rudiments, auditing positions, various types of upset preventers—all of those things are contributive to getting this fact to occur. But remember they're only contributive to getting this fact to occur. Your E - Meter is only contributive so far as it applies to rudiments in body of session. Your E - Meter is only contributive to this fact as far as it applies to rudiments. Of course, the E - Meter has an entirely different function, which is assessment. But where you're using the E - Meter to get somebody into session and to audit him, you continuously go astray and become completely unstuck, because you try to do with the meter what you can't do naturally, if you ever have trouble with sessions. You're trying to make the rules and the meter do something that you can't do. Now there would be some reason why you couldn't do this.

That is to say you didn't want pcs to talk to you or you were trying to make them sane because they were so crazy, or someone's basic purposes get in his road on this. But some auditors, all they got to do is sit down in the auditing chair and the pc ARC breaks. Well, do you realize that this is getting worse? It is more apparent in sessions these days than it ever was before. It is more apparent.

Why? Why are ARC breaks very often these days so much more catastrophic and explosive than they were perhaps five or six years ago? It's only been in the last two or three years that you could really make an explosive ARC break, and that's the period we've been using meters.

Well, that's because the auditor can do this interesting fact: The difficulties that an auditor encounters are his own difficulties. And the mechanics he is using force the pc into session with an auditor who doesn't want the pc in - session or who doesn't understand the pc should be in - session or why the pc should be in - session. You follow me? And these rules have made auditing so powerful—the rudiments themselves have made auditing so powerful—that where the auditor is actually incapable of getting somebody interested in his own case and to talk to him, and yet is using all these rules to put a person in a state of mind—see, to be

interested in his own case to talk to him—but the auditor doesn't want the pc to be interested in his own case and talk to him. He thinks auditing is for something else. See?

The rules drive the pc into session and the auditor drives him out, and it kind of drives the pc around the bend. You see how this could work? Do you see how this could work?

Audience: Yeah. Yeah. Yep. Yeah.

This is very, very vital. This is very, very vital. How could this work?

You have the auditor sitting there looking like an auditor. The rules trick the pc into being into session. The pc suddenly finds out he's made a mistake. The auditor does not want to hear what the pc is saying. The auditor doesn't understand the basics of auditing. The auditor's just auditing by some kind of a set of rules. In fact there is no auditor, but the technology is sufficiently powerful to create a pc.

The technology with the auditor busy auditing—understand this—the auditor busy auditing, you see, with all these rules but not auditing then leaves a pc without an auditor. Do you see how this is? And this can be the most maddening thing, and a pc really doesn't know what's wrong. He's actually—a lot of tricks have been used on the pc to get him into session. And now he's in - session and interested in talking to somebody about his own case, see, and interested in general; and there's no auditor.

Now, look - a - here. We've been blaming meter reading, missing meter reads, cleaning cleans and that sort of thing. This is just another technical rule. Now a man who is auditing or a girl who is auditing by the basics of auditing—understood the basics of auditing and could audit by them—could actually miss reads and clean cleans on rudiments and session material and still have the pc perfectly happy and in - session.

Audience: Yes, yes.

Do you see that? But, a person who is cleaning cleans and missing reads must also be committing this other error of not auditing by basic auditing but auditing by rules which force the pc into session. Now the pc is only facing rules and a meter. The rules may be right, but the meter is wrong. There's nothing else holding the pc in session. And as a result, you get a very, very upset condition on the part of the pc.

Therefore, it's very necessary to know what basic auditing is. And I'm going to tell you the gruesome fate of the Ws and the Xs at the Saint Hill Course, including those who are present at this moment in those two courses.

The others who have graduated above those courses are fortunate unless they have been peculiarly unlucky—it's always "unlucky," see, it's never any reason for it—in not being able to handle pcs. And then they will be graded back into this W, X type training.

The first moment somebody appears here—we've got some more auditing space coming up shortly so we can do this—they're going to start auditing. See? If they appear here, they're going to start auditing. I'm going to take the meter away from them. They're not going to have any meter. And they're under orders to put all of their rudiments in and move on up the line—not with Havingness, see—move on up the line with some salient Prepcheck questions. And they can get out of that unit when they can have all of those rudiments in, checked by a meter, after the session.

We're going to make some auditors. We're going to make some auditors. It's a horrible thing to do to some people, perhaps. Think of it. You're sitting there and you got no meter, and you say, "Willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" And there's the pc, and the pc is in a particularly 1.1 frame of mind that day.

Says, "Yes. Talk to you about anything," you know, the frank - eyed stare of the criminal just after they robbed the First National, you know? "No, I wasn't even there. Um—I wasn't even near the place." Greenbacks in their pockets, you know? And be able to go through all of those rudiments, do some Prepcheck questions, get those all clean, miss no withholds of any kind, catch all the missed withholds, bring them out the other end with the end rudiments and no missed withholds, and an Instructor can check that all on a meter and find every single one of them in. See?

Well, they can do this, because they're going to learn the basics of auditing beginning with this tape.

Basics of auditing in rapid fire are very easy to state—very, very easy to state. Why does auditing exist at all? In the last two issues of Certainty magazine, published in, I think, July and August in London, you find a critique of psychoanalysis. It's an old article - 1956—but is possessed of several terrible and unavoidable truths of what psychoanalysis did wrong. It's pats on the back in there for old Papa Freud. I'm not kicking Freud's head in particularly. But we had to know what psychoanalysis was doing wrong. What did psychoanalysis do wrong?

Frankly, no auditing ever existed in psychoanalysis. Nobody in psychoanalysis was ever permitted to be in - session—never permitted to be—but went into session accidentally. And it's no accident—now this is a figure that you—it's something like "All jewelers—jewelers never go anywhere." You know, it's one of those horrible, broad generalities.

Thirty - three percent of people going to psychoanalysts, according to the records in the United States based on the 40s (and these records, you see, are not very public), in the first three months (this sounds incredible) wind up in spinbins or commit suicide. That isn't given in that pair of articles. But that's the truth. But the data of why this is occurs in those articles, and any interested auditor's attention is directed to that, because it was a rather careful breakdown based on old technology as far as we're concerned—not particularly up - to - date in Scientology. But nevertheless, that told you why psychoanalysis didn't work: no, the guy could accidentally go into session and he never had an auditor. There he was down the track, and all of a sudden, "And my mother did this to me." Motivator, motivator, motivator, you know? "My mother did this to me and my mother did that to me and my mother did something else to me and awham - ljust - er - ooo - rowrr. And I—I was so abused when I was a little child, and oh, yes, everybody interfered with me sexually. Yes, everything was terrible," and so forth.

And he's way down the track someplace, and the analyst says, "Well, it's five o'clock now. That's the end of your period. Thank you very much. I hope you do well now, Mrs. Jones. And goodbye."

Just look at that, man. This could happen to a dog, you know? Nobody ever brought them up to present time and squared them around or anything like that. Hypnotists even have rules on the subject. For God's sakes, wake your patient up and slap him in the face and pour cold water on him. Don't let him walk out of the door and out onto a busy public street, because they very often do and get themselves killed or run over or injured, because they're still hypnotized when they leave the session, you see? Well, that's a hypnotist, see? Even a hypnotist knew. Psychoanalysts didn't know. I'm not jumping on Papa Freud. Papa Freud perhaps had all kinds of rules about auditing that we'll never hear of, see? Because he's not a well—recorded man, if you recognize that. He has fantastic numbers of interpreters. And he himself didn't write enough or put out enough dope, and he was not really scientifically oriented. He was more mystically oriented.

All right. Well, that just gives you an example. See, they made a lot of mistakes. Well now, do you realize that we could walk forward into a lot of mistakes unless we examine the basics of auditing. What, why is auditing—and these basics are very few. There's the mechanics of blowing something; why auditing works. Ask yourself that question, that burning question: Why does auditing work? See? There's such things as asking an auditing question, getting it

answered. Now, there's just that fundamental, you see? There's make the pc feel better. An interesting thing that gets overlooked—just that. That's quite incidental to auditing, but is a— is an underlying factor in auditing. I won't say that I have never given a session that made anybody feel worse. But in recent years, I give somebody a session trying to get something done, see?

That's fine. I'm very happy that they feel better, but the point is that, God Almighty, they could fall through the bottom of the chair and break their arm, and it wouldn't stop me from getting done what I'm trying to do.

Let us say we're—let's say we're trying to check out some Prepcheck questions and make this per—self—this person is going to stay in session, don't you see, while we do a Goals Assessment. See, that's what we're trying to do, see? Well, I just get in there and pitch and hammer and pound and do everything else, and they go to the end of the session and they feel better—wasn't even intentional. I don't care whether they felt better or not.

It isn't that I don't care whether people feel better or not. I do. But in that particular session, see, they could have—as far as I was concerned—could have wound up at the end of the session feeling like hell and they would have been better off, because we were now up along the line to do our next step and get closer to clearing this guy. You see, it's quite incidental. But nevertheless, the pc felt better.

You do a Security Check on a pc; the pc feels better at the end. See, this is an underlying thread. This is the golden thread that goes through all good auditing, is the pc always feels better. You've really missed the boat if the pc feels worse.

Let's say we're doing a Goals Assessment. It's one of those horrible sessions where we have not found the pc's goal and it lies somewhere behind us and we haven't found it out yet. And the pc is just blowing his stack and is upset, and we can expect everything going to hell in a balloon. A good auditor should be able to bring that session off with the pc feeling better at the end: goal missed, everything missed, everything gone to hell, you see, as far as the pc is concerned. The pc feels better at the end.

Now man, that's asking something, because the most fruitful source of a screaming ARC break is a missed goal. That's a missed withhold with magnitude! Do you realize that's why human beings are so inhuman to humans, just because every one of them has missed the basic purpose of every other one of them. This is what makes your Torquemadas.

Possibly the basic goal of Torquemada was to make people happy. But nobody ever found that out. So he knew how to make them happy, you know? Most of them could be happy if you tortured a few. Ha - ha - ha! You see how wildly astray the man could have gone? Why? It's a missed withhold. Nobody believes this Torquemada. Nobody believes this fact. He actually hadn't hidden it—just nobody ever finds it out. He could even have told somebody someplace on the track that he was trying to make people happy. Nobody ever believed him. He never got off the withhold, in other words. And eventually it got to be more and more a withhold and more and more a withhold and more and more a withhold. And we find a book that dear old Torquemada bound with his own little paws, which is in the Carmel library, by the way, off at Pacific Groves, California. It's bound in human skin. This was the great boy who made Spain safe for Christianity or something. Actually, there is a copy of that book bound in human skin. Interesting. That was our boy, see? Maybe his basic goal was to make people happy, you see? And he turns into a complete beast because everybody has missed this withhold.

So, you say—originally, the pc is sitting across from you, you got a missed withhold on him to begin with. You haven't got his goal or any of his goals, plus you haven't got any of his overts, plus you haven't straightened out anything that people have missed on him in this lifetime. Ha - hu! What's that make? Ha - ha - ha - ha - ha - ha. It makes a cabinet minister or something, you know? This makes a boy. Ha - ha. There he sits. We all know how it feels to

be like that, because before we got into Scientology we felt like that. We knew what life was all about. Rowrr.

Now, the earliest part of auditing is the roughest part of auditing, therefore. And an auditor who can handle new cases has to be far better than an auditor who is handling a case who has gone along the way for a while.

Now, this is fashionable in Scientology to believe that Scientologists are harder cases than raw meat. And that's only because you mainly get Scientologists to audit, see? You really don't collide with raw meat. Ha - a - a - a! Let's go out to one of the Johannesburg mines and just tap a black boy on the shoulder, just at random. Let's not get somebody who has reached for Scientology. He - that already tells him that he's accessible for auditing. He's reached!

All right, we just tap this boy on the shoulder and we sit him down. And we say, "We is gonna audit you. Ha - ha - ha - ha."

And he says, "Wus dat?"

Well, that would be an interesting test of an auditor, wouldn't it? Yet an auditor ought to be able to do that. I've put cops, newspaper reporters, all sorts of weird characters into session while being interviewed. And occasionally have them come around and ask for auditing - occasionally audit them; get their rudiments in. You know, that kind of thing. And let me tell you, when I haven't done it, I've usually been sorry.

But I very often think that the guy is too rough or something like that, or he's too this and that, you see? He's too far gone. He's unauditably, and it's very hard to get him into this type of session, and I let him go.

So you see that type of fellow who is dead set against it, and so forth, he could be very rough. He could be very rough to handle. But you would be surprised at who will go into session and who can be audited.

The Detroit police, one time, came down with a crash on a center in Detroit, and they did the incredible thing, which has never been repeated anyplace, of seizing a whole bunch of tapes. And they had fourteen cops, I think, listening to these tapes in relays down at the police station. And twelve of them resigned from the force. That's a record, isn't it? That's truthful, it's factual; I've had the reports from it now. And that shows you that there are - people are auditable if you approach them right.

An auditor has got to handle the pc's problems. An auditor should be able to get a clean needle so a pc can be assessed and made to feel better. I don't care how he does it. Whether he even does it by Dynamic Assessment, he should be able to do it, you see? An auditor should be able to get things done in an auditing session and not audit for the purpose of auditing.

Don't audit to audit. Get things done in an auditing session. That's an interesting fundamental that is, interestingly enough, missed. People all will sit down sometime, and they will audit. And they audit, and they audit, and they audit, and they audit, and they audit, and they audit, and they audit, and they audit, and they never get anything done! Get the idea?

We had somebody - a team going here. I mean, won't mention any names. I had a team going here for a week. I was saying via the auditing section - I was saying get this one little thing done on this audit—on this pc, because this pc is having a rough time. This pc has continued to have a rough time, and a checkback shows that in one whole week of three - hour sessions this auditor was unable to get done this one little thing. There wasn't anything else to do for the case. It's just clear up a couple of questions, see, something like that. Had to get it done or the auditor couldn't have gone on, and yet for somehow or another went jockeying back and

forth and just auditing on and on and on and on and on and on. For God's sakes! Fifteen hours! And never got this one little thing done. You see, so busy putting in rudiments and making out the reports and handling the E - Meter and starting sessions and ending sessions and giving breaks and doing this and doing that, doing this, doing that. And they substitute looking like they're doing something for getting something done, see? They look awful busy, but you check up at the end of a period of time and you say, "Well, all right. That's fine, son, but what have you got done?"

And the individual says, "Well, we—we've got the pc's goals list in his folder."

"Yeah. Well, did you do any part of that..."

"Well, we didn't do anything. That was—that was completed before we—we started in there."

"Well, all right. Fine. Now have you—have you set the pc up? The pc got a clean needle here in order to be..."

"No. Well, the pc's needle is pretty dirty. We—we—it gets dirtier almost every day, I think."

And you say, "Well, have you prepchecked out the subject of clearing or you got something accomplished that way...?"

"Well, no. We were going to start on that here next week."

And you look at this long span of auditing time and nothing happened in it, see? Nothing got done. They did other things in order to get something done. You get the idea? Other things. They did a lot of other things, but they never got anything done. Seems like whenever they'd start to do anything, they would hit some sort of a via that led them into some other type of action, which led them into some other type of action; but somehow or another they never did get around in the session to asking the girl if she had a missed withhold on her husband in order to cure up these PT problems which have been coming up for the last twenty sessions. See? Never did get around to that, see?

Now, auditing actually consists of little accomplishments. It's a series of small accomplishments. It's getting something done. It is not going through motions.

Now, you should be able to get somebody into session without a meter or anything. You should be able to get somebody into session. You don't need a bunch of—you don't even need rules or anything. You get somebody in session. How do you do that? A lot of people have this as a sort of a gift they call it. They make terrific auditors. They've already crossed this little bridge, so they can get somebody interested in their own case and willing to talk to them. That's all it takes, see? And that's without any artificial aids of any kind whatsoever. And they can get somebody in session.

Now, an auditor should be able to allow a pc to blow something. That means an auditor must permit the pc to talk to him. And you'd be surprised how rare this is. You would really be surprised how rare this is: that the auditor will let the pc talk to him. A large trouble in auditing is differentiating between a Q and A and TR 4—and this is another thing.

An auditor must be able to differentiate between Q and A and TR 4. And an auditor must be able to handle the session and do things the pc wants done without Qing and Aing. And auditors who have trouble with this are just having trouble. It's almost willful. I mean, you have to practically sit up all night to have trouble with this. You have to work at this trouble.

I'll tell you the basic differences between Q and A and doing something. Q and A is a very simple thing; it's just not accepting the pc's answer. That's all a Q and A is. You question the answer of the pc. I mean, how simple can it get? Isn't anything more simple than that. Don't

question his answers. And everybody comes around and they want to know rules: how you're not supposed to question their answers. Oh, no! Please. I can't substitute for somebody's lack of understanding of anything. Oh, I can do a lot, man, but that's pretty—that's asking it, you know?

In other words, let the pc talk to you and you'll never have any difficulties with Q and A. See, people who Q - and - A do not want the pc to talk to them. That's all. So they use a Q and A to keep the pc from talking to them.

You can just see them sitting there with an oar in the auditing session, and they use a remark—an evaluation, you see, or a comment or a request for more information or—perfectly, occasionally to ask the pc for more informa—you don't think he answered the auditing question, you better ask him for more information. But usually this doesn't apply to this, see? Or, the pc is asked another question without any acknowledgment of what he just asked, you see, or he's asked a question which is wildly off what the auditor was trying to do in the first place, you see? It's all a defensive mechanism. Or the auditor does something every time the pc says something. You know that will break down a pc quicker than anything else? TR 4 be damned!

Once in a while a pc gets so hot, so smoking, ruddy hot in the room, he can't stand it. He can't stay in session and he says to the auditor, he says, "Please open a window."

And the auditor says, "Well, I mustn't Q - and - A. Ho - ho - ho - ho - ha - ha - ha - ha - ha. Let him sit there and roast. Ho - ho. That makes Ron good and wrong, isn't it—doesn't it?" See?

Hell's bells! Go open the window! Say, "You feel better now?"

Pc said, "Yup," and you go on in session.

An auditor who never does anything that the pc wants him to do will drive a pc mad. I guarantee it, man. And a pc—an auditor who always does something when the pc says something will also drive a pc crazy.

Pc says, "Well, why were you going over that goal there? I had a little bit of withhold there. I mean, I th—I thought to mys—ha - ha - ha—thought to myself that's silly—ha - ha - ho - ho - that's silly; that goal is silly. That's what I thought."

Well, there's a variety of courses open to the very bad auditor.

He can say, "How was the goal silly'." See? Completely psychotic comment, see? He can say to the pc, "All right. Uh, thank you." ("That's good TR 4, isn't it? Ha - ha. That got the TR 4 in there. I—you understood the pc thought the goal was silly.") And he says immediately, jumping out of the middle of his Tiger Drill, "Has that goal been invalidated? No—no there's no read on there. Hummm. Wonder why not?"

Well, why not? The pc got it off just now. See? This auditor is in a fog, man, if he does a thing like that.

The pc said, "Well, I—I think that last goal, ho - ho, the last goal up the line there—I thought the last goal up the line there, the one that you just went across, I—I—I actually thought that would stay in." You know, the pc has dared open his yap, see? He's dared be in - session.

And the auditor said, ("I'll fix this. Ha - ha - ha - ha - ha. I'll fix this. Ha - ha - ha.") "I'll check that for you again."

What's this? That's using session doingness to prevent communicatingness.

Now, there's two things that pcs do: They ask the auditor to do things which, if the auditor doesn't do them, the session is just going to go round the bend, let me tell you; and they originate. And auditors who are having hard times with pcs never differentiate between these two facts. They never find out when the pc wants them to do something or when the pc is originating. They can't tell from the tone of voice or something of the sort. You could do all sorts of weird things, like make bargains with the pc, and so forth. You don't need to do that.

The pc says, "Heh - heh - heh, he - heh. That - that - that - that goal that - that..." He's pointing at you - your goals list upside down, you know, with his can sort of, you know, "Ya - aheh - heh, to ca - catch catfish - to - to - catch catfish. I - I cant believe that that's out. How—how—how can it be out? I've always sort of thought of that as my goal, and how can it be out? I—I—I think you've missed a suppress or something!"

And the auditor says, knowing he mustn't Q - and - A, you know, audit by the rules, says, "All right. Thank you. To be a tiger. Has that goal been suppressed?"

May find this pc hanging by a rope from his neck in the barn, don't you see? He can't keep the pc in - session; he keeps wondering why. He's auditing by all the rules, isn't he? Never Q - and - A, never do anything the pc says, never this, never that, see? Never, never, never, never, never. Well, actually, basically, he's not doing any basic auditing. So he just doesn't know his business. He doesn't know his basic auditing. He's auditing by some kind of a bunch of silly rules. Trying to make—you know, he's trying to make me wrong through having said a rule some time or other.

This is a rule that you can follow. Every time the pc says something—a Q and A is challenging, questioning the pc's answer. See? Also doing what the pc tells you to do is a Q and A. Well, that's for sure, but what's the order of magnitude here? There's a hell of a difference between running, "How many times have you gone unconscious?" as the process which the pc demands, and rechecking a goal the pc thought was in. There's a hell of a difference between these two things, you see? You sacrifice no session control of any kind whatsoever when just being a civil—a civil auditor and saying, well, cheerily, "Oh, right—let's see..." You're supposed to help the pc, man. Well, let me tell you. You don't help the pc ever by running his processes. You never help a pc by taking the process he knows should be run on him. Oh, never. Pc doesn't know.

The pc knows this is his goal, so the auditor says, "All right. He knows it's his goal, so therefore, we'll take it as his goal and we'll list it even though we cant quite check it out," see?

Well, there's a hell of a difference between that, you see, and just civilly—the pc says, "There's a racket out in the hall, I—I just can't stay in session. There's just this racket out in the hall," and so forth.

And the auditor civilly says, "Well, it will probably be over in a minute. Why don't you put down the cans. Why don't you put down the cans and have a smoke." And they do. And the racket subsists or the auditor goes out and say, "What the hell is going on out here?" See?

And somebody says, "Well, we're just changing the mop pails."

And the auditor says—shouldn't say to the person, "Well, you must never change mop pails while I'm auditing." For this is the nuts, see? He should say, "When will you be finished?"

Well, the person says, "Well, couple hours."

Well, you better find something—do something yourself or find somebody in charge. Let's get this thing squared, you see? Let's don't keep running into this. Let's not demand of the pc that he stay in - session under such impossible circumstances, don't you see?

At the same time, it may be a situation where, well, it's raining on the tin roof and this gets on the pc's nerves. Now you say, "All right. Look. Ha - ha. I can't do a thing about it," you say to him. "I'd like to help you, but I can't do a thing about it. It's just a tin roof And this is the only place we've got to audit, and there's the reality of the situation. It's going to audit on the tin roof." And then say, "Well, does it remind you of anything in particular?"

And sometimes the pc looks at this terribly reasonable attitude on the part of the auditor, he says, "Well, yeah. When I was a little kid, I used to have nightmares all the time. And you know, I used to have nightmares all the time and slept in a room that had a tin roof."

"Oh, yeah. What do you know? Oh - oh, okay. How do you feel about it now?"

"Well, I guess I can get along in a session," and he goes on in being audited. It's handling the pc.

Handling the pc isn't making him sit still and talk when he's supposed to and not talk when he's not supposed to you know? That isn't handling the pc. The pc, as far as the auditor is concerned, is a rampant reactive bank that is influencing an analytical viewpoint, and there's limits that you must not go beyond, of course, in helping out. And anything serious like, "Well, in this session today we're going to prepcheck."

And the pc says, "Oh, my God! I thought we were going to..." (This is the roughest part of auditing, is why I'm picking up goals, you see?) "Oh, my God! I thought we were going to - uh - gee. What the hell! God damn! I sat up all last night doing this list and now you're not even going to go into it!"

And the auditor says, "Well, I've got my orders here from Mary Sue to prepcheck you this session." Gives him Mary Sue, you see, as an auditor. He just backs out of the session totally, you see?

No. An auditor on the ball handles that. And he said, "All right. I would be very happy to go into this. I'd be very happy to do this. However, 'it ain't reading very well. And some time here in the very near future, we're going to find your goal and all will be straight, and I'm not going to desert you, and I'm going to raise hell if I get transferred off of you. I'm going to find your goal. Don't worry about it. From where I sit here, I think we ought to have a Prepcheck, and I think this Prepcheck will straighten out a lot of things and smooth the whole thing out and that's why I'm doing it. And if you can give me a hand here, why, we'll get through this thing, and of course the more you help me get through this thing, why, the faster we'll get through it. And we might even be able to get onto a few goals today. Ha - ha. How about that?"

Zip! Zip! Zip! Zip! See, you get a Prepcheck all down the line. In other words, you use the force of the protest to get your auditing done. A lot of tricks. You could probably learn it by the rules, but actually there's no substitute for an ability to understand and a feeling of humanness. See, there's no substitute for these things.

Now, why does auditing work? That is the burning question. Why does auditing work at all? Well, you could theorize on the subject of ventilation, and you could theorize on the subject of as - ising. But let's not theorize. Let's just take ourselves a look at the basic - basic basics of the basic - basic.

This guy has been going around haunted for a long time, feeling that the whole nation was after him, and then you find out he was Benedict Arnold, and this somehow or another blows some charge. This wouldn't be a normal action. You find a goal will blow charge. But actually just finding out the character was, you know, or something like that. This might do an interesting thing, you see, for the case.

Well, all right. You've gotten something done, and so forth. But how did this do anything for the case? It's because as long as only he had his attention on it, and as long as he had to keep anyone else from having an attention on it, it bothered him. And when he puts it out where somebody else can see it too, and he can see it too, he all of a sudden sees it too. And we don't care what other mechanics occur, don't you see? You can find them all in the Axioms and that sort of thing.

But look at the Condition of the guy who is withholding. He is not letting anybody else see it. All right. So he lets somebody else see it. And the other person says he sees it. Then he knows that it has been seen by somebody else and then he waits there for a moment for the roof to fall in, the clouds to collapse, Earth to open or the devil to appear complete with forked tail. What you're running into is the phenomenon of "no consequence." Axiom 10 hasn't fired. He hasn't produced the effect he thought he was going to produce. He was always absolutely sure if he ever told anybody about this, he'd, of course, be executed on the spot. He can imagine hordes of people swinging in, climbing in through the windows to get at him.

I know what he feels like. I've only hit one of these on the track and it was very funny. It was one morning when Suzie was doing some coffeeshopping, and we were hitting back along the track someplace and I was trying to pick up something of the sort. We'd had a session and I was trying to pick up something. Then all of a sudden I had the feeling like everybody was after me, see? Just for a moment. I spotted it suddenly where it was and where it was on the track and what I'd been doing at the particular point of it, and the feeling that they were still after me was almost overwhelming. It was right in present time, don't you see? I could practically feel the cops battering the door in there for about—oh, I don't know—it must have been over a second or so that the feeling lasted, see? I just knew that was what was going to happen. It puzzled me very much afterwards exactly why it happened for about three or four minutes, and then I added it up. It was a scarcity of dead families. Imagine that. Hadn't seen one for two or three billion years and all of a sudden saw one. Scared me half to death, see? I thought I'd done it! Yaw. Ooh. Horrible! And I didn't tell anybody I thought I must have done it. Somehow or another I must have produced this action, now withheld, and then I didn't look at it again. And it was just sensation of this and that. And just the process of ventilation of the thing, and nobody came in the doors, nobody came in the windows. The Galactic Empire didn't immediately send a despatch and a scout car to have me picked up for the execution, you see? Nothing happened. It's anticlimactic, whatever else it is.

Well, he hasn't made an effect with that one. So he drops it like a hot potato. And we don't care why auditing—we do care—but we don't have to go into why auditing works by what phenomena exist and as - ising and so forth. Let's not go into the actual complications of as - ising and all this sort of thing. Let's just look at this one interesting fact: that when the guy has presented something to his own view and the auditor's view and the roof hasn't fallen in as a result of it, or if the somatics turned on didn't actually kill him—and they never do, you know, unless you're listing the wrong goal—you get a sudden feeling of relief. You have ventilated something. They—various phrases have been applied to this basic phenomenon, you see? What you've done is, his attention doesn't have to be on it anymore because he doesn't have to hold it in. You've freed up his attention is what you've really done in the most common action. You presented something to view. The auditor hasn't knocked his head off.

Now supposing the auditor did this. The guy says—in this particular instance, the guy says, "I think I was, ohh, dead family lying there in a log cabin, and I think I killed them. Uop!"

And the auditor says, "You what? You murdered a whole family. Mmmmmmmmm. Well, I don't know whether I care to audit you anymore." See, we let the bird create an effect with this thing, you see? We let him—we haven't ventilated it. He still has to hold onto it. It hasn't been presented to view. I mean, it doesn't fall with a thud. You get the idea? I mean, a lot of things here go on. And, man, that thing will persist like crazy. Let's just look at that as a fundamental that something happens. That is blowing something. You call it colloquially,

“blowing something.” The pc blew something. You do it all the time. You do it all the time. Well, that’s what you’re describing.

An auditor who will not let the pc answer an auditing question will not let the pc blow anything. And auditors have interesting mechanisms by which they forbid the answering of the auditing question. They use the meter. “Has anything been suppressed?”

And the pc says, “W—.” He’s about to say, “Well, actually a—quite a few things. Yesterday, why, I was thinking about this and I suddenly said I’d better not think about it because I was supposed to study this bulletin, see? And so forth. And there was yesterday and a suppre—. I was about to say that.” See, the pc is about to say that.

And you say, “Anything been suppressed in the area?”

And the pc is just saying, “W—.” He gets about that far.

And the auditor said, “Good. Well, that’s good and clean. Thank you. All right. Has anything been invalidated? Good. That’s good and clean.”

The pc had about ready to say, “Well, yes. The suppression I just had was invalidated. I was just about to say that, see? But...”

“That’s clean. That’s good. Ha - ha - ha. Fine. All right. And all right. Is there anything on this you failed to reveal? That reads. That reads there. What was that? What was that?”

And the pc says, “Well, wasn’t able to re—.” And he’s about to say...

“Well, yes. Well, what was it?”

And the pc says, “Well, I—I was going to—going to—to tell you, there’s a—there’s a suppress—press—press read, and—uh - uh - uh - uh...”

“Well, what was it?”

And the pc says, “Well, I’m tr—trying to tell you. There’s a—it’s a - s - s - pp - pre - pre - a suppress read, and - an - an - an - and I was going to tell you about that too.”

“Well, what was it here, something you failed to reveal? Right here. There. There. There. What’s it? Where? What’s it? What’s it? Well, all right. I’ll ask the question again now. Is there anything you failed to reveal? That’s clean. I told you it was clean.”

Well, of course, no auditing occurs at all. You can actually tiger drill with complete impunity if your intention is well understood by the pc. You’re just asking the meter and trying to check and that sort of thing. You’re not interested in getting the thing answered. But there’s even a way to do that, see?

You say, “All right. On the goal to catch catfish, has anything been suppressed?” And “To catch catfish.”

“Ah, well, that’s—uh...” And the pc is saying, “Uh—that’s, uh—I—I—I—I had—had—had an answer, you know? I thought of something that’s suppressed. And—and so forth. And, uh—I had an answer there. I felt kind of suppressed in the session, just early on in the session, you see?”

“Oh, you did, huh? All right. Well, I’ll check that. On the goal to catch catfish, has anything been suppressed? Yeah, well, it’s—it reads now. What was that?”

The pc says, “Well, I just told you. I mean, I um—umf—give me a session, I felt something, bzzzzz, that heh - heh.”

“Oh, well, yeah. All right. That’s fine. But there’s a read here. And what’s that? This is the one I want.”

“Well, that’s the one I’m trying to tell you.”

“But well, this is right here. This read. This read. Suppressed. That’s the one I want.”

“This is what I’m trying to tell you.”

“Oh, all right. Well, what was it? What was it? Go on. Well, say it anyhow, and then we’ll clear this up. On the goal to catch catfish, anything being suppressed? That’s it. That’s the one. That’s the one right there.”

“Well,” the fellow says, “pft - ft. I’ve told you.”

“Well, it’s reading on something here.”

Pc said, “Well, it’s probably an ARC break.”

“Oh, well...” Auditor knows now he mustn’t Q - and - A so he can’t ask if there’s an ARC break, see. This whole thing would go completely around the bend, you see? It becomes a comedy of nonsense—just becomes asinine.

The way the mechanism works is every time the pc tells you something, you do something. You never Q - and - A. You could never be called guilty of Qing and Aing, you see? But still, it somehow works out that the pc says, “Well, at the beginning of the session, I was warm.” And you go open the window. The pc doesn’t quite know what to make out of this, see? He was trying to get off a withhold. You just asked him for a withhold, and he said, “Well, at the beginning of the session, I was sort of warm,” and the auditor goes over and opens a window. Why, the pc realizes if he’s going to get any auditing, he’d better not talk to this auditor. See that? The auditor never quite differentiates between these two things: of the pc asking him to do something and the pc getting off something. That’s because the auditor doesn’t understand what basic auditing is—the mechanism of blowing something. That’s why auditing works. He never reads this difference in the pc.

The pc is saying, “Oh, my God! I just suddenly realized something. I have been withholding a Suppress here for the last four goals you were nulling.”

Well, you got an interesting question there. That suppress is a pretty tricky button. This pc gets this off—, he tells you. You say, “Well, all right. What is it?”

And he tells you what it is and so forth. “Well, I don’t know.” You got to put in an R - factor if you’re going to do anything about it.

You say, “Do you think it affected those next goals?”

“Yes. Well, my mind wasn’t on them at all.”

“All right. Well, do you think it might be a good idea if we covered those again? What do you think of that?”

He says, “Well, yeah. Yeah, I better.” Well, that’s because he suddenly caught himself on a mistake. Don’t you see? This is—you’ve got to have an ear for this sort of thing.

All right. Here's an entirely different situation. Pc said, "Well, I just suddenly realized that you asked me a Suppress question a minute ago and I've been sitting here with an answer to it. Well, I've been holding my breath every time you said anything because I was afraid my breathing was reacting on the meter."

And the auditor says, "All right. We'll check that Suppress question again."

Get the interesting dividing line, see? Well, the basics of auditing include the mechanism of blowing something. And if the auditor always does something or Qs - and - As and does—says something else and never buys anything from the pc, nothing is ever blown. And if the auditor never, even on a Tiger Drill, makes any allowances for the pc to say things to him and never sets it up in the session so the pc can talk to him, why, of course, the pc never blows anything. And after a while the missed withholds stack up, stack up, stack up, and it becomes painful because auditing works because the pc blows things. And the auditor is actually preventing auditing from working. Of course, the pc will stack up and almost blow his head off like he was an active volcano. It's just the force and power is built up on this thing. Oh, the pc must be permitted to blow things. It's as simple as that.

The answer to Q and A and TR 4 and all these other interestingly involved and technically difficult questions is whether or not the auditor is actually auditing the pc or going through a drill, see? That's the difference. And inevitably, if an auditor is having trouble differentiating this way and getting into ARC breaky sessions, they've got something that is—they've got a bug on preventing the pc from talking to them. Auditing can still happen under these circumstances, but it's rather rough; auditing can still be very successful under these circumstances, but it is tough auditing.

The more the pc is in - session, the more understanding and the less antagonism the auditor has for the pc, the more the pc can blow, the easier it is for the pc to go over the road he's going over, the more auditing occurs per unit of time. These are the basics of auditing.

And actually, an auditor ought to understand why auditing works; ought to be perfectly willing for the pc to talk to him and also realize that the pc's havingness will run down and right on out the bottom if the pc talks to the auditor too much. Because then the auditor isn't really being talked to. He's being talked at in some fashion.

You don't let a pc go on for three - quarters of an hour telling you about how his mother caved him in. You can't. You'll kill him.

You see these little dividing lines? An auditor has got to know these things. And an auditor has got to know that when he asks an auditing question, he's got to get an answer to that question, not some other question. And when that question is answered, by God, he's got to buy the answer to it. And if he finds himself in the embarrassing position of the question having been answered, but he didn't buy the answer but questioned it, of being graceful enough and willing to admit that he is wrong and apologize to the pc and say, "I'm very sorry. I didn't realize that that answered the auditing question." You know, bang, bang! Everything would go back into shape, and he keeps going.

If the auditor explains to the pc why he didn't think that was an answer to the auditing question and how he was really right in challenging the thing, of course, out goes the session because he hasn't let the pc blow anything.

And your pc feels better as he goes along. Now, auditing is validated for him. He becomes more willing to be audited, less defensive. If he feels worse all the time, he becomes harder to audit. And you try to get a pc with a lousy, dirty, scrubby needle that's going bzz, bzz, bzz, and you're trying to read through this thing and you're trying to do this. Now that you got a Dynamic Assessments, that cures it. You see? But oddly enough, if you're a good Prepchecker, you can also cure it. And oddly enough, you can actually assess on old 3GA on a dirty needle that you can clean. And you clean that dirty needle. And you should be able to

do that. You should be able to clean up a pc's needle slick as a whistle. See? He's right in the middle of a rock slam. You should be good enough that you just clean up his needle, bang! You know? You ask him this, you ask him that, you ask him the other thing. Say, "What does that refer to?" Bzz. Boong! Bzzz. Bong! Got a perfectly even needle. You understand?

There's no excuse for trying to ask questions across a dirty needle. Of course, I will admit that I have spent as long as two hours, two hours and a half of a person's auditing time just shopping around for, "What the hell is this all about?" And then all of a sudden, why, strike the jackpot. Say, "Oh ho - ho, I get it. Yeah. I got it now." And ask the series of questions, straighten the thing out—pc assessable. Got the idea?

Pc would be prepcheckable on the thing. What turned it on? You must have turned it on somehow. It got turned on somewhere by something. An auditor ought to be able to clean up the pc's needle. Just similarly, an auditor without any meter at all should be able to sit there and just bleed every single one of these Prepcheck questions dry as a bone without another tick on them by just looking at the hunted look in the pc's eye, by looking at this, by looking at that; just watching that pc operate and keeping that pc talking to him until the pc looks nice and comfortable and relaxed and happy about that particular zone in question. You see? You ought to be able to do that.

You can't assess goals without a meter. At this stage of the game, you can't do it. Impossible! Period. Don't ever try it. You'll get into trouble, man. You'll have a pc so damned sick, he won't know whether he's coming or going. You're burying that boy, you understand? But you sure should be able to put a whole Model Session together without a meter within a mile of you—sensitivity to the pc. Don't get dependent on this meter to put a pc in - session. You should be able to—a good auditor should be able to put a pc in - session, put all of his rudiments in, make the pc happy as a bird, get a lot of things done and so forth. We did it for years with lots lousier technology than we got now. Ah, what's all this dependency on a meter? You put the mechanics in and take the human being out. And you should be able to get things done in an auditing session, not just audit for the purpose of auditing. And you ought to be able to allow the pc to get well, the pc to get up, the pc to have wins, the pc to do this.

If rules are so much in your road according to your understanding of the game, then you probably don't understand the rule. It isn't the rule is wrong. You just don't understand it. And it must then follow, immediately, that you're using the rule to audit the pc. And do you know a rule will never acknowledge anything? You could set a rule down in front of the E - Meter, and it would never clean or clear anything.

Fundamental auditing, basic auditing simply consists of getting the pc in the session willing to talk to the auditor; and then, for God's sakes, let him talk to the auditor. And then be able to use the technology that you have in front of you to make himself feel better and put him in - session, square him up, bring him up smiling at the other end. You should be able to do that.

Actually, you should be able to audit a pc without a meter for an hour and bring him up at the other end—Model Session throughout—bring him up to the other end, have an Instructor check the thing and find—with a very sensitive meter—and find every rudiment in, neat as pie. You understand? If you could do that, you can audit.

And today I don't mind telling you the reason I'm giving you this particular basic data has really nothing to do with the fact that we are making bad auditors. We are not. It has to do with the fact that 3GA requires a superlatively good auditor. It's not going to get easier. I don't expect it to get easier; I expect it to get shorter. You understand? But the more you shorten it, the more tension you put on the pc. So the more you shorten it and the faster you do it, the better you've got to be as an auditor. So I have been studying basics. And that's what they amount to. And, actually, auditing consists of no more than I have told you in this lecture. Interesting, isn't it?

So wherever we see ARC breaks flying, we don't necessarily suppose we've got a bad auditor on our hands. But where it happens all the time, then somebody is auditing "by the rules" but not sitting in the auditing chair. Something or other—the rules are somehow being misused to keep the pc from talking to the auditor. We don't care about an ARC break, and a pc blowing his stack and going to hell in a balloon. His goal has been missed, and everything has gone to hell and so forth, but an auditor ought to be able to sweat it out one way or the other and get the job done. We don't care about that. We're talking about a persistent, continuous action of the pc always feels worse, the pc always feels more upset, we never get anything done in a session, the pc is always nattering, this, that and the other thing. You got that sort of thing. We're talking about that kind of thing. And that auditor must be auditing by the rules, man. He must be auditing "by the rules" on a sort of a white mutiny basis, you know? He should never Q - and - A. The pc says, "You know, there's a tack in this chair and it hurts, and that's what you're getting on the meter is this tack in this chair."

And the auditor says, "I mustn't Q - and - A," and never removes the tack. Three sessions later—this has been going on for three sessions—why, he has a dirty needle and complains to the Instructor the fellow was unauditable. See? Well, I don't expect things like that to happen around here. Okay?

All right.

Thank you very much.