THREE ZONES OF AUDITING

A lecture given on
5 November 1963

Vas da date?

Audience: November the 5th.

Five Nov. - a Russian month. Five Nov. AD 13, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

Now, you're facing a cataclysm in auditing - a cataclysm. You haven't recognized fully that you can be found out! Not as a pc, but as an auditor. We've gone through the stages of finding out pcs; now we can always find out the auditor.

The tone arm. The motion of the tone arm finds you out. And if you are still in a state of wondering what it is wrong with the pc that you're not getting tone arm action, then you have already been found out. Because an auditor can get tone arm action at will. An accomplished auditor can get tone arm action at will.

Tone arm action has to be prevented. There are numerous ways this can be prevented. Numerous ways. There are at least ten or twelve ways per auditor. Now, if you multiply the number of auditors by ten or twelve, you will possibly have some approximation of the number of ways that tone arm action can be prevented. Because it's prevented by additive complications and a failure to recognize basics. A failure to recognize basics.

Today there are three zones of auditing. Three zones, not of just auditing, but three zones of applied Scientology. One is basic auditing. Two is case analysis. And three is R4. Now, that means - that means, then, that there are three zones of expertness and you should recognize these as separate and distinct areas of performance. It's, in driving a ear: can you steer, can you handle a gearshift, and can you start, stop, and run the motor via the accelerator? I mean, there are these three separate areas of action.

Now, this tends to reduce the amount of complication that you're confronted with. Because there's many an auditor will be doing R4 and falling all over himself, but doing it perfectly: writing down the items perfectly on lists with a calligraphy that is beyond reproach, who is reading his meter down to the finest point, who knows every rule, who knows every law connected with all goals finding, lists and item finding - knows it cold - and who somehow or another will go splat! And the pc won't make it and so forth.

Because there remain two zones: basic auditing and case analysis. And he could do the techniques and processes of R4 with the most surpassing perfection without once colliding with a win - not even accidentally. His basic auditing could be out or his case analysis could be out. He can do all the actions; he has no ability whatsoever to visualize a bank. Two goals in juxtaposition, to him means nothing. It means it's a thought in advance of another thought or it means something. He's playing mumbletypeg in the dark and getting his knuckles cut to ribbons. Because he doesn't know what's an engram and what's an implant and he doesn't know this and doesn't know that. And he just hasn't got his paws on these items at all.

He can do the technique perfectly, you see. That - he can do that perfectly, but the other - bluaah! What's he getting with it? Well, he'll get all sorts of balderdash for one thing or another. He'll do a perfect list and come out perfectly by the rules and he finds a goal "to be, do, have and find catfish." Well, bunk, brother! There was never such a goal ever invented anyplace by anybody! And he has found this by opposing "to dance." It just doesn't make any sense. But because he doesn't know what sense it's supposed to make, he then buys it lock, stock and barrel.

You see, the mechanical actions ... When I'm auditing these days, I actually do just about the most mechanical job of auditing you ever cared to watch. It's just pocketa - pocketa - pocketa - pocketa - pock. Totally mechanical. Pc says, "waterspouts in the firebox" - that's all right with me, you see. Ill write it down. Pc says, "to spit," and then says, "to orangicate," and "to jump over the moon," and "to wear hip boots," and says, "to spit" again, Ill just write down "to spit," because that's what the pc said at that particular time, you understand? And then says, "to catfish," and "to be a tiger" and so forth, and "to spit" - I'll just write down "to spit" again, because the pc said it, you understand?

All right. Now, he's running along and as long as he runs I don't pay any attention. I'm just there and I read the meter, and if something falls, I mark it "fall"; if it blows down, I mark it "blowdown!"; and if it's there it's there; and if it isn't there ... When I start nulling, if it falls, I mark it as a "fall"; and if I find two falls on the list or two RRs or two anythings (except a couple of ticks), I just tell the pc to continue the list, I don't care what the pc's saying and so on. The pc says, "Oh, well, that "to spit,' that's my goal," and so forth.

And I say, "All right, thank you, I'll check it out here. To spit." I'd say, "well, it doesn't read yet. Let's get some more charge off and see where we sit here. Now, here's your auditing question..." Just mechanical, you see. You drop a nickel in the player piano, man, and it grinds off the roller. You get the idea?

Now, that phase comes to end at one of two points. Either everything has gone off according to schedule and I'm sitting there looking at a goal or whatever it is, or it hasn't. And I've got a pc who's looking ragged and red - eyed and who's getting awful droopy and so forth. And at this point I become a case analyst. See? You can't even hear the gears click, but I've moved over into an entirely different department of auditing. New department. New sign on the door: "LRH, Case Consultation." I don't quite change my collar and hat, but I think if you were watching it you would see almost that amount of change occur.

Pc's been running things up to now and he fell on his head. See, I'm perfectly willing the pc go on and tell me anything. See, as long as it fits up and so forth. But now this thing has run into the wrong pocket and the thing has gone awry and I've got a goofed - up pc, and I've got things that are a bit not running right. See, it isn't all by perfection. Or simply the action - the mechanical action of finding something has been concluded, see?

See, if something went wrong, I consider the mechanical side of the picture is concluded. That's it. See? Just like you're coaching somebody, "That's it." Well, that's all with the mechanics, boy. You have just lost your amanuensis and you have just inherited a case analyst, see?

All right. The action either completed its cycle and finished, or it went wrong and couldn't complete its cycle. So it's quick like a bunny, out with the drawer, off with the robot auditor and on with the other hat, see? Now. Now. All right. Uh - huh! Now - now we're in the case analysis department. "Why did your grandfather have to marry the girl?" You see? We're going to get down to basics here.

Now, the data I'm using now is an entirely different set of data. It's how do banks go together? Does the goal "to be, do, have and find catfish" oppose "to dance"? That's just me, see; I asked that question. I look at this thing that's been found here, see, "to be, do and have catfish," you see, "and find catfish," you see. Does this oppose "to dance"? "Nope," I say, and I'm afraid at that point the pc could persuade, plead, do a mammy act down on his knees and would find me adamant. I would let him itsa all of his reasons - as long as I was getting tone arm action. But that's as far as I would go, because that's over in the field of basic auditing, which never completely deserts you and which we'll go into in a minute.

But he says, "This 'to be, do and have, and find catfish' was originally found in Los Angeles by one of the best squirrels there. And you see it, it rocket reads." And it wouldn't matter much. It wouldn't matter much. I'd let him tell me anything he knew about it as long as I was

getting tone arm action. And after he got all through telling me all about it - because he's now gotten enough charge off so that maybe my case analysis is a little more accurate - I'd just go through my act and I find out what's wrong here, because I know something is wrong.

Now, it isn't a matter of "Is this list complete?" or "Isn't this list complete?" because I'm not now being the listing robot, see. I'm being the case analyst. And I want to know how come this list is misbehaving! That's what I want to know. That's the first thing I want to know. What's it coming from? Is it something wrong here? Has the pc not been answering the auditing question? I don't count on an ARC break. You don't become a case analyst just because you have an ARC break and only because you have an ARC break. No, no, no. We want to know "How does this bank add up? Which GPM has swapped ends with what GPM? How has the pc managed to get himself into this mess now?" You get the idea? And I'm going to find the answer.

Well, there's a dozen potential answers - fortunately, very few more than that - and I'm going to find which one of these things apply and I'm going to straighten it out. And after I got it all beautifully straightened out, we find out, in this particular instance, that it was very, very simple: The pc has been guessing "What goal harmonics on the goal before the goal which we have just been listing?" That was what the pc was listing, you see? "What goal is an upper harmonic of the goal we had before the goal," when he's supposed to be doing "Who or what would 'to dance' oppose?" See, that's what he's supposed to be asking, see. Or the pc is saying, "What problem would 'to dance' resolve?" See, there's something goofy going on here and I'm going to find out what it is, or I'm going to find out what bank misalignment.

When we did "to dance," in all innocence - because I take it at any given instant that having gotten more charge off, our analysis will be more accurate than previous analyses. So I never count on any analysis carrying forward in time.

No analysis is valid after the date of the analysis. Why.? Because the accuracy of an analysis depends upon the amount of charge taken off the case. So at any future date, if you can audit at all, you have taken more charge off the case and so you'll get a more accurate analysis.

All analyses are subject to inaccuracy by reason of charge! Therefore, tone arm action in the interval, having removed charge from this particular area, will now make it possible for you to get a more accurate analysis. Any analysis you do is succeeded by a more accurate analysis until there isn't anything there to analyze. You got it? That's the only time when you never reanalyze or requestion anything.

On Tuesday - on Tuesday, we have found out, absolutely! equivocally! with exclamation points! with rocket reads! with a pc sell! with a total auditor agreement! with everything just flags going up in all directions! you see, small Guy Fawkes fireworks coming out of the E - Meter - every sign points to the fact that "to dance" is an actual GPM!

Yeah, but that was Tuesday. What will it do on Thursday? We are now analyzing a case on Thursday. Well, then, my analysis is never based on the comfortable feeling that Tuesday I had a right answer. At any given instant, on any analysis, it is only the factors present now which are analyzed. That's the only safe way to do an analysis.

You can make some of the most colossal mistakes. Let's say you're going up the bank, trying to find the PT GPM and you found the goal "to play golf" and you marked that down very carefully as the third GPM. You're a nut if you just keep on believing from here on out that when you come back down the bank, having removed two GPMs off the case, you're going to find "to play golf" Probably hasn't anything to do with it. See? It's probably a lock on an RI in the third GPM, "to recreate." Got the idea? But at that time, when you first were going up the bank, you checked it over: "Is this an actual GPM?" Brroow! You know, fireworks, rocket reads, everything! Oh, the pc - cognite, cognite! Oh, everything terrific, you see. Blowdowns, oh, marvelous!

It doesn't cut any ice on Thursday. Because Thursday is two more days of charge off the case, don't you see? So you're always approaching a more accurate potential analysis, right up to the moment that you attain OT. You're going to be horrified. You're going to run some goals perfectly correctly, absolutely, every item out of the thing and yet a few months from now when you're going - somebody's going over this case, they're going to find out that half the items were missed and three - quarters of them were wrong. Somehow or another you got by, however, and so forth. Well, that's the case analysis with the case that far upgraded, don't you see? So of course the analysis I more accurate.

Analysis is not dependent upon the auditor's ability to read an E - Meter" It is dependent upon the pc's ability to itsa. And therefore it's going to shift. The fond beliefs of Tuesday are where most case analyses come apart at the seams. Because on Thursday, with two days of charge off, you're liable to get some different answers that make a lot more sense. You understand?

You never take a case analysis for granted. These things are always taken conditionally. Always conditionally. An auditor needs a nice, full saltshaker sitting around under the corner of his E - Meter, you see, so he can always take everything with a grain of salt.

A case analyst is a skeptic. But his skepticism must not be so high as to undermine the pc's confidence. So this, again, is another frame of mind. An entirely different frame of mind. Your robot frame of mind: Well, the guy says, "I spit" and so forth, and he puts that down, and that's a goal and oh my, you got another one and that's another goal and he puts it down, "to spit" again and so on. And you - your frame of mind is, "Well, he said it, so we w - rite it down. And the meter said this, so we write it down and..." There's nothing going on here except that's what you're doing, you see? You can sit and dream about the weather, as far as that's concerned. There's no mental strain here of any kind whatsoever, see. That's an attitude. That's the attitude of the auditor running the process, you see?

Now we shift the hat. We get a different attitude. Not a challenging, invalidating attitude with regard to the pc, but an attitude of - which is best attended by the song, "It may be so, I really don't know, your story sounds. .." you know. This - it's not really a skeptical attitude, but it's the attitude of somebody listening to the tales of several travelers who have just come back from a far land they have not been to with different stories.

It's not a buying attitude, it's not any kind of an attitude. "Well, that's what it is, so we will try that one on," see? "Well, this is the best we can arrive at, so this is what we will use to proceed with - warily. Expecting all trucks to come off the rails at any given instant." See? We're proceeding warily under this.

The case analysis is always as good as it is at the time it is done. And is no better than that. And there's no reason to get misemotional about it just because on Thursday you got different answers. I've seen auditors go out and contemplate suicide, you see, just on this basis. "But on - but on Tuesday - but on Tuesday it was an actual GPM, and - and - and so forth. And it read, and everything ran, and everything ran along beautifully on Tuesday. And - and now I find out it's just a lock, not even an RI; it's a lock on an RI. And ohhh, deeeear, ohhh!"

Well, there's no reason to be like that about it, because the reality of the situation is, is that Thursday, of course, with more charge off, is going to give you a better answer. So you can always look for a better answer. All answers are taken conditionally. And everything you know about a bank and about a case and about how the thing ought to stack up is used. There's no stops. It isn't a basis of, "Well, I can't make the pc wrong by saying this, 'to be, do and find catfish' doesn't sound to me like an actual GPM. You mustn't say something like that, you see, because that would be invalidative of the pc. No, the thing to do is accept it and let the pc run out of RR in the next few minutes of play." Oh, yes? Yes? Like nonsense it is, you see.

You don't want to speak invalidatively. There's a trick of doing this. I'll show you an invalidation. The pc says, "You know, I - my goal - my goal is really 'to be, do and find - have and find catfish,' and that's - that's my goal. "

And you say, "Oh, yeah? All right. Okay. Okay. You want me to check that out? All right. To be, do, have and find catfish. To be, do, have and find catfish. I'm sorry, that doesn't read right now." That's not an invalidation.

This is invalidation - this is invalidation:

The pc says, "My goal is 'to be, do, have and find catfish.

"Oh? Mm - hm. To run. To walk."

Say something else to the meter rather than what the pc said and you're in trouble right now. Ill give you an idea. The pc says, "There's some more suppresses on this" - this doesn't just apply to lists, see - "There's some more suppresses on this."

"Okay. On so - and - so, has anything been invalidated?"

"Yes, goddamnit. What you just said has been ... Me! I'm invalidated." You know, ARC break, here we go, see? That's a direct invalidation, because it's basically a disagreement, don't you see? You've gone through all the actions of a disagreement. So you don't care what the pc says, you don't immediately throw it in his teeth and say, "Under no circumstances is there such a goal as 'to be, do and have - find catfish,' " without even checking it, and start answering. You know, well, check it. The pc wants it checked, Check it! No skin off anybody's nose - it'll read or it won't.

But you got this on the list - "to be, do, have and find catfish," - and that's supposed to be the last item on the list, and this is supposed to be what is opposed by "to dance." Not in your bank, not in anybody's bank. It ain't never happened, and it never going to happen.

The kind of a goal you'll get ... It's very hard to imagine what it'll be before you eventually see it and sometimes you get beautifully surprised. But you have an idea already of the kind of goal you're looking for. What would "to dance" - what goal would "to dance" oppose? Well, probably "to be sour," you know, to be something. It'll be some different type of action, you see, "to be funereal," you know, "to drag," you know, "to sag," you know, or something like this. It'll be some kind of funereal goal. Sometimes they're very clever. Sometimes they're very tricky and you can miss them. And they - you have to think about them for a moment, and all of a sudden you see that it would. But it definitely would oppose it. It definitely would oppose it. Not resolve it; it oppose it!

Bang! Goals are in opposition. It's white today on this bank, and it's black tomorrow on that bank. You get the idea? I mean, bang! bang! Direct oppositions. They make a dichotomy, you see?

"To be happy" is followed by "to be sad," and it's no more complicated than that, you see? So you can figure yourself to death in case analysis and so forth. But you should have a general idea. You should have a general idea about what you're going to get there. And sometimes you're very agreeably surprised - "to dance" comes out as "to be a funeral director." See, something like this, you know? And it's just a little bit offbeat, and then sometimes it takes you a little bit by surprise. And you could beat yourself to death by not accepting it, and so forth. It is or it isn't. But because you know case analysis, you know what you're looking at.

Now, if you got a goal like that, however, "to be, do and have catfish," as "to dance" oppose - ahh! If you just got through running "to dance," and it didn't run out of RR, it obviously was the goal. There's no doubt about that. But there's something messed up here someplace and

you better find out what it is. Maybe you overran the bottom of the goal. Maybe you got items in that goal from something else. Maybe the analysis of the goal. Or the goal looks all right, however; it doesn't seem to be bad off. So it seems to be - have the right line plot and everything, so ... You're not being critical in this particular line because it looks all right. So you finally - you decide, well, "to dance" - there's nothing wrong with that as the source to list from. That would be the first thing that would give you some wild goal like this as the only goal you could get on the list, you see. "To be, do and have catfish," see.

So there's nothing wrong with the source you're listing from, it looks all right, it checked out, you've run it and so forth. When you're just doing goal opposes, trying to get to present time and so forth, you're running it blind because you really never have a second check of running it. Final check of a goal is "Will it run?" not "Will it behave on the meter?" see, but "Will it run? Do you get a line plot off of it?" That's the final test of a valid GPM.

Now, then you must assume other things. Amongst those is the pc might have been out of session while he was listing it, might be an ARC break involved here that you hadn't suspected; you throw those things aside or accept them. Or the pc wasn't answering the auditing question or something of the sort.

So we go into some kind of a dissertation with the pc, finally decide the pc couldn't have been answering the auditing question. There's something wrong here. So you ask, "Exactly what were you doing as you were listing this list?" and so forth.

And you finally get, "Well, I was trying to list the harmonic on the list which just came before this, and so forth. And I was - I knew what it could be, because, you see, on - on just before 'to dance' - 'to dance,' you see, we had 'to be sad' and - and so forth. So obviously it's something about being leisurely, or - or something, and that would be what it ...

All right. Have you found the answer? Well, you'll find out that when things are wrong, your tone arm is wrong. Always. You're not getting action on the tone arm; it's stuck high or it's messed up in some way, but basically you're not getting tone arm action. When you don't get tone arm action you either have just run - if you're running, why, the tone arm action depends on getting the next item. But this thing - this tone arm action is pretty extreme and you've made an error of some kind or another. Well, when you get that straightened out, that tone arm action will correct. Soon as you get your tone arm action corrected and looking a little bit better and you got the answer to what this is all about and so forth, you got the answer.

Now, at that moment you remove your hat as a case analyst and you put it in the drawer and you take out your hat as a mechanical auditor and you put it on, and you say, "This is the auditing question. This, this is the auditing question. The auditing question is: What goal would 'to dance' oppose? Now have you got that? You know we went a little bit astray just a moment ago."

The pc is saying, "Rrraah, rrraah."

"A little astray, you know, just a moment ago, not answering the auditing question. So let's make sure we answer this auditing question real good, and so on. You're doing fine, all right, but let's get the auditing question answered now. Now, what goal would 'to dance' oppose? All right. Th - th - th - that, th - th - th - that, th - th - th - that, that, that," and you get the list. Go through all the rules and - just mechanical - and you come up smiling bright.

That's all there is to it. There's two hats and one of them is always in the drawer.

The speed with which you shift these hats is sometimes rather bewildering. But it's actually a hat shift. So it isn't something that you should get all tangled up about and get your feet all wound up in the rope with. Because in actual fact you are never the mechanical listing auditor and the case analyst at the same tune. And you are never the mechanical auditor when there's something wrong with the case. You can't do the job, so you obviously are a case analyst.

And after the case is straightened out, there is no more need for case analysis. That's another point you should keep in mind. If there's nothing to analyze, don't analyze. If everything's going along "smouthily" now, why, you go along "smouthily" back to your mechanical auditor hat, see. Let's not start making trouble for the pc as a case analyst. Let's not start showing off

You've found the answer; you've restored the case; the pc is cheerful; the tone arm is now in a reasonable situation; life, it looks much brighter to one and all. Well, this is the point where you should take off the case analyst badge - hat, and put it in the drawer and put back on the mechanical auditor hat, Da - da - da - da, de - de - de - de - da, de - de - de - de - da, de - de - de - de - da, just all sweetness and light. And you're not saying, "Is that an actual GPM? Are you sure you're listing right, now ... You ... Well, I wonder if that is ... So on and so on. You're doing uvruh - rrhur - urh . . ." No, no, no, it's just all sweetness and light, ta - da - da - da. The pc says, "Oranges are black"; you say, "Okay, thank you, good, fine." Anything he says - "All right." Got the idea?

Well, so that takes down your complications to a considerable extent - to compartment your actions, see. If you try to run both of these actions at the same time you'll go mad. You'll be under such tension that you will develop GPMs with it.

Now, there's one hat which you wear all the time. All the time, all the time, all the time. Even though you're shifting these other two hats, you've got another hat on the back of your head. And that is the basic auditing hat. And if you can't do the basic auditing hat, then it doesn't matter how brilliant you are as a case analyst.

It doesn't matter how marvelously mechanical you are - and believe me, it's marvelous to be that mechanical, you know, for just your R4 hat. It takes a lot of skill just to sit back there and just do nothing but "So, the sun is shining and everything is fine."

The pc says, "There are fire engines in the beauty shop," and you write down "There are fire engines in the beauty shop," go to hell, we don't care. Everything's fine, but your basic auditor hat could be wrong and prevent you from doing that.

If your basic auditor hat is wrong, both of these hats go wrong no matter how well skilled you are in both of them. You could be a case analyst with exclamation points halfway down the wall. You could know R4 backwards and upside down, count the name, rank and serial number of every bulletin which ever carried a listing rule on it and so forth, and be able to do shorthand Pitman and Gregg simultaneously with three different pencils on three different lists on three different pcs and you still wouldn't make any OTs. Because the basic auditor hat is the third hat and it's worn all the time.

And it's not a complicated hat. It starts originally with TR 0. Whatever other TRs you have, it still starts originally with TR 0, which is being able to sit in the session and confront the pc, you see? And it goes up to TR 1, giving an auditing command that somebody can hear and understand and that impinges on somebody. And giving an acknowledgment when one is needed! Not giving acknowledgments when they're not needed and forgetting to give them when they are. Guy's going on, te - te - te - ta, bur - te - ta, bu - de - ta, de - yap, yap - yap - yap - yapple - yapple - yapple - yapple - yapple - yapple - yapple - yapple - yappleyapple - yapple - yapple. Your TR 2 has got to be good enough just to go on and on and on and on and on. You acknowledge the completion of a cycle of action. Well, you've asked a whatsit and the pc hasn't completed the itsa. So you sure don't acknowledge. Because the acknowledge is a stop point. So it's gauging the cycle of action which you're handling. That's basic auditing. What's the extent and length of this cycle of action? One whatsit and fifty itsas? All right, therefore at the fiftieth itsa, you say, "Good." Is the length of it one whatsit and one itsa? So therefore at the length of the itsa - one itsa, you say, "Good." That's elementary, see?

The complete cycle of action of the whatsit and itsa is followed by a TR 2. Now, you've got yourself a great big lot of ability if you can do that.

You know, basic auditing has practically nothing to do with anything I that anybody thinks it has anything to do with, you know? It's giving somebody something to talk about and letting him talk and telling him he has talked when he has talked, you see? And when he originates and says, "You know, that goal, 'to be, have, do and dance catfish,' you know, that - that - that - that thing that we had, and so forth. .." you don't immediately jump in and say, "That was 'to be, do, have and find catfish.' That was 'to be, do, have and find catfish' that you found, not 'be, do, have and dance catfish.' That was - that was something else. Don't you remember?"

So your Auditor's Code comes into it, too, a bit. See, we've had these things for a long time, they aren't anything new. We can state them more smouthily. But pc originates and says, "You know, that goal we found, you know? I just realized that applies very definitely to my marriage, you know, even though it wasn't my goal it does have something to do with my marriage" and so forth; let him finish the cycle of action, you see, there, of that origin he's making and so forth. And he's run down, and you get TR action; so you just keep your mouth shut because he's making a cognition and so on; you gauge the point when he's finished with his cognition; you've understood what he said and you told him you heard it. That's just basic auditing. There isn't anything can get around it at all.

Now we add the complication into basic auditing, as part of basic auditing, of being able to run an E - Meter while doing those things. Run an E - Meter well enough so that when the needle goes ping against the right - hand edge of the dial, your thumb goes slip and rights it to Set. And when it goes tick, we know it has gone tick. And when it has rocket read we know it has rocket read. And when it's fallen we know it has fallen. And we've adjusted it and noted that thing accordingly, and this is done all the time when basic auditing is going on and so on.

So the woof and warp of basic auditing can get terribly complicated on this basis - on this basis, this fundamental: You ask most auditors, "What are you doing?" they will tell you what they were doing. But if you asked them this question: "At that point in the session, what happened?" they will inevitably tell you, "I did this, I did that, I did something else." They're more likely to tell you, "I so - and - so and so - and - so." They're not telling you what happened; they're telling you what they did. That isn't what happened. Because all basic auditing actions are coordinated with the pc. An auditor may be just going through some mechanical motions of some kind or another, but he is still handling another thetan and a full bank. And what happened in the session combines what the pc did, what the bank did and what the auditor did and what read on the meter. And there's four elements that comprise what happened.

Now, this is asking you to extend your perimeter of permeation. When you are so sucked back to your chest that you can't see beyond the other edge of your E - Meter, the chances are, you aren't going to be able to do the TRs either. But you're handling a pc and you're handling a bank and you're handling a meter - in addition to your own actions! And frankly, your own actions in a session are completely unimportant.

Ninety percent of a student's worry is about his own actions in the session. How did he hold his little finger of his right hand while he asked the auditing question? And did he have the right vocal intonation when he asked the auditing question? Was his diction absolutely proper when he said, "Thank - gulp - you!"

That's the most wasted show in the world. It has no audience. There's no audience, there's no applause, there are no observers. The most unseen character in the world is an auditor in session. He actually, unless he's a born exhibitionist, is about as visible - about as visible as a drop of water in a running stream.

It isn't that he isn't there it's just that he isn't visible. He's an almost perfect example of a thetan that isn't packing mass. And if he understands that his actions in a session are not the important actions of a session at all ... They're not the important actions of a session. The

important actions of the session are the performance of the pc, the pc's bank and the meter. And the auditor's actions are completely unimportant. Except where they get in the road and fail to promote the actions of the pc, the pc's bank and the E - Meter.

So an auditor consistently worrying about his own actions and what he's supposed to do right and what he's done wrong in a session ... I'm learning some of this from critiques people are making of their own auditing. Yeah, that's right. They're all critiques of their own auditing. I couldn't care less. They don't realize that I have yet to receive a proper report of an analysis of a session given on a tape. I have yet to receive a proper report. I'm still waiting for one to come in. There are some that are almost proper, in spots. But they all - most of them concern what the auditor did. Who cares? Do you realize the auditor is not going to get Clear on his own actions in a session?

Now, this is impressed on you by your Instructors, by the fact they do TRs - by your coaches - you're supposed to be able to do this, do that and the other thing. But a little study of this sort of thing goes long, long ways.

An auditor's actions can be anything they care to be as long as they are not destructive of the continuity of the session. An auditor, actually, runs mostly on a lack of action. See, he doesn't have to do this and do that and do the other thing, and not do this and not do that and not do the other thing. That's a bunch of balderdash.

Somebody's orienting his auditing on the subject of "I should not" and "I should," and "I should." Wi - o - wha - wait a minute, wait a minute! This is an auditing session and that's a third dynamic activity. The auditor's merely running it.

Now, it's only when the auditor starts putting his feet on the desk, and getting the shoes in the pc's face that we run into the not - do's. Or it's only when the auditor sits there tongue - tied and the pc's going into a big ARC break and the auditor's saying, "Well, let's see, the right way to itsa is to ... Heh - heh." You know, you ought to be in there pitching. What the - what - what cooked here? What happened, see? He apparently is not adding anything into the session; he's not getting anything done in the session; he's not directing the session; he's not getting the session running in any particular direction, so that's an absence of auditor.

Now, the pc ARC breaks and the auditor sits there and says, "Oh, it's perfectly reasonable. I have goofed, so therefore it's perfectly reasonable." You know, a lot of pcs been knocked in the head with this. In fact, I know of one auditor (this, actually, is not fully the story of it but just in passing) saw everything the pc was saying so reasonable ... The pc was already - for other reasons having nothing to do with the auditing - on the way out. The curtains were ringing down, the between - lives areas were yawning, and the auditor, however, did have a last - minute chance in order to make a grab back, see. The pc ARC broke over a period of days, actually, and the auditor sat there and said that everything the pc was saying was reasonable and so never tried to cure the ARC break. Well, the pc died. Sad story. But I wish to drive it home. That happens very rarely, but this isolated incident did happen, purely and for that exact and only reason!

The auditor knew that everything the pc was saying was reasonable. The auditor did not know how to audit well, the auditor did not know how to read a meter, the auditor did not ... You get the story here, you see? So therefore, the auditor sat and agreed that this was all true and a pc never ARC breaks for those reasons. A pc ARC breaks because of uncompleted cycles of action, bypassed charge. And when that's kicked into view, the pc ARC breaks and his attention fixates on the auditor.

Now, a session ARC break is where the auditor has gorgeously goofed, and has yanked the pc's attention with violence off of some charged object, thus not completing the ARC - the cycle of action of the pc's inspection. And so this causes a collapse which is very painful to the pc and the pc will take it out on the auditor. But in actual fact, an eradication of that sudden yank of attention is what is needful to cure this ARC break.

So the auditor who gets in a reasonable frame of mind about his auditing, an auditor who gets in a reasonable frame of mind about his ARC breaks, or gets unreasonable and starts protesting against it, simply doesn't understand the mechanism of an ARC break. His auditing really had very little to do with it - very little to do with it, except where the basics of auditing are violently followed. The pc is saying, "I've got a - I've got a large cat here on the table." And the auditor says, "Well, I'm not going into that now. Get that nasty cat off the table!" you see? That's liable to produce shock. But why'.? Not really because of what the auditor said, but because the pc's attention was yanked suddenly off the cat, the cat collapsed on it and you had bypassed charge right there, right then. And then the auditor did nothing to restore the attention and get rid of - locate the bypassed charge. Do you understand?

Auditors running R4 may go on for days, weeks even, with a big section of bypassed charge and the pc nattery and ARC broken. The auditor's saying all the time, "This is a nattery and ARC broken pc." No. That is an auditor who doesn't know his basic business. He just doesn't know his business. Had nothing to do - even case analysis. He just doesn't know his business! ARC broke pc - something big wrong. See? So that's the time when you take the basic auditing hat and add to it the case analysis hat. Basic auditing has gone wrong, so you add case analysis to it to make it work. That's all there is to that.

Auditor's never reasonable about an ARC break. If there's a big ARC break, then there's something big wrong with the case. It isn't that you have slightly misworded some little tiny RI in some corner of case - ugh - bluh! You got a couple of goals wrongly worded and backwards, brother! Great, big, husky GPMs are pushing this pc's head off. And then, of course, basic auditing failed slightly and produced the necessary lock to cause the ARC break to swing up into session. It all requires a little error in basic auditing to trigger the ARC break. A wrong goal can sit there a long time without ever being fired into an ARC break, until all of a sudden the itsa line is cut or imagined to be cut and the pc will flare on that lock into an ARC break.

That ARC break means only this: that there's something God - awful wrong with that case! That's all that means! Something's gone wrong in the case analysis department! Not in the basic auditing department.

The basic auditing department can always be improved. Always. And improved 100 percent, to absolute perfection, will not avoid ARC breaks; will not, all by itself, make a case run smoothly.

Given errors in the case analysis department, no basic auditing in the world, no personality, no, "I am a holy man, and everything in my vicinity, of course, runs calmly. I permeate peace." That's not going to prevent an ARC break, brother. You found a wrong goal and you listed it upside down. There's only one thing going to straighten that out, and that's finding it's a wrong goal and that it was upside down. You understand?

So that comes back into the case analysis department. But basic auditing is something we do smoothly, not self - critically. We do a very smooth job of basic auditing. And that's what we do in basic auditing. We don't do de - de - de - de - da, and then not do de - de - de - da, and bu - da - da - bup, but if you de - de - de - de - da, you will dav - dva - dva - dva - vaw. And - and if you get criss - crossed up, and if the pc says, 'A - wig - a - wag," you never say, "Ka - pow - pow," you see? Bunk! That is the wrong way to study basic auditing! I mean, that is the wrong way to study basic auditing.

Basic auditing does really not consist of a bunch of do's and don'ts! It consists of a thetan sitting there in the auditing chair running a pc and the pc's bank, and verifying it on a meter. And keeping up the auditing cycle, whether the big one, or the little one - just keeping it kicked ahead and keeping it going. And there's really no rule or trick in it anywhere that solves all of its problems and so forth, because it isn't that complicated an action. You make it far more complicated an action than it really is.

You say to the pc - you say to the pc - you - you're into techniques in "How do you produce tone arm action?" You're not into basic auditing - not really. But basic auditing will produce tone arm action if it's being done.

The auditor says, "How are you today, Joe?" I don't care what the whatsit is. "How are you today, Joe?" This is basic auditing, See. Joe says, "Well, when I woke up this morning and I wasn't feeling so good, and so on. I still have a little bit of a headache, and so forth. And I think it was that letter I got from Aunt Susiebelle and so on, and she so on and so on and so on and so on . . ." And the auditor sits there and basic auditing simply requires that as long as that tone arm is moving, you don't do another ruddy, rrr - rrr, goddamn thing. See? Heh! It's almost too elementary. See?

And finally the tone arm steadies down, and the pc's finished saying what he's saying. But even though he has stopped talking, he might still be thinking over the remainder of the communication, and if so, you'll be getting some needle and tone arm reaction. You don't even have to learn to look at the pc and tell whether he was introverted or extroverted, you can tell it off a meter. And he goes on and pretty soon - and he looks at you, and he looks blankly into thin space for maybe a minute, two minutes, three minutes, four minutes, five minutes (it doesn't matter how long), and you're still getting the tone arm action and so forth, and he finally turns around and he says, "Yeah, I - I guess that's all, I guess that's how I feel this morning."

And you say, "Good."

Well, where's the technique, see? Unless interrupted, and blasted with bazookas, with his chair pulled out from underneath him and the auditor eating a crunchy brand of candy - see, additive, additive, additive, additive - why, basic auditing runs off nicely.

Now, you've got to know what to ask the pc. Now you're getting slightly into techniques. Now, what do you ask the pc to produce tone arm action'.? Well, you're getting into the technique sector, and I started out by calling it R4 because we're mainly talking about Routine 4 and I'm trying to coordinate it with you, but at lower levels, the techniques still belong up there in that sector.

What technique do you use? Well, whatever technique you use you run it the way it is supposed to be run. If it's run with a little bit of assessment and a little bit of this and a little bit of that and so forth, it's still run first with basic auditing, then with technique, and if anything goes wrong you finish the cycle of the thing with case analysis. It's always a one - two - three proposition.

The one hat you wear all the time is the basic auditing hat. Now, as long as you've got this basic auditing hat terrifically tangled up with techniques, as long as you've got it terrifically tangled up with case analysis, as long as you've got case analysis terrifically tangled up over here with techniques, you're going to be in a mess, man. I feel for you!

I can see you now, supposed to be asleep, lying there upon your pillow, a bit of salt water dripping upon the cambric, quietly in the dark. And if I was to appear at that moment and you were to ask me, "What am I doing wrong?. " why, I'd almost hit it right on the groove if I said, "Well, you've got basic auditing mixed up with technique. You've got technique mixed up with case analysis. You've got case analysis mixed up instead of basic auditing. And your basic auditing is probably absent while you're doing other things and so forth and if you'd just straighten these things out into its three ponds, then learn to do each one of these things ... First, basic auditing without injecting what you are doing in it very much, but just do the actions of basic auditing. And the technique - well, learn what the technique is and then adapt and fit that into - so your basic auditing can go on and run it. And when you run into trouble or finish the technique, go into case analysis and so forth." Why, you probably would take a

look at that and be able to figure out exactly what you did had crossed up. You probably would close your eyes and go soundly to sleep. If you heard me! I can't talk loud yet.

Anyhow, the situation, then, is that a compartmentation of action brings about a comprehension of action. You go down in the engine room of a ship, and you see the big whizzles going around the scrubbles, and the ruddybars pounding out against the flogwheels - looks awful complicated to you till somebody points out that those bars belong to the Generator and these bars belong to the main engine. And those up there, they're steam pipes and they simply have to do with the fire room and they have nothing to do with all this moving machinery. You take it apart and you can understand it.

You realize that all those bars up there can s - when they stop, well, the lights go out in the ship. And when these bars down here - these great big ones - when they go out, why, the ship stops moving through the water. And when the fire goes out in there, why, neither one of them moves. See? And right away you understand this a little bit better, see. Actually, you could teach a woolly fuzz - wuzz that much compartmentation about steam engineering, don't you see? So it's not too much hill to climb. And basic auditing is the firebox, see. You're putting something into this session or you're not, don't you see? And as long - when that's absent, why, nothing moves. Just nothing, see. And - not a good analogy, but the generating equipment and that sort of thing - that's the technique. And the big drives going around - that's the pc's bank, man! And as long as that bank is moving, you've got tone arm action and you've got things happening, the pc's getting better and everything is going along beautifully.

All of a sudden, why, you come to session one day and you got a headache and your basic auditing goes out and everything goes to hell, so you remedy your handling of technique. You go study a bulletin on R2H, you see, to get this new technique because you didn't have a good session with the pc.

So you get down R2H perfectly, perfectly, you get it down so it - just to the exact point and you listen to a tape on it, and you get it absolutely squared. And you go into the next session (your basic auditing out the window), do perfect R2H, and you lay a beautiful - wshhh - boom!

Well, the main drives weren't running, you see, so you repaired the generating set which was running. Wasn't anything wrong with your technique, you just didn't happen to be applying it. Small oversight, don't you see? All the valves were open but there was nothing generating steam (to make a better analogy). Simple.

You actually think you are being trained as auditors. In actuality, you are simply being untrained over all of the complications which, during the vast vistas of time, you have accumulated with regard to human relationships and minds. And I'm simply trying to lead you through this maze, these barbwire fences, these down forests, these windfalls, this snow, wind, storm and ice and sleet that you imagine is there, and finally point out to you that it doesn't matter whether it's there or not, this is what you do. And you get a marvelously simplified look at the situation, see.

I imagine - you know, in the writing professions they always have writers who cannot write unless they have their blue slippers on. They have musicians who cannot play unless they have the purple handkerchief in the swallow - tail coat pocket, you see. You have the fellow who always has to have a china cat on the piano, you see, before he can give a concert, you know? You have the prima donna who must always have received green and purple chrysanthemums, just before, in order to have good luck, you know. You've got all this nonsense. Well, actually, that's just a big substitute for knowing what they're doing. It's a big substitute for confidence. It's - they put it off into something else. They've got it fitted into some other thing. Because you're actually wearing all these three sectors very solidly, with high level of responsibility asked. But you'll find out that a person believes that if he takes

too much responsibility in one of these sectors or something like that, it's liable to go wrong. Well, that's just because he's unconfident.

"It's best, sort of, to let the pc run the session" - this is one frame of mind, see. See, this has nothing to do with basic auditing or anything else. This is a - this is a new datum that is interjected. This is one of the additives: "It is really best to let the pc pretty well run the session," and the hidden datum is "because if anything goes wrong, then it really isn't my fault." And we call this "making the pc self - determined." See, that's the way we excuse this frame of mind. So we're into a complication now that has to be battered down with clubs if you're going to get at anything, see.

All right. Now let's go in the other way. "The pc doesn't know what he's talking about and is going to get himself into severe trouble and I will be to blame. So therefore, I had better do everything in the session and not permit the pc to do anything in the session, because if you depend on the pc, that will make him guilty and that's like blaming the pc, and you really shouldn't do that. So we must relieve all responsibility from the pc, and therefore itsa only on the meter." You get this frame of mind? Well, this is this reverse vector of responsibility on the thing. "Let's take full responsibility for the thing, you see, and then it won't go wrong."

Well, what's all this worry about it going wrong?. I don't know why you worry about it going wrong. And yet an auditor audits more poorly if he himself has had some bad sessions. Then he has the example of how wrong it can go. If as a pc he's had some very bad sessions or as an auditor he's conducted some bad sessions, now he's got a reality on the fact that it can go wrong. And he actually starts fighting back against it going that wrong. And he'll start fighting back against its going that wrong up to a point of where he does nothing in a session but keep it from going wrong. So there's, of course, no session; there's just an effort to not have wrongnesses. That's not a session.

There are many ways that you could analyze this; there are many ways you could understand it. But this is all in the matter of being conducted across the storm, sleet, rain, night, barbwire fences and howling - wolf type forests to a safe plateau of confidence, don't you see? It's all liabilities. As long as you recognize that additives are the main thing. And frankly, you - in the field of basic auditing, there's very little to teach you. Very, very little to teach you in basic auditing. All you have to do is observe that a pc has an attention line on his own bank and that when you ask a question, his line goes on his bank and you should let it go on his bank until he's - until it's through going on his bank and then you should tell him, "Well, that's now off of your bank," when it comes off the bank, and keep an agreement on the situation, and just gets these things running.

Find out what the mind is doing. This fellow's worried about squirrels, so all right, you just say, "Well, when did you start worrying about squirrels?" Now you're in the technical department over here, you see. That's the technique department. So you know that there's something to do if you - you got the times he's worried about squirrels; all right, that's fine. But now you fit that into basic auditing and you're back on the same old stand now. You're noplace else. You're asking a question and he's going to play the - play the attention line on the stuff in the bank and your tone arm's going to move and when he's finished talking, why, you're going to tell him he's finished talking, and what the hell? I mean, how can you make anything complicated out of this, see? It's not possible, really.

Most auditors' genius is - when they're having a hard time - is best demonstrated in finding a difficult way to do it. Because in actual fact it can't be complicated.

Techniques are taken care of over here in this second department, See? There are ways to run these techniques and they run off in a train maneuver. Actually, it requires quite a little grooving and training to run a technique. It's all sort of da - da - da - da - da, wound - up doll. And this wound - up doll stuff goes on, but back of that wound - up doll stuff - that's not auditing. See? There's no auditing connected with "All right, when was that ARC break?" See? Da - da - da - da and so forth, and "All right, now, was it caused by affinity,

communication or reality? Is it so - and - so, waff - waff - wa ... ?" Well, this is all a sort of a phonograph - record stuff, you see.

At any moment - at any moment, the auditor's basic auditing hat is liable to go on. He says, "Was it affinity?" And the pc says, "Well . . ." (There's your basic auditing hat, see?) The pc says, "Oh, well. You know, it could have been. A long time, about 19 ... And there was this girl and so forth. Could have been affinity. You know, it's a funny thing, but every time I thought of that in connection with that particular incident, I waff - waff - waff - waff - waff - waff - waff, waff - waff - waff - waff, waff - waff - waff - waff - waff. . ." Well, how long is he going to waff - waff - waff? Well, it doesn't matter how long he waff - waff - waffs, because you're auditing the whole time. There is no speeding it up or slowing it down, except as it produces or fails to produce tone arm action.

Now, if you let him go "waff - waff - waff - waff - waff," on "Was it affinity?" when actually it was communication, and you didn't get down to a point of being able to assess that yet, you know, and he's going, "waff - waff - waft" on this particular subject and the tone arm is sitting here at 4.7 period. And it isn't going anyplace else and you let him "waff - waff - waff" for half an hour, you've got rocks in your head! See? That's basic auditing hat - where is it? Where is it? Look through the drawers, man. You must have parked it down there - the last time you took off your case analysis hat, you must have removed your basic auditing hat, too.

This guy has finished talking, but because you are being silent, you are inviting itsa in some peculiar way. Oh, yes, you could explain it, but the truth of the matter is, is time is going by without tone arm action! So what hat is out? The basic auditing hat is out. Not the technique hat. Not the case analysis hat. It's the basic auditing hat that's out. You're letting the guy run on and on and on and be in - session without getting tone arm action, so, obviously, he has said all there is to say and he's as - ised everything there is to as - is and he has done everything you have required of him and you are now from here on, in some weird way, cleaning a clean from now on out. So you, of course, aren't auditing.

You just haven't perceived. You ask him a whatsit, and you said, "Was this affinity? Was this caused by affinity?" And then you looked at him expectantly, you see. In other words, you threw your basic auditing hat into the middle of your technique hat, see? You just didn't go wound - up doll, say, "Was it affinity? Was it da - da - da - da, wa - da - da - da - da - da?" Tick, tock, bing, bang; "That was a d - bow - bow - bow - bow - bow . . ." down the line. But you pause somewhere. You invited this. You caused something to be corrected, you know? You're somehow or another inviting an itsa. You're not in control of the session. You got your basic auditing hat of getting him to answer a question. You don't want a question answered, you want a tick on a meter. You understand?

Now, if you're getting TA action on slow assessment, that's another thing. That's the technique, don't you see? But this, you're just simply trying to find the source of the ARC break - pow - pow - pow - pow - pow - pow - pow - pow - pow, oh, bing bang! See? All right. There it is - bang. You've done it; back to the basic auditing hat. "It says here that this is a false communication that caused the ARC break. Is that so?" Oh, now you get "waffle - waffle - waffle, yip - yip - yip' yop - yop - yop - yop, yiffle - yop - yop, waffle - waffle - waffle - waffle," down comes the tone arm, up goes the tone arm, down goes the tone arm, "waffle - waffle - waffle - waffle. There we go. There we go. That's it. That's a wrow. It's so wrow, and so on, so on, and it was so on and so on. And I - I - it was Aunt Sadie. It was dear old . . ." Tone arm action, tone arm action, tone arm action, and so forth. What are you doing? You're getting tone arm action; what are you doing auditing? See?

All basic auditing is, is coordinating your question and the pc's itsa with the tone arm and when there's nothing happening in the session, make sure that you grab the technique or the other hat and get something - and the case analysis hat - and get something to happen, see. And when it isn't happening - "Well, the tone arm's rolling now, that's fine, and so forth" - just keep kicking the ball along, man, keep pouring the coal into the firebox and letting the

flames roar. You're just sitting back there, and you say - pc says - your pc says, "Oh, scraffle, scraffle. " And you notice, "Well, he said 'scraffle, scraffle,' and it's been kind of a little while and we don't seem to be getting any tone arm action here. And he seems to be getting sort of dark in his statements of 'scraffle, scraffle.' Maybe I'm overrunning this particular thing." Recognize an error in basic auditing - you've invited an itsa on something without having any coal on the fire, see? You just went for a vacation or something when you shouldn't have as far as the basic auditing hat.

You'll get all this stuff coordinated. There's really nothing to it. There's three hats. Now, you're taking the basic auditing action; in the basic auditing action - you can do all kinds of wild things with basic auditing and produce tone arm action. You can produce tone arm action with "Do birds fly'.?" perfectly done as a basic auditing action. Now, you think I'm kidding. Try it some time. "Do birds fly?" That's as close as you can get to no technique. See? Go through Model Session and run "Do birds fly?" You'd be surprised. You'd get some tone arm action.

The pc says this is a boring and tiring process to have nothing whatsoever to do with that. And you say, "Okay," and if you do it all right, he'll then explain to you why it's a basic and boring process, and you'll get quite a bit of tone arm action.

You've got to have the pc willing to talk to you and got to have the pc's attention on his own case and you shouldn't go yanking his attention off his case and putting it on you, because you're not putting on a show; you're just the auditor. It's not a matter of merely the auditor, but the best auditor is totally unperceived in a session. He's not visible, man. His presence is felt, not seen. He's just about as close as you can get to an invisible man.

Now, of course, it's the technique and it's the state of the case as arrived at in case analysis which gives you the technique, and the application of the technique, and the wound - up - doll characteristics with which you can deliver that particular technique and when to stop delivering the technique and so forth. These are all questions which are really independent of basic auditing. They have to do with the understanding of what's technique and what's basic auditing and what's case analysis. But basic auditing: It's your ability to just sit there and be uncomplicated and keep the ball rolling.

Actually, the divisions do not at first appear sharp to you. They would not appear sharp to you. Because at the present moment I imagine you've got them pretty well intertwined. You say, "What is auditing?. " Auditing is running the process. Go to the foot of the class. Auditing is not running the process. Auditing is doing basic auditing, running the process, and having an analysis of the case that justified your running the process and tells you when the process is flat. See? So there's three different departments involved here. Auditing is three different departments.

You say, "Well, an auditor, actually - in a session, an auditor should sit there - should sit there and answer politely." Well, I don't know. I don't know if that's a statement of auditing or not, don't you see? Why?. It's only one section of the session. One section of the session - that's the auditor.

See, there's three other sections of the session and the two most important parts of the session are completely omitted. That's the pc and his ability to itsa, which you're trying to improve, and that is the bank, which is knocking the pc's head off and via the pc can knock yours off too, if you mishandle it.

All right, there's two big - great, big, important pieces of the session, and they're the most important pieces of the session. The most important, of course, is the pc. And the next most important is the pc's bank. And the next most important thing is the E - Meter, and the verification - indication/ verification process of what the pc said. And we get down to, not the most unimportant part of a session, you understand, because he's actually the most important as far as the beingness of the session is concerned, but the most invisible or unexamined or

not germane - conduct not germane, is the auditor. See, these - you don't concentrate on the auditor.

A fellow says, "I listened to this report of my case analysis, and I found out that I cut the pc's ... and I found ... and I did this and then in the session I said..." Oh, man, they're not answering the auditing question. The auditing question, on a criticism of your auditing thing - hell, it has nothing to do with what you did! Who cares what you did? Nobody - unless it got in the road of the session or failed to make the session run. Now, that's important.

What is important is what happened in the session. See, it's not a case of "I cut the pc's itsa." Oh, no! It's the fact the pc was itsaing and was apparently as - ising some portion of the bank and was prevented from doing so by dropping the E - Meter off the table on his foot. That's what happened. So now you see, you have all elements expressed. But "I cut the pc's itsa" - I don't think you have the power to cut the pc's itsa. What kind of thetan shears do you use? See?

The pc also can cut his own itsa. Don't be so self - conscious. You don't always cut the pc's itsa to make the ARC break, you see? You do it frequently enough, but once in a while you just didn't pick up the ball at that particular minute, or steer in that particular direction, and with perfect aplomb you were steering to the right and you should have been steering to the left and everything exploded in your face and there was frankly no possible way - you shouldn't be so self - critical - there is no possible way it could have been prevented.

Svengali, Charcot, the best mind readers of all time, inhabiting his bank with him, could not have foretold that when you zigged, he would zag. Don't you see? The important thing is that a zig occurred when a zag should have occurred. That's important. Why it occurred is of secondary importance. But it did occur. Now you can go ahead and say, "Well, why did it occur?" and so forth, and promise never to do it again and throw half crowns out here in the wishing well in penance and make the Instructors do infraction sheets ...

But anyhow, the thing about it is that it did occur. That is primary. Not why it occurred; that is not even secondary. That is tertiary, or something. I have to learn what some of those upper figures are. I wonder what "fiftieth" is? "Fiftyertiary," I guess. See what I mean?

You see, a session - a session is something. If we've got a piece of cake and it's sitting on the table and somebody comes along and picks up the cake and throws it on the floor, only a damn fool stands around and asks why he threw the cake on the floor. But people, I will assure you, always do ask that.

The only important - really important element present is that a cake has been thrown on the floor which you were about to get a piece of. And yet you'll inevitably stand around and ask why did he do it and so forth. That's completely unimportant; there's no cake, it's on the floor. See, that's important. First things first.

Now, a session is an irreplaceable section in time. It will never happen again, there will never be an opportunity for it to occur again. There will be more sessions, but there will never be that session. See, that session is itself So we look straight at it and look straight in the teeth of this thing and we see that what happened in the session is of primary importance. First, did you get TA action? Second, was the pc's ability to itsa and confront improved? Third, was his bank straightened out? Now, those are the important things in a session. That you cut the pc's itsa has nothing to do with it whatsoever. If, at the same time, you got TA action, you actually did eventually improve the pc's ability to itsa and you got his bank straightened up. You understand? Those are the important things.

It doesn't matter what expression you have on your face, so long as that expression does not impede getting something done. See, that's all that's important. It does not matter whether you appear in a session in a boiler suit or pin - striped morning trousers or an afternoon

cocktail dress. It just doesn't matter how you appear in the session so long as, when you appear in the session, is your dress impeding or pushing forward the session?

Now, you can wear a glaringly yellow sweater or a dazzle rhinestone - studded sweater and cut the session to ribbons. So therefore, your dress influenced the session because it ruddy well blinded the preclear! The boiler suit, being stained with diesel oil and quite odiferous, impeded the session's progress. So if you adjudicate everything from what - what happened in the session, what is happening in the session and whether or not the session did get tone arm action, whether or not it improved the pc's ability to itsa, confront, his reality on his bank, and whether or not it straightened out the bank any - if you adjudicate those things, you've got it made.

And you go around holding your head in your hands and saying, "Well, let's see, did I give the auditing command in the proper tone of voice?" It frankly doesn't matter a damn whether you gave it in any tone of voice, by telepathy, or by short - wave radio. All that matters is was you - did you produce these results in the session?

Now, what you call basic auditing training is simply the mean refinement - the average action - best calculated to produce a result in the session, with minimal impedance of the session gains. There is no completely proper auditing action except as measured against these elements.

Now, if you understand auditing from that particular viewpoint, when you walk outside after this lecture, you can lift up a flap of your skull and skid out the 568,000 data which you've got there now completely impeding your ability to sit there and get the job done, see. Because in the final run is "Did you do your job as an auditor?" And if you did your job as an auditor, that irreplaceable, terribly precious session was very far from being in vain. It promoted the thing and went on forward and you continued to do your job, adding up one of these sessions to the next session, to the next session. At the far end of it, somewhere up along the line, you've got yourself completely rehabilitated being. And that can mean a great deal.

So all of your rightnesses and wrongnesses with regard to your actions particularly, see, are just waste of breath. Your self - criticism has - is badly spent. It's whether or not you produced a result. If you're doing things in session which impede gains in session, well, they're probably wrong, but who cares? Let's do the things that get results in session, not the things that don't. And if we never get results in session by reason of never doing anything in session, well, decide to be brave and do something in session. And that is - about there is where all analysis ends. It doesn't go really much further than that.

Well, I thought I could give you these three sections and subdivisions of auditing, and you could see them clearly each one in their own light and it might make it much easier for you to view what is going on and carry forward a session to a better and happier conclusion.

Thank you.