

AUDITING

A lecture given on
17 April 1962

Thank you.

Thank you.

Are you making it?

Audience: Yes.

Listen to those. That's what you get for getting yourself in such lousy shape. That's all I've got to say. What a dirty look. Well, who got you in that shape? Yeah, that's it. That's just the whole thing That's the whole thing. Somebody else is to blame. All right.

All right. Good enough. Now, my auditor at the moment is probably sitting back there. Where is he? Where is he? Yeah, there he is there. He's probably sitting there nervously because he said to me last night, he says, "Well, that's something that you can tell the students." Actually, he's very nervous that I'll make a comment on his auditing

I haven't gotten any hammer-and-tongs auditing for quite a while, straight on through and I'm going for broke now. And let me tell you, it's a terrific sensation to be audited by an auditor that knows his business. You know, will follow through and does do his business. You know, it's terrific. And absolutely nothing compares to it at all.

The standard of auditing—just from—just from a subjective viewpoint—the standard of auditing of a couple of years ago and the standard of auditing now, they're absolutely no comparison of any kind whatsoever. The auditor's predictable, the rudiments we have, when they're in, the person is in-session, so forth. The auditors are getting careful of the pc. They're auditing the pc, not the chair or something And it's—just makes—it makes a heck of a difference. Terrific difference.

And this has been quite an experience last week and this far this week. And from a standpoint of subjective reality on just exactly what you are doing Nothing very fancy. Phil was auditing me a couple of hours a day and it's pretty good. And I was impressed with this fact. I was impressed with this fact, that all an auditor has to do today is do exactly the processes, the Model Session, the exact routine that you're doing—and if he doesn't vary from these things, if he's careful on each point and so forth, that it's absolutely marvelous. Absolutely marvelous. We really got this thing grooved in and a pc could not help but be impressed with just good standard auditing. He just couldn't help but be impressed right down to the ground.

I was thinking it would be a wonderful experience if all auditing in Scientology were of that caliber. If it were all predictable. See, if it never got any funny business going on and if the auditors more or less stayed in twoway comm with the pc and carried on exactly what he was doing and never let the pc take the session out of his hands and so forth.

This—particularly a new experience for me because the auditing I've had has been pretty varied one way or the other. And auditors suffer from the fact that every time I sit down as a pc, why, they think I'm going to instruct them and they want me to instruct them. So halfway through a process or something like that, they ask for some directions or something. That's pretty grim, believe me, you know.

And I got so I couldn't—I didn't dare make a remark to an auditor, you see. They'd do something about it, you know. I mean, I say, "Well, I had a somatic there," you know and the

auditor would do something about that. We wouldn't go on with what we were doing, don't you see?

And this—this in itself, just a non-Q-and-A in the auditing department is a fantastic thing to experience. An auditor never Qs-and-As. Pc can say what he damn well pleases. Gives you a terrific area of freedom.

You can say, “Well, you goofed,” you know. you don't have the auditor all of a sudden blowing, you know. Auditor goes on with his business. In other words, you don't have to sit there carefully as a pc to keep the auditor in-session or something. And it's really been a terrific experience. I really appreciate it very much. We're going right on with this at a couple of hours a day.

It's been about seven sessions, two items listed and found, the terminal and oppterm of a package on a discovery list and tone arm action through the two items has been 1.75 to 5.0, as a breadth of range, constant motion. And we're having a ball. That's no—that's no kidding. I really appreciate the auditing I'm getting.

And I'm here to tell you something. I'm here to tell you something You probably have fantastic ideas of—particularly if you're just coming in new on it or if you've only been at it two or three weeks here or something like this—of, “Exactly what frame of mind do I get into in order to audit?” and so forth. And, “How do I best overwhelm this pc?” or some such questions, see?

And I can tell you that the most impressive attitude for an auditor is simply calm competence and go on and do his job. Come hell or high water, just go on and do his job. And the greatest certainty the pc can have is that the auditor will keep on auditing and not take up something else every time he starts in auditing something

And when a pc gets that idea, why an auditor then has terrific altitude. An auditor, actually, in an auditing session, has altitude for no other reason at all.

All right. Well, let's see. What's the date?

Audience: 17th.

By George, it is the 17th. 17th April AD 12, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, lecture on the subject of auditing.

We're only hitting two processes today—two packages of processes—on which we're going to count for steady, continued case gain. We're going to count on these processes. And that's the CCHs and 3D Criss Cross. And we're going to count on those processes. And the reason we're going to count on those processes is because those processes have been working and because they take a case all the way south. And because there are a certain number of skills which are packaged up into the CCHs and 3D Criss Cross which auditors have been able to learn, auditors have been able to apply. Auditors do well with these. There are very precise drills and they are carried out in a very precision manner. And auditors can do these things.

Now, that's the first test of a process, is can an auditor do it, not can I do it. 'Cause, Honey chil', I could audit things on you that would stand you upside down and hang the pc's thetan on the moon, see. But that hasn't anything to do with it at all. It has to do with my enthusiasms for certain processes in the past and it has to do for my misguidedness occasionally on certain processes because I could do them and somebody else couldn't. Something like that, you see. It'd be a limited number of auditors that would have success with it.

You look at these two and you will find out that they are broad success processes. The CCH and 3D Criss Cross. You'll find out that nobody's going to have very much trouble with these processes.

You have to be a terrifically well-trained auditor to run these processes. Don't kid yourself about that. The standard of training is way up. But there is no compromise. There is no lesser grade of processing that will get a pc all the way through and don't believe that there is. There isn't. Not that auditors will consistently do around the world.

Now, what changes my viewpoint on this is that I have had a great deal of success with some rather fantastically, razzle-dazzle processes at one time or another. I remember a girl stumbled into the office one time, didn't even know her right name, audited her, think a couple of hours or something like that and she turned clean and sane and went and got herself a job. And as far as we know never had any trouble afterwards.

Trick processes. Yeah, yeah, yeah, but these are spotty. Next psycho came along You couldn't audit the same process on that psycho. You see, you had to dream up something else.

Well, this enters in judgment. It enters in imagination and judgment. It enters in a great many factors. And I will give you a resume now of what can broadly be done. And this is no insult to auditors broadly, but I'm just telling you factually what's the truth about the situation.

An auditor can do any process—that is, any auditor can be trained to do this—which does not require of him more adjudication than can be given to him by an E-Meter. If you ask him for any further adjudication or judgment than he can read off the E-Meter, you're going to find a broad swath of disaster following that process. See, some are going to be able to do it, but the majority are not.

Now, these precision drills of the CCHs require that an auditor observe constancy or change. Now, there we're going to run into a little bit of trouble occasionally. Some auditors are going to look at a pc and say this pc isn't changing when the pc's changing wildly and so forth. We'll run into a little trouble like that occasionally, but that nevertheless can be borne with and steered into adjudication of it.

In other words, as long as we've got Instructors that'll kick an auditor's head in while he's being trained for a change in processes while the pc is still getting change on the process, we can ride out that one. Auditors can be taught to do the CCHs. There is no mystery about why the CCHs work.

An auditor can be taught to list and read a meter against a list. In other words, he can do any of these CCH drills and he can do any of these listing, meter-reading drills. And those, auditors are having no difficulty doing And fortunately for us all, it is the main route and the fastest route to Clear or OT or anything else you want to reach. That's very fortunate for us, you see. Now, what it requires is instruction of a precision nature. When you're training somebody to do this, don't yourself get into the idea that there's two ways to do it, because I can tell you right now there aren't. There aren't two ways to do any of these things. There aren't two ways to do the CCHs. There's only one right way to do the CCHs.

And in 3D Criss Cross, there's only one right way to list. There's only one right way to null. you could differentiate a couple of ways, but you'll lay eggs. It isn't a two-way proposition that you're dealing with. So we're dealing with something which is a studied, precise drill and a studied, precise drill which has been successfully, consistently taught to auditors now for quite a while—especially the CCHs. Right CCHs are easy to teach to auditors. Wrong CCHs are hard to teach.

3D Criss Cross—we've been very successful in teaching people to do 3D Criss Cross. Extremely successful. And this is marvelous. And the other thing is, we can train an auditor to do a repetitive process and that's your Class IV. It's just repetitive processes.

So as long as we get a high level of competence in exactly those spheres, you're going to see dissemination go by leaps and bounds. It's terrific. I mean, there isn't anything that you could say that would be an exaggeration, factually. From days of exaggeration when I shouldn't have been exaggerating, perhaps, on enthusiasm, we've gone to a level where we can't exaggerate it. You yourself should learn that and you will learn that in your line of experience, that you cannot exaggerate what you are doing. There's never been anything like it. Auditors can be taught to do this competently. And competently done, it makes a fantastic impression on the pc. He gets a level of security and interest and so forth. Terrific.

Now, you can do these drills without sometimes understanding everything there is to do in them. you actually can do them a bit in the absence of understanding. But it would be much nicer if you knew precisely all of the reasons which underlay these drills. That would make a much more intelligent auditor. And he would not be teaching somebody on the basis of that old, old saw that I have mentioned of the wise man who taught the neophyte all about it. And to keep the cat from running around, before he began the lesson each day, he tied the cat to the bed. So when the neophyte got to be the wise man, why, he got a student in and said, "Now, the first thing we do is tie the cat to the bed" you know. A lot of that bunk can get into what we're doing, you see. A lot of—a lot of magical monkey business, you know.

And fortunately for you, we know why. you see, that's even more important. We know why these things are working. See, and also you could find out why these things are working. There isn't any reason to go around Robin Hood's barn to wonder why these things work, because it's only recently that I've gotten the facile explanation of why the CCHs work, after all these years.

Now, you're going to ask the question along about now well, what the hell happened to prepchecking? Oh, yeah, you've got to be able to prepcheck. You learn how to Prepcheck and you learn how to prepcheck just as best as you possibly can. Because if you can't prepcheck, sooner or later you're going to run a cropper on some person. They're withholding like crazy. They're—you're missing withholds like mad on them. They're mad at you all the time and so forth. You only got one answer. That's Prepcheck. And that's what Prepchecking is for. And that's all Prepchecking is for.

Now, Prepchecking has gone the whole evolution. It is quite amusing that with Prepchecking we wind up, 100 percent, the work of Sigmund Freud. That's it.

We've left the animal psychologist lying where he belongs in 1879, from which he never advanced. His idea was man is a brain. I, by the way, these days am never referring to psychologists. I only talk about animal psychologists because I want the beast to be known by his right name. That's all he is and all he ever pretended to be. Any psychologist is an animal psychologist because the basic theory on which he operates is man is an animal. So we call him animal psychologist. And I think that will effectively take care of that as the years roll along

Now, don't ever use that word psychologist after this. See, just use animal psychologist, always. And you'll get it around. You'll find the Times, sooner or later, will be talking about the animal psychologist. And people will be phoning them up to take care of their horses. I wouldn't let them though. And I don't even like horses. I wouldn't let them take care of my horse.

Anyhow, the thing that—the thing that is newsworthy and noteworthy on this subject is that all of the work of Freud and any work by the faculty psychologist has been wrapped up in Prepchecking, which I consider quite wonderful. It's quite an achievement. Really, we ought to get very proud, you see and say this is really marvelous.

Do you realize you can find any of the childhood traumas that Freud thought were there. You can find them all. you can eradicate them. And worse than that, we've wrapped up the work

of Freud's squirrels: Jung, Adler. Well, I think it was Jung that traces everybody back to his stuck engram— druids. And we can trace people back to druids. Blow the trauma too. Blow the whole tree up.

No, any of the work that has been assayed in this, any of the work at all. Furthermore, we can probably turn it all around into black Pavlovianism and probably give people enough psychic traumas to make them "slaver." I think you could hit a guy long enough and often enough to make him slaver when he saw food.

Maybe I've got Pavlovianism a little bit wrong, but it seems to me that that has something to do with it. People are supposed to slaver. Actually, all the work that has been done by Pavlov was swallowed up by communism. Pavlov's basic work is not available to the Western world and never has been.

And he treats of animal conditioning The last days of his life he was whistled up to the Kremlin by Stalin and told to sit down and write himself a manuscript of everything he had learned about animals and how they could be applied to men. And he sat up there in the Kremlin for quite a while and he wrote a four-hundred-page manuscript which has never seen the light of day. But we see communism everywhere.

There was a film that was captured in Russia by somebody or another. And it's one of the basic training films on the use of Pavlovian work. And they show a young man going through all of the actions. They show a dog going through all the actions and a young man going through all of the actions, you know—slaving over the bell ringing and coughing because of the food or whatever it is, you know.

In other words, they have a human being who was being conditioned the same way that the dog was conditioned in Pavlovian work and so forth. And this was a training film for embryonic Pavlovianists in the communist bloc. It isn't anything peculiar that people all lay aside the first dynamic in communism and assume only the third, you see.

Those techniques are used politically by the state. And if you were to take any communist and put him over the jumps with any processes you've got, his communism would blow because it's a lot of psychic traumas. He has himself terribly associated with the state. You see, socialism lets you own . . . Well, actually, capitalism tries to let you have what you've got if they can't get it away from you. A socialism lets you have about half of what you've got. You see. It lets you have about half of what you already own. That's a socialism. But a communism doesn't let you have anything that you own. Well, let's just get off the definition of state ownership, see. Let's just define it for what it really is. It is the total games condition between the state and the individual. See, the total games condition. And nothing for the individual to the point where he doesn't even exist anymore.

All right, so that particular field of psychology, not particularly important to us—could be, politically, perhaps—but that field is sufficiently vicious that it'd probably have to be undone with the CCHs or something like that. You probably wouldn't be able to get down to the ground with Prepchecking. And in animal psychology itself, the way they have been developing it since 1879, I don't know that you would be able to get down to the ground of it in Prepchecking. These are traumatic actions which are undertaken in these particular fields, you see. They contain injury, which they call conditioning and all that sort of thing.

It's efforts to do things to people. So that effort to do things to people doesn't classify with the Freudian and the faculty—early faculty psychologytype work. you see, that was designed to alleviate things in people, which is a different goal. you have to recognize that the Pavlovian and the animal psychologist in general, are trying to do things to people. So Prepchecking wouldn't cover that.

But all of the work of Freud is wrapped up in Prepchecking. And the outline of how you do Prepchecking in a recent bulletin, wraps all that up. That's it. That's what Freud was looking for.

Now, having gotten that, we put it over on the side of the desk and we say, well, whenever your pc gets upset with you, you know how to do Prepchecking and you address the Zero question of "Who has missed a withhold on you?" see, "Who should have found out?" "Who failed to find out what?" That's this kind of a Zero. And you'll cheer the fellow up markedly and enormously. And as far as clearing is concerned, that's the sole use of Prepchecking.

You have to know how to do Prepchecking. But the end results of Prepchecking would only be the end results of—well, I don't know twentyfive, thirty hours of Prepchecking would be fifty or sixty years of Freudian analysis.

But the very funny thing—if you knew how to Prepcheck perfectly, you could actually hang out your shingle as a psychoanalyst to psychoanalysts and do nothing but prepcheck them.

Here's the way you'd do. You'd clear the withhold question and just take Form 3 and any other applicable Sec Check and use those as your Zero As. You see, your Zero would be "Are you withholding anything?" and then your Zero A, would be "Have you ever raped anybody?" You see. Any one of the Form 3s or any other applicable Sec Check. That becomes your Zero A. And you use that as a test Zero A. And then, of course, your What becomes the first withhold you get from the pc, if you get a reaction on that Zero A. Do you follow that? That would be the cleanest way to prepcheck.

But it has been demonstrated to me, several things. The first is condemnatory to auditors, so we'll leave that to later. The first thing that has been borne home to me is that it is a shallow approach. Later on, it might become adaptable in Class IV skills to the handling of actual items found in 3D Criss Cross. And be fully prepared to see it respond in that particular zone of action. But as far as clearing somebody is concerned, there is a probability that you could key everything out with Prepchecking But this is the derogatory point to auditors; is auditors do not uniformly find good skill in Prepchecking. And that's what licks Prepchecking. You understand?

Auditors go in too shallow and they miss withholds. I tried for a long time to convince everybody that this was what they were doing. I worked on it hard. I worked on auditors personally with this and they still went on doing it. And if I can't teach somebody this particular skill a few feet away from me, how can I teach anybody in Perth? You see? They'll go too far.

Honest, I got so I was practically weeping, looking at the Prepcheck folders. Somebody gets off this terrific withhold that they tripped over the linoleum and hadn't told anybody. And your heart would bleed for the absolute blood and viciousness in these—in these Prepcheck folders. Well, that's too bad. I mean, you sit there and weep over the terrible agonies this person had gone through because he had borrowed Joe's necktie.

Pardon me if I seem to sneer sarcastically. It's just too much. I mean, my nerves couldn't take it anymore. It's just too bloody. I use that in an American sense. I could just see the sanguine results of these sessions, you know. Gore all over the floor. And it's terrible. Auditor battles through and finally gets this terrific withhold off, you see, that once upon a time he had seen one of his mother's shoes mislaid. You see, I mean, gets right in there and pitches.

There's a terrific amount of skill between the Zero Question, the Zero A and the What question. And there's a terrific amount of skill between, particularly, the Zero A and the What. Finding that exact specific withhold. It requires skill. And it requires more skill than auditors broadly exhibit. And that's my opinion of Prepchecking.

We've wrapped up Sigmund Freud. If you want to get to be an expert in Prepchecking, please do. You've got to know how to prepcheck to get missed withholds. You won't have any trouble getting missed withholds. You can't help but get the missed withholds that are making the pc unhappy. So you can get those, follow them through and clean them up because you're after a specific target: missed withholds. Fine. Cheer everybody up.

But withholds, no. Oh, it's very little skill in withholds. Plowing up new virgin territory in withholds, they exhibit too little skill. They settle for too much pale, skim milk. I mean, the quality of the porridge . . . See, here you are sitting there ready to see the river of fire go tearing across the cliffs and destroy the cities, you see. And there's this little, little trickle of milk runs out underneath the door and this emaciated kitten walks for it. you know that isn't what's wrong with the pc. you know it goes so much deeper than that. And auditors will settle for a null needle. And prepchecking for broke, if it's going to do anything with the case, has got to be a stirred-up case. You've got to stir up the case all the time. Stir up the case all the time.

Auditors will always quiet a case down. you see why the skimmed-milk effect? They will always quiet the case down. They will always get that needle null, only to get that needle null right now, see. That's fine. Shows considerable skill in getting the needle null. And that's just what you need to do in doing the rudiments. But Prepchecking is a reverse action. You've got to get in with a spade and pickax. You unfortunately got the question null. That's your attitude. "I must have slipped someplace. I got it null.?"

See, we got a nice, greasy fall, you see, on the subject of “Have you ever robbed anybody?” You know.

And the fellow says, “Well, I—I took a—ha, I got a knife one time and I got a penny out of my brother’s piggy bank. Ha-ah-ha.” You know and it goes null.

And the auditor says, “Well, that’s good. We certainly got that one null.” See and they go off to the next one. Well, he got a null. He didn’t miss a withhold. But what it requires in Prepchecking is an excursion about this point, you see.

“Have you ever robbed anybody?” You see?

And he says, “Well, I took a penny out of my brother’s bank.” And now it’s gone null, you see. The auditor doesn’t experience horror that the thing has now gone null. He experiences quite the reverse. He experiences relief.

No, no. About that time, “Well, what else have you robbed?” You see? Yeah. Well, all right. And it doesn’t do anything.

“Have you robbed anything else? Have you robbed anybody else?” And so forth? “Ever robbed anybody else? How about school?” you see, “Well, how about school? How about the rest of your family? How about your father? Your mother? How about the church? How about God? You know. Your friends, companions. You were in the service once—you ever rob anything in the service?”—clang! “What was that? Heh-heh-ha-hd! ~~It’s a trick!~~” requires a highly punitive and accusative frame of mind. And because you’ve got to use an accusative frame of mind this whole while, keeping the pc in-session while you ream him out for it, requires an enormous amount of skill. I would say that it can be taught straight up and with great ardure. But that does not guarantee that it will ever get as far as it may. Do you see that?

Now, there's no doubt about it. You've got to learn how to prepcheck by rote, to get up missed withholds and be able to sit down with somebody who is boiling over. you know, how bad it all is and how bad you've treated them and how bad everybody's treated them, how bad their families treat them. That's all you hear about in this pc, you know. How bad. How bad, you know. How bad. you know.

Well, we've got the absolute positive cure for it. "What did they fail to find out about you?" See, that's all you have to find out. Yeah, "What they—what should they have known and didn't?" That's all we've got to clear. And you clear that with a Prepcheck approach. And that's easy because you're trying to get the needle to null. And you're really not trying to stir up anything

We've got the whole mechanism of the missed withhold and that's the most important mechanism. So just relegate for the moment, Prepchecking to that, well realizing that we're just abandoning the fact that it's totally wrapped up Freud.

I mean, my God, the old man would be standing on his head. He's in school someplace. Let me see, what grade's he in now? Anyhow, if you—he'd actually, practically stand on his head. He'd say, "Wow! You know, how that man worked. You know, how he worked to get out psychic trauma and find out how to handle them and that sort of thing."

And of course our technology is so extensive in this particular field that it makes Freudian analysis look almost in reverse. But the final analysis is, you've got all these basic psychic trauma keyed out by the time you prepcheck somebody.

You go for broke on Prepchecking, you could change their lives. There's no doubt about it whatsoever. But you have to be continuously punitive. And you have to keep stirring up the case and you have to work at it and you work real hard at it. And it doesn't happen to be in the direction of clearing because it's just key-outs. Key-outs, key-outs, key-outs, key-outs, key-outs. You got the idea? The hell with key-outs.

Don't forget we've wrapped up Freud and don't forget you should know how to do it. It'd be terribly impressive, you know. And any time you really wanted to put on a full parade in this particular direction it'd be shocking to anybody that knew Freudian analysis or something like this, to see you handling with ease, something in a—in an hour or two, that an analyst might very well require—oh, God—and maybe never get handled at all, you see. It's a superior skill, but it no longer belongs in your lineup as a process. See, it's a patch-up process.

If you don't know how to do it, then you're going to have pcs get mad at you and you're never going to be able to straighten them out. See, that's the—that's the penalty for not knowing how to prepcheck on missed withholds. See.

Sooner or later, somebody's going to get mad at you or mad at your family or mad at your organization or mad at something and you yourself are going to be powerless to do anything about it. Because the only thing that you can do about it is a Prepcheck against missed withholds. And that is the only thing that works out of all the sun, moon, stars and firmaments. That's the only thing that works.

We have pushed it right up to the point where it's terrifically workable, too. Guys get mad over the darnedest, smallest, tiniest, little things you ever heard of.

But you're far more likely to find out what is basically wrong with the case—far, far, far more likely to find out what is basically wrong with a case—with the CCHs followed by 3D Criss Cross.

Now, you're assaulting the basics of the case. Now, you're assaulting whole packages called circuits, valences. You realize that it might only take you six or eight hours to find one of these items, see. Find the whole package. Another six, eight, ten hours maybe to find the other side of it. I'm talking about long lists and extreme jobs and all that sort of thing, you see. Now, what's this make? This makes twenty, twenty-five hours. Oh man, by the time you have found one hot item on a case and opptermned it you have gotten two personalities, two valences, two chains of lifetimes. You see, one of those 3D Criss Cross items is not just

one life. That is not John Jones, the evangelist. See, we found the evangelist, you see. That is not John Jones, the evangelist. That is John Jones, Henry Smith, James George Wesley, you see. And that's in America. Now let's take up the number of times he was an evangelist in Holland, you see. Now let's take up the number of times that he was an evangelist in the Marcab Confederacy. Now let's take up the number of times he was an evangelist earlier on the track, before he got out of the habit and then later on keyed it in and became an evangelist again, you see. And do you know that any one of those lifetimes require about 150 hours to be prepchecked and cleaned up. Interesting computation, isn't it?

Let's just be casual about it. Let's thoroughly clean up one of those lives as John Jones the evangelist. One hundred and fifty hours, but then there's Henry Smith and then there's George Aloysius Wesley or something. And then there's the times in Holland. And we're getting 150 hours and 150 hours and 150 hours and 150 hours and a hun . Hey, what the hell are we doing here, see.

Well, now we're up to a thousand, twelve hundred, sixteen hundred hours' worth of Prepchecking and we've—we've only gotten one item, an evangelist. Oh, well, there's the other side of it. There was the devil. Oh, well, of course, he was a devil on the early track. He was a devil in the Marcab Confederacy and he's been numerously a devil in Holland. And, of course, he was quite schizophrenic as George Wellington Aloysius Wesley, you see. And was an evangelist all day and a devil all night.

Now you got two packages, so you just have to double the amount of time in Prepchecking. We're up to maybe thirty-two hundred hours. Well, if you could do it in twenty or twenty-five, I'd say you'd better do it. you better not bother with the thirty-two hundred unless you've taken to looking at the long track and gotten into the frame of mind that you have an infinity of time. Perfectly all right if you have an infinity of time and look at the long track. But it seems to me that something that could be done in twenty or twenty-five hours shouldn't have thirty-two hundred hours devoted to it. Because the funny part of it is, is you wouldn't clean it up in the thirty-two hundred hours. Isn't that terrible?

It's purely the mechanics of postulate-counter-postulate, mass-counter-mass, see, goal-counter-goal that you find in the Goals Problem Mass that keeps it hung up in the first place. And if you've got it going zzzzt this way, why, of course, it starts spreading out along the track anyway.

I speak with good reality on that. I've mentioned this, but I didn't realize it till I walked away from the session, something very peculiar. Items three and two that went out on the list, were another package. And they were a package that was some collision out here. And they came apart and blew before we found the final item of the second list, which collided with the first item we had found which, of course, blew. I think this is rather fantastic, you see. I mean, there's—there's a bonus package. See, there was thirty-two hundred hours blew off while we were trying to find the first thirty-two hundred hours' worth, see. Took a couple of minutes. Anyway, hardly anybody noticed it passing.

But here's what you're into. You've got a bank that can't hang up. The mathematical probabilities of a Goals Problem Mass item hanging up against its opposition terminal and staying suspended in time and space are just a million to one, that's all. It's almost impossible for this accident to happen. By the time you found both sides of them, you get this kind of an effect. How can I do that again, you see. He hasn't got a prayer of doing it again, that's all.

And you've done it. you haven't pulled apart somebody's miserable sequences of lives and all the times he did kiss the landlady and all the times he didn't kiss the landlady, you see, and got that all disentangled one way or the other. Just his bank wouldn't hang together is what the horrible overt which you have performed at that particular thing, you see. So the reactive mind is blowing up. This other way, you're still going to have the reactive mind around. Interesting, isn't it.

So that's why you prefer 3D Criss Cross. And you will come to as you operate with it, why you will prefer 3D Criss Cross over Prepchecking. Of course, that doesn't forgive you for not knowing Prepchecking.

I would like to see anybody be able to do a good job of Prepchecking if he could. Somebody wants to get rid of his lumbosis or something of the sort, well, prepcheck it out of existence. You can try anyway. Somebody will get a 3D Criss Cross item on him, it will come right back, but that's all right.

You understand that in Prepchecking you must do an expert job of Prepchecking to handle the temper and temperament of the pc on the subject of missed withholds. Because you're going to run into missed withholds and I guarantee that a case that is really plowed in on this is going to get missed withholds tomorrow if you don't prepcheck them today.

In other words, you could just spot a missed withhold and spot another missed withhold and say, "Well, that's fine. He's happy." Oh, yeah, he'll be happy for hours. You get what I mean, because you didn't go in—you didn't go in down the chain of these. See, you just clipped off the last two locks. Well, tomorrow those are going to key in again. Ha.

See, you, the auditor, are going to once more wiggle your right ear more than you wiggle your left ear and that is the key-in, you see. So that's an—then he thinks this thing again and then it becomes another missed withhold and you have to pull it all over again.

Well, by the time you get tired of doing this you will come to realize that Ronnie is telling you sooth. Pull the whole ruddy chain when you pull a missed withhold, see.

Well, you're gonna—you're going to handle missed withholds, handle them in two frames of mind. One, in rudiments, just to get them out of the road. When you're doing 3D Criss Cross, you're doing 3D Criss Cross. But the temper of a pc sooner or later is going to become recognisizable to you as very badly needing some Prepchecking, by which you mean you want to get off the missed withholds and stop this nonsense so the rudiments will stay in.

You see, we found the common denominator back of all rudiments is withholds, see. And then the common denominator back of all withholds is missed. So prepcheck missed withholds. You sit down for a session or two with some pc and say, "Well, this guy's acting up. It's just hell to keep rudiments in one way or the other," and just go for broke on the Zero Question, "Who's missed a withhold on you?" you see? And then just carry on from there and develop these withholds—what people should have found out about, what they shouldn't have found out about and all that sort of thing.

You can cash in on a lot of processing this way. Case can't seem to get it going, it's having difficulty moving and even though you've done CCHs it isn't getting the sufficient tone arm action and his CCHs are apparently flat but really not and 3D Criss Cross and nothing much is moving and so forth. And all of a sudden—all of a sudden, like a bolt from the blue, this terrific thought will occur to you. "This case has missed withholds." "See, every time I put this case through the rudiments—'What withhold have I missed on you?'—he's always had one, hasn't he? I'll bet there's a chain now."

Just take time out on whatever else you're doing and sit down and do a whole missed withhold session. And then maybe you have to do another session because you didn't get all the chain clean. You'll get all that type of missed withhold and you'll find out what he was missing withholds and who should have found out and God help us. And all of a sudden the case presents an entirely new aspect. And you get tone arm action where you didn't get it before. That is the one way I know of whereby you can promote a case into tone arm action with a strong arm.

Now, most auditors have been able to pick up missed withholds. And very few auditors have done a skilled job of Prepchecking on virgin, stir-it-up withhold type of mechanisms. That

fact, that it's difficult to teach, is—already makes it a questionable subject. And then the other fact, that it only keys out and a 3D Criss Cross does so much more—the conclusion is that it becomes a junior process. One that an auditor must know how to do.

Oddly enough, this junior process is senior to all other processes. Show you where we've gone. See, we're now calling a junior process "Prepchecking," which is senior to any other process we ever had, you see. Well, where does that put the CCHs, run right and 3D Criss Cross done properly? Well, it puts them in the stars. That's really where they belong.

Now, you see how auditing stacks up? You see how it lines up.

A little advice. Once more I repeat this advice. If your CCHs don't seem to be just what they ought to be and the pc just sort of sits down and he's doing them all mechanically and they all appear flat and... Yeah, CC... Yeah, he hasn't grown any wings that you can see. you know, you haven't had a good change on the case. you know. No cognite. No cognite, you know. He's not said anything about it. Let's get smart. We're dealing with a missed withhold case.

And sit down for a session, check him. And after that do end rudiments on him. You'd be surprised. At least half of the pcs you're running right at this moment have their—on CCHs, have their end rudiments out on halftruth and untruth.

"Are you satisfied that you did that?"

"Yes. Yes. Oh, yes, yes, yes. I duplicate it. Woo-woo-blyaa." Damn liar. You stack up enough of those and the CCHs become nonfunctional. You get your end rudiments . . .

Beginning rudiments aren't as important as end rudiments, frankly. And you get your—you get your missed withholds and halftruths and untruths stacked up in CCHs and your case will cease to gain because we're using the CCHs now on the sane people. Now, in the old days, yes, you could bull it through and go for two hundred hours and you would have gradually overridden it, you understand, Upper Indoc style. We're not doing that same type of CCH.

And I would say, on a person that could articulate and talk to you, that if they gave you any trouble or you really ever had to put your hand on them to guide them around or force them into a session, I would say their rudiments were wildly out.

I wouldn't spend much time wrestling. I don't mind wrestling As a matter of fact I'm fond of wrestling. But it doesn't seem to me to be the thing to do in an auditing session. It seems out of place. The simpler way to go about it is flatten whatever you're doing or finish that session and come to the next session lugging a bulletproof E-Meter, you see. Let's find these missed withholds. And you're just going to do a Prepcheck-type activity. Get the idea? You find out a lot about it that way.

Don't keep probing when you're doing this. Don't keep probing for missed withholds because you don't have to probe for a missed withhold. The only thing you have to do is maybe guess who's been missing. See, who's been missing the withhold. Well, we know this fellow has a dog and a wife and has a Central Organization that has been near him and he doesn't like that very well. He's got a couple of friends and he has a mother still living, see. And he has a job someplace.

All right. Well, you've got these few items, see. Just very smart and do one of these—do a very careful resume of the Preclear Assessment Form on him, you know. Go over that very carefully and so forth. And notice what makes the tone arm shift as you're doing it, you know.

List all these things and people up and so on. And then find out who— who amongst these people, you see, has missed withholds on him. What should they have found out? And you'll all of a sudden have a resurgence of case, don't you see? It's an easy one to do. There's hardly any difficulty with it. But that will very often give you tone arm action which you're not getting any other way.

And the individual is sitting there. Boy, he's really braced. He's really braced. He eats with his knife, you know. And he never dares go into a nice restaurant because he eats with his knife, and so forth. And he actually never dares go to a restaurant because he eats with his knife. And he never dares take you out or be—let you invite him out to dinner because he eats with his knife, you see.

And this is pretty bad socially. And this is something that's pretty grim. And as you're doing the CCHs on him, you know, this really starts stacking up. He eats with his knife. And you mustn't find out about it. And on such shallow delicacies, you see, his whole case starts hanging up.

So in doing the CCHs on sane people, why, you ought to occasionally sit down and clear up them thar missed withholds. Clear them up on as much track as you can clear them off of. And you'll put the guy in a much happier frame of mind.

And a fellow who is showing no good increase on the CCHs should always . . . You just start getting the habit of finishing up the session with the . . . Sooner or later we'll have to do it for everybody. Otherwise, you see, to those people that are not getting increase, it's an evaluation. So everybody will have to be able to do . . . But I'll tell you, the truth of the matter is, is you only really need to do it on those people who are showing no increase of response.

And then you ought to do your end rudiments. And the most important end rudiments are simply the missed withhold question and the half-truth, untruth. And occasionally, when you've had a wrestling match, the damage question. He's been trying to damage you, the auditor. And this'll hang him up like mad.

Well, now, the extent of auditing as you see it there... Prepchecking and rudiments are something which are relegated to letting auditing occur. See, these are the tools with which auditing can occur. You permit auditing to occur with these things.

Keep your rudiments in, auditing can occur. Pick up your large gobs of missed withholds off the pc and smooth him out in his relationships with his family and of course your rudiments will smooth out. The only difficulties he's going to have is with his environment and if you cleaned up all the missed withholds with his environment—just sat down for a couple of sessions, you know—you're not going to have any trouble with out-rudiments.

It's very well worth doing. Instead of spending half of the 3D Criss Cross session everyday, you see, putting his rudiments in, just take two sessions and run missed withholds on him on any part of his environment you think might be out, you see. Get the idea?

It's much happier to do it that way because then you've got it done and it'll stay pretty well done, too. And then you can keep it in with ordinary rudiments. Do you follow the use of that?

Well, to get something done with the case—the CCHs, they will get something done with the case if they're done right. And 3D Criss Cross, well, my God, that just doesn't get something done with the case, that takes the reactive mind and pours it down the sewer. That's it. 3D Criss Cross well and accurately done—marvelous.

You recognize that the CCHs are a precision activity. You recognize that meter reading is a precision activity, that Prepchecking, even for just missed withholds, is a precision activity. And CCHs, more than ever, is a precision activity. That preciseness in it is simply your ability to give the auditing commands, to stay in communication with the pc, to ask the right questions for the Prepchecking. And as far as 3D Criss Cross, just reliably make sure that your rudiments are in and reliably make sure that your list is complete and that you differentiate it fine and that you null it perfectly and that you wind up at the other end with the

item, that you check it out right. It's all very precise. It's all very precise. It's almost got the words and music all written down. I mean complete. And any auditor can learn those.

It's a marvelous thing that you could today, with such ease that it would hardly be worth mentioning, identify the well-trained auditor and the poorly trained auditor. The ease with which you could identify the well-trained auditor just by looking at his pc's progress you wouldn't have to look at his auditing at all.

You say, "Well, there he is. And actually a well-trained auditor really never gets in trouble with a pc. It's nothing extraordinary that's being requested of the auditor today except just an atmosphere of competence and accurate rendition of a certain finite number of things. He just has to do those things, make sure that he always does them and does them thoroughly.

You're not reaching for an unattainable, in other words. Nobody is asking an auditor today to do something that is impossible. That might have been true yesterday, but it is not true today. And it can be done and it can be done well.

And the results which you get for doing the exact textbook solution, see, are just fabulous. The results don't match the sudden divergences and brilliances and new ideas, you see, that you get in the session and so on. The results don't match that. The results match the textbook solution today. Probably the first time in the history of this planet, that that has ever been the case.

If you ever fought a war, according to West Point textbooks, you'd lose it. If you built bridges according to the engineering school manuals they would all fall down. If you repaired machinery by the maintenance and operation manuals, that you're issued for engines and things like that, Lord knows what would happen. They have one grease cup going three years, but you have to change the oil in the crankcase every fifteen minutes or something, you know.

Well, I'll give you an idea. The car you drive—if you're driving a car—the oil people tell you, you should change the oil in that car about every thousand miles. That's what they tell you if you read their advertisements. Factually speaking, nothing possibly goes wrong with the oil for the first five thousand miles.

And you see motorists all over the place busy following these rules and regulations, you see, and changing the oil every thousand miles and they grease it every twenty thousand. And their cars just fall apart and they never can understand why.

Probably a car needs to be greased every thousand miles, but it doesn't get its crankcase changed every. . . It all depends on the climate you're running in, of course. How dirty and gritty the country is or something like that, has a lot to do with it. These things are practically done in reverse, you see. See, you're so used to the textbook solution not working, see, that you tend to believe that something new and extraordinary and beyond this will be demanded of you.

Well, I can tell you straight from the shoulder right now, that that is not true of Scientology today. The textbook solution gets you the whole distance. And the only reason you won't get there is because you don't follow it. I know. I know. I just had about. . . I guess it's been about fifteen, sixteen hours of nothing but textbook solution. Working like a dream. Working like a dream.

Well, that's auditing today. That's what's expected of an auditor today. An auditor can do these things, fine. If he can do them with understanding, wonderful. But he won't get any results at all unless he does it with complete precision. And that's what it depends on. Okay?

Thank you.

