

## THE COMMUNICATION CYCLE IN AUDITING

A lecture given on  
6 February 1964

Thank you.

Thank you very much.

Now, what is the date, here? What's the date?

Audience: 6th of February.

February what?

Audience: 6.

6—6th of February. What year?

Audience: A.D. 14.

Thank you. Thank you. February 6, A.D. 14, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. I'm going to talk to you about a very arduous subject. The subject is the communication cycle, and I think you might like to know something about the communication cycle as used in auditing. It's a new subject—new to many.

If you look over communication, you'll find out that the magic of communication is about the only thing that makes auditing work. And if you could sit down to a meter—a one-hand electrode—all by yourself and run some process on yourself, it'd make a citizen out of you. And the reason it'd make a citizen out of you, is you would see a little bit of tone arm action at first, or if you tripped across something like an active, loud, large GPM, why, you might get yourself a quarter or a half a tone arm division, or a couple of needle flashes. Now, you can always get a needle flash. You can always get something of that sort.

Now, the amount of tone arm action you would get doing this would make you blink, because it's none. And you could run some hot process on you that had been run by some auditor and which gave him good TA—this process that has been run, give you good TA, you see, when the auditor was auditing it—then you sit down there with a one-hand electrode while the process is still hot and run the commands on yourself, you're going to get for a moment the residual of the auditing. That is to say, the auditor will have stirred up enough so that you'll see a little bit of charge go off, and then your tone arm is going to go dead—and it's going to stay dead.

Now, the reason for this has to do with the thetan in this universe. Now, he has begun to consider himself MEST, and he's begun to consider himself mass. And the being who considers himself mass, of course, responds to the laws of electronics and the laws of Newton, and is actually incapable of generating very much, you see, or—which is what we're interested in—arising very much. There's not very much going to disappear there in the way of mass. And this is a very discouraging sort of an activity.

Now, I have had to explore this particular field of auditing—self-auditing, because most anybody does it, and so forth—and what was this all about. And I have even gotten ambitious enough to run an actual GPM, bangity-bangity, bangity-bang, on a one-hand electrode. That makes your hair stand on end. Well, it made my hair stand on end. And my auditor fished me out. It didn't kill me, I was able to breathe afterwards—that is, if I didn't move much. But the same GPM, run with the same items and so forth, would produce upwards to 175 TA divisions, down. And the GPM, self-audited, produced 2.

Now, what was this all about? What was this all about? It tells us (now, it isn't that experiment; other experiments were made in this particular line)—and it tells us that an individual considers himself MESTy, or massy, if you see, and therefore he has to have a second terminal. And a second terminal is required to discharge the energy.

Now, a lot of auditors go further than this, and they go downhill to a point where they think they're being the second terminal to the degree that they think they pick up the somatics and illnesses of the person they're auditing. Well, get that.

Actually, there is no backflow of any kind hits the auditor. There is no backflow hits the auditor of any kind. But if he is so convinced that he himself is MEST, why, of course, he will turn on somatics and everything else in echo to the pc, because he's simply doing a matched terminal with the pc, don't you see? Actually, nothing hits the auditor. It has to be mocked up or envisioned by him. I think you find that's quite amusing, because there are whole schools of healing, back in the early days of Greece particularly, where they picked up the pain out of somebody's 'ead, or off somebody's arm, and they got the somatic very nicely and took it away and dumped it in the trash bin. Spiritual healing has this in its textbooks, and so forth. Well, that is its genus, is just this two-pole proposition.

Now, you don't have to know anything about electricity or electronics in order to go into this very deeply, but it's obvious to you that for a motor to run or for something to occur, like a light go on, that two poles have to be involved. And energy passing between two terminals, or two poles, makes an interchange, and it gives you what you call electric light.

Now, of course, that is the burning of energy. In this particular case you don't have the burning of energy, you have the as-ising of energy where the auditor and the pc is concerned. Now, the ability to hold a position, or the ability to hold two terminals apart, is a definition of power. Not how much energy can be thrown by a unit, but the base, the strain that is put on the base. The ability to hold these two positions. That's a little bit outside of what we're talking about. But here we have two poles. We have an auditor and a pc, and as long as the auditor audits and the pc replies, we get an apparent exchange of energy from the pc's point of view, which doesn't hit the auditor; but because they thinly of themselves, don't you see, at this low, subvolitional level, as terminals, why, you get these exchanges of energy going on, you see? And nothing hits the auditor, and it anises as far as the pc is concerned.

But you have set up, in essence, a two-pole system, and that will bring about an as-ising of mass. It isn't burning the mass, it is as-ising the mass. And that's why there is nothing hitting the auditor. Now, that is the essence of the situation, and the magic involved in auditing is contained in the communication cycle of auditing. You see, now you are handling the smooth interchange between these two poles. Eventually, the individual will get up to a point where he does not consider himself to be matter, and this no longer occurs. When you've got half of a pc's actual GPMs run out, you start running into trouble. I'm running into that trouble right now.

Unless the pc makes up her mind, or recognizes the truth of the situation, I can't knock any energy off. I can ask the question, and the meter is the deadest-looking meter you ever saw in your life. Yet there's a red-hot GPM sitting under this sort of thing. See, there'll be a red-hot item or a red-hot this or a red-hot that. But I have to ask the pc whether or not that is it. And when the pc looks at it and decides that that is it, or that isn't it, only then do I get an active meter.

And this is most amazing. This is most amazing. The GPM can be sitting right there ready to read, and unless the pc has looked at it and has thought it over, why, nothing happens on the meter. Yet this same pc, before those—half of the bank was run out, don't you see; all I had to do was sneeze at the meter and I got rocket reads on anything, and the pc didn't know anything about what was rocket-reading and what wasn't rocket-reading. You get the advance? The advance is upwards toward knowing one is one, see? And you get out of these automatic

physical-energy manifestations of the physical universe. And getting out of these things, you then get to a point where you've got intention.

Now, what is one of these GPMs, anyway, but a method of limiting the pc's ability to intend? And that is the whole idea behind implanting or any thing of that nature. The whole idea is that if he intends positive, he gets negative. If he intends negative, he gets positive. So, therefore, he cannot decide.

Now, if you take somebody and every time he says yes you say no, he eventually will get into an indecisional state of mind. He can no longer intend yes, completely, see? So this is how you could wear somebody down, break his spirit, or make him a private in the army. Get the idea? Every time he has a thought, you deny it. You see? There's where you get your original power of choice. The ideas of power of choice—and all such other ideas. The ideas of self-determinism versus other-determinism. All these other various ideas stem out of this alone. It is the ability to intend something.

Now, somebody cannot write. He intends to write, and he'll go around talking about writing, but he doesn't write. Well, what is happening there, he is intending to write, but something is intending that he not write. And that is his mind kicking back at him, which is simply a positive-negative proposition there, of two poles. Do you see this?

All right. He intends to talk Arabic, but the mind says that he can't talk Arabic. See, there's your positive-negative. He intends not to talk Arabic and finds himself chattering strange phrases, and you get these speakings in foreign tongues that the hysterical religionist very often is found to have, and so forth. In other words, you get the positive and the negative proposition. Well, a person has to be very MESTy indeed before they are subject to these particular phenomena. And the more MESTy that they consider themselves, the more enmeshed in matter that they consider themselves, and the more energied up they are, why, the more trouble they have with this particular action. And, of course, as you go upscale this phenomena drops away as progress is made in this particular direction.

Now, what value is the auditor? Well, the auditor, of course, is at his greatest value at the lowest level of the case, is necessary all the way up through to step six—end of actual GPMs—is necessary all the way. But the auditor at very low levels can produce some of the most interesting phenomena. And it was in the Dianetic days that they were able to absolutely break their hearts, because you could say to somebody so-so-so-and-so and so-and-so, and you could handle engrams, you could handle matters associated with the bank, and the pc would lose his or her arthritis, would lose psychosomatic ills of one kind or another, and never find out about it.

In other words, the auditor could sit there and as-is bits of the thing, just by the automatic mechanical process of a two-way communication with the pc. But the pc was so snarled up and so sunk in, and considered themselves so much a brick or a piece of rock or a wooden slab, that they would never find out about it. And after the auditor had cured up somebody's lumbosis completely, why, the person would say, "Well, yes, but you haven't done anything about my worries about my wife." Well, yes, he was incurable, he was bedridden, he had to go around—the most he could look forward to was a wheelchair. And the auditor would fix him all up and he's walking around now, and he complains because he hasn't had his wife straightened out.

In other words, he was actually influenced without his knowledge. Do you understand this, now, Tom a two-pole arrangement? Wherever an individual, wherever an individual, then, thinks of himself as an animal, as matter, as a bit of mud, as algae which has coadulated [coadunated] into the difficulties of manhood, when you get these various things, what do you eventually see? You see a whole scientific world indulging in the philosophy of "man is matter." So the spiritual values and natures of man are, of course, lost completely. Only auditing can restore these. Nothing else is going to restore them.

But when you look over the difficulties of auditing, realize that you are handling simply the difficulties of a communication cycle. And when you, yourself, as the auditor, do not permit a smooth flow between you as a terminal and the pc as a terminal, and the pc as a terminal back to you, you get a no as-ising of matter: So you don't get tone arm action.

Now, part of the trick of course is what has to be as-ised, and how do you go about it? But that we call technique. And if you remove technique, if you remove technique from the area—let's not worry about the particulars, what button has to be pressed or stepped on. We're not going to wonder about this—what button. We're going to wonder only about the communication cycle. We find, oddly enough, if the auditor is actually capable of making the pc willing to talk to him, he wouldn't have to hit a button to get tone arm action. Do you see this?

Now, the person who is insisting continuously upon a new technique, a new technique, or a very fancy technique, or that sort of thing, is neglecting the basic tool of his auditing, which is the communication cycle of auditing. He cannot make the pc get tone arm action. Well, he can't make the pc get tone arm action, basically, because the communication cycle doesn't exist. And when the communication cycle does not exist in an auditing session, we get this horrible compounding of the felony of trying to get a technique, but the technique cannot be administered to the pc because there's no communication cycle to administer it.

So basic auditing is called basic auditing because it goes prior to the technique. The communication cycle must exist before the technique can exist. And, therefore, any case supervisor is very, very well advised to merely heal up the various points and portions that are missing as far as that communication cycle is, and hit it as buttons. And in view of the fact that the auditor is trying and the auditor is doing something, to actually neglect whether or not the auditing is good or bad—that's up to an auditing instructor, isn't it?—just neglect that. But just look at the case from the basis of "What parts of this communication cycle are awry?" and "What isn't here in the form of a response to the auditing question?" And simply heal those points up.

Now, if you had a man lying unconscious in the street, you certainly wouldn't be thinking up what technique to run on him. If you wanted to bring him back to life and livingness, what you would want to do is get him to talk to you, or breathe, or flutter an eyelid. That would be something. Oddly enough, the communication cycle all by itself will cause him to flutter that eyelid.

You can take an unconscious person who has been in a coma for some time, and by picking up their hand and making them touch the pillow, and even touch your arm—you know, picking up the hand (they have no volition here)—picking up the hand, touching the shoulder, picking up the hand, touching the pillow (giving them the command at the same time, talking), and so forth, that person will come back to life. This is the greatest magic that anybody ever saw. It's very startling, but look, you're just trying to get this man into communication with the auditor and communication with his surroundings. And he'll come back to battery. And there's no technique.

So, that should demonstrate to you that the fundamental entrance to the case is not on a level of technique, but on a level of the communication cycle. Now, all you have to do is mark out how many branches of this communication cycle can there be. There can be a communication cycle between the pc and the auditor, and the pc and the auditing room. And that's about it.

Now you can get particular, and you can have parts of the auditing room, or you can have specific portions of the auditor or the auditor's beingness—you can mark down to that. And then you can maybe go afield from this particular zone or area—if the person is already in a communication cycle with the auditor—you can go afield and start to address his present time problems. Now you can address whether or not his wife fixes the tea properly or puts arsenic in the coffee, as he is worried about. Now you can address that sort of thing.

But this, of course, because it is distant from where you are sitting, requires a technique. First you have to know what he is worried about out there because it is not present and visible for you to see, or for him to see. So the technique selects out what he is worried about—a little form of assessment, don't you see? And now you're into techniques and processing, having left the field of the communication cycle. If the field of the communication cycle with the auditing room and with the auditor is all solid ground, and if all of that is squared away, you can now worry about technique.

Now, the auditor who comes tearing down to you sometime as—when you're D-of-Ping someplace—and the auditor who comes down and says to you, "Ho-ha-hai, I . . . I just can't get anyplace on Mrs. Hepsibah. Can't get anyplace on Mrs. Hepsibah," and you say, "Well, why don't you run so-and-so and so-and-so," will inevitably come back (you give him a technique, you see)—will inevitably come back a half an hour or so later and say, "That doesn't work either." And you can keep up this silly cycle for a long, long time. Because of course there is no technique being delivered to the pc because there is no communication cycle present.

Now, what needs to be repaired is the communication cycle, and when you've got a communication cycle repaired, then you can audit a technique. It's as elementary as that. Now, there are many parts of this communication cycle that can be addressed, because you have the pc there and you have the auditor there. And, of course, the first part of it that has to be addressed is the fact that the person is having a session and is in a room and is being faced by an auditor.

Now, if you take all those and write down the categories—you write down all the categories, all the different little bits that can be written down that are part of this (it's best for you as an auditor to imagine them rather than for me to give you a long catalog of them, you see)—and then figure out how you're going to get him into communication on each one of these points, realizing that communication is simply a familiarization process based on reach and withdraw. Even when you speak to a pc, even when you speak to a person, you are reaching; when you cease to speak you are withdrawing. When he hears you, he has something withdrawn—and at that moment he's a bit withdrawn, don't you see?—but then he reaches toward you with the answer. And you'll see him go into a withdraw while he thinks it all over. See, he gets back and, well, he's—"Which . . . why did my grandfather have to marry the girl?" See?

And he thinks over this, and you'll see him think this over, and he thinks that cycle through on a withdrawal, don't you see? And then he will reach back to the auditor.

Now, he's already reached this reason. Now he will reach the auditor with the reason, and he will say that was it. Now you have made an exchange from the pc to the auditor, and will see it reflect on a meter. Because that exchange, now, is giving an as-ising of energy.

In the absence of that communication, you do not get meter action. So the fundamental of auditing—the fundamental of auditing—is the communication cycle! That's the fundamental of auditing! And that is really the great discovery of Dianetics and Scientology. It is such a simple discovery that—and everybody does it. But you realize that nobody knew anything about communication when it came along. The number of chaps in communication companies and that sort of thing, who fall around our neck saying "Really!" you know?

You say, "Well, communication, it consists of cause, distance, effect," you know?

"I . . . yeah! By golly, it does, you know!"

Well, it's just this sort of thing. It's a fundamental that everybody knew was there. They've been watching apples fall off trees for a very long time and Newton had to come along and see an apple fall off a tree, see? And he said, "Hey, apples fall off trees, and when they leave the tree they hit the ground!" See? Everybody says, "Wow!" you know? "Terrific!" you know? And his name has gone singing down through the ages, because he noticed that apples fell off trees.

It's always this sort of a thing. It's always this sort of a thing which escapes the attention of people. Because MEST is basically very complex stuff. And being very complex (composed as it is out of electrons and molecules and minerals and gee-whizzes of all kinds or another, wavelengths and all this sort of thing), because of its tremendous complexity—so complex that nobody can understand it, they can only. .. You know? Therefore, people who are very plowed in, you might say, into matter, and who are themselves thinking as matter, think very complexly. And they cannot observe the simplest things with which they are confronted. And they observe none of these things.

Now, you look over this. I call this to your attention. The ease with which you can handle a communication cycle depends on your ability to observe what the pc is doing. Now, we have to add to the simplicity of the communication cycle, the obnosis—the observation of the obvious. If the pc hasn't been talking to you, and if the pc hasn't said anything to you for a very long time, it is no time for you to be thinking on the subject of "What do I say to the pc?" You say, "What do I say to the pc?"

Please! I invite your attention that your inspection of what you are doing should have ended with your training, and thereafter is taken up exclusively with the observation of what the pc is doing or is not doing. And your handling of a communication cycle ought to be so instinctive, and so good, that you are never worried over here about what you do now. "Let's see, am I doing it right or am I not doing it right? Let's see. I wonder how my acknowledgment was that time. Did I say 'Okay' in an artificial frame of voice or should I say it naturally, like 'O-kay.' No, that wasn't right." No. The time for you to get this all fixed up is in training. And in actual auditing, the communication cycle that you watch is the pc's. That's the communication cycle you watch. You know yours is good. So you don't worry about it anymore.

Now, if you know your communication cycle is good, you haven't any longer got to be upset about whether you're doing it right or not. And you ought to be well enough trained that when somebody says "catfish" to you, you look at them and recognize they are no longer saying "catfish" and have finished saying "catfish." And having finished saying "catfish," it is time for you to acknowledge. But you only acknowledge because they have finished the communication. And your observation is simply limited to the fact that they have completed their communication, and that is your observation. Your observation is the observation of the communication cycle of the pc. And you get good enough so that you just lay in mothballs your worry about your communication cycle when you're finished training. That's the time it goes into mothballs. You understand? You know how to do it now. Your business is the communication responses and cycles of the pc. Do you see that?

This pc: You ask me, "What technique shall we run on this pc?" Technique! What are you doing with a technique? Let's look at the pc for a few minutes. "Oh yes, but," we say, "well, the pc has got to have something to talk about." Oh, come, come, come! You've been in Scientology or Dianetics all this time, and you can't dream up something for him to talk about? It's as corny as this: "You had any problems lately?" See? Or it's corny as this: "How are you doing?" Let's get this pc to talk so we can see what the score is. Now this is the true—the true—touch of genius on a case. This is what makes that auditor who can crack any case, and when it's absent, has an auditor who couldn't crack an egg if he stepped on it. This is the difference. This is the difference. It's whether or not this auditor can observe the communication cycle of the pc and repair its various lacks

Now, I'm now talking to you—when I talk to you about the auditor's communication cycle—I'm talking to you about something that's so simple. It simply consists of asking a question that the pc can answer, and then observing that the pc answers it. And when the pc has answered it, observing that the pc has completed the answer to it—that the pc has answered it and has completed his answer to it and is through answering it. And then saying "Cheerios"—giving him the acknowledgment—bang! like that. Say, "All right. You finished that," and then giving him something else to do. That's all. You can ask the same question. Or you can ask another question. It doesn't matter. But the communication cycle is simply asking something that the pc

can answer. There's a lot of little trickery involved in this, because that includes clearing the auditing command. See?

You don't say to somebody who's got a—you got a five-year-old kid. And you say to him, "Have you had any marital troubles lately?" and I don't think you're going to get much of an answer. See, it requires that much good sense: Ask a question that can be answered, and then ask it of the pc so the pc can hear it and knows what he's being asked, and then the pc answers the question; and being bright enough to know that the pc is answering that question, not some other question, and then knowing—and this, by the way, is a very interestingly developed instinct—you can tell when the pc is finished. And if you don't develop that instinct, you're very often lost. You'll say, "Well, did he end, or didn't he end?" and so on. Well, some auditors try to make it up, making another technique inside a technique, like, "Have you finished answering that auditing question?" of course this is so much balderdash. You should be able to know. It is a piece of knowingness. See, you just know he's finished. He looks like he's finished, he feels like he's finished, your telepathy tells you he's finished, you get the idea? It's that esoteric.

He said, "Well, I . . . I didn't have a grandfather." And you now know that he is not going to say any more. See? It's part sense. It's part his vocal intonation. But it's an instinct that you develop. You know he's finished. So, knowing he's finished, then you tell him he's finished. It's like pointing out the bypassed charge, don't you see? "You've answered it," you say. "You answered it." Actually, if you said "Okay. Good," you might as well say "You've answered it. You have now found and located the bypassed charge in answer to the question, and there it is, and you have said it." See? That's the magic of acknowledgment, don't you see? But, naturally, you say, "Good," "Very good," you know, "All right," "Okay."

But if you got a long continuing thing, you don't want to stop him too hard. So the degree of stop you put on your acknowledgment is also your good sense. Because you can acknowledge a pc so hard—and if your impingement on pcs is way up in the stars—that you finish the session right there. You just end the session. You waste all that remaining two hours that you had to go.

So he's talking on a consecutive line of thought and you acknowledge as though you're not going to ask it anymore, ever. And he won't think of it anymore, ever, either. So frankly, now, when you've acknowledged it, you knew he was finished and you said he was finished by acknowledging it, and then you gave him something else to answer! Now, that—aho-hu-rrrrr-mmm! Second we got into it, we got into trouble, man! Because we dropped out giving him something else to answer. And an auditor will sit there without giving the pc anything to do. And you've got to develop a sensitivity. When did that pc finish answering what you asked? At that point you say "Cheers," and give him the next question.

But when you don't have that sensitivity, the pc answers it, gets nothing Tom you, you sit there and look at him; his social machinery goes into response that "We must not be sitting here quietly doing nothing." Some pcs take up humming, I hear—because the auditor hasn't acknowledged and given him a new question! The auditor just is not there, that's all.

Now, it's 811 very well to do that sort of thing in training, and it's forgivable, but not in an auditing session, really. Now, after all. Pc has finished answering the question, "Cheers! Thank you. Good. All right." Now you know you've acknowledged something. You finished off that cycle, so you better ask him, "Do fish swim?" man! "Are there any other problems you've been worried about?" See, he's finished that one. "Anything else upset you between sessions?" See? But be in there, man! Don't stand there tangle-footed saying "What do I do now? Oh!" Because at this point the pc is going to overrun. He's going to start making a session out of it, he's going to go onto auto. And what did I just tell you about self-auditing? It gives no tone arm action. So the degree that the pc hasn't any communication cycle with the auditor, he doesn't get tone arm action. So then the degree that the pc is sitting there all by himself, self-auditing, gives you no tone arm action. And that's actually—the absence of tone arm action is the degree of self-audit the pc is indulging in. You understand this cycle?

All right, well, that's all there is to that cycle. That's all there is to that cycle. Now, for heaven's sakes, get yours sufficiently well repaired that you don't have to worry about it after training. And after that, spend your basic auditing doing nothing but repair the communication inabilities of the pc, and you will be a genius, man! You crack 99 percent of the cases that walk in. A screaming genius! People will look at you, "Wow!" you know? Well, this fellow is awful worried because his wife's waffling and ran off with a "waff-waf, and so forth, waf-waf-waf-waf-waf-waf-waf. . ." and you say "Thank you," and he goes " Waf-waf-waf. . . "Thank you." ". . . waf-waf-waf-waf. . ." "thank you! Thank you. Thank you. Yeah, I heard . . . I heard about your wife running off with the chauffeur. Tha . . . thank you. I got that. I . . . I—r got that! I heard it. Yeah, yeah. Good! Thank you! All right. Thank you. Thank you very much. Thanks. All right."

Guy will be looking at you like a snake that has just been faced with a shotgun, see? "What has entered into my perimeter? Is there something else around here? I could have sworn I heard somebody speak."

A lot of you take over the case, and the guy is going, "yip-yip-yap-yap-yap." And he says, "waffle, waffle, waf and so forth and so on, and so on and I really don't have any and so on and all these lollipops, they keep coming out of the wah-blah-blah . . ."

You say, "Thank you."

And he goes, "Wa-wa-wana-nawa-wa . . ."

You say, "Thank you."

And " Wa-wa. And then the—all the lollipops and the wife ran away with the chauffeur, and so on. And it's all very terrible . . ."

And you say, "Thank you," and so forth.

"And it's all very terrible and the wife ran away with the lollipops and, oh, the chauffeur came out, and . . ."

Oh, don't be an idiot and sit there and let this go on forever. He isn't talking to anybody. Now, that's what you've got to recognize. Let's get down to some of these problems here. Let's get down. What is this guy doing with his communication cycle? You want to know how to bust cases, that's how you bust them.

What's he doing? I'll give you an idea. Let me give you a very, very high-school, way-upstairs analysis of this situation, show you how far this can go—way up in the clouds. Bang! Pc takes twenty minutes to answer the auditing question. Now, the auditor, see, in this particular case, he knows Scientology. He knows it backwards, forwards and upside down, see? Guy takes twenty minutes to answer the auditing question, and in that answer of the auditing question, doesn't answer it. Now, the very smart auditor, the very, very, very smart auditor, in repairing this communication cycle from the pc, would look at that, and he'd have three processes just like that. Three processes he'd know he'd have to do on this pc. Pang, pang, pang! This, I told you is very high school, see? It's very up. Very upstairs.

(1) Pc cannot have an auditing question. It's pretty obvious, isn't it? Didn't answer the question, so he couldn't have gotten it. So your first process would be "What auditing question wouldn't you mind being asked?" or "What auditing question should you be asked?" or "What question could you answer?" This is getting very elementary, isn't it? "What question wouldn't you mind answering?" You say that's running him at effect. No, it isn't, because you're asking him to have the power of choice over what question. You'd be surprised. You could probably run that as a repetitive process for an hour or two, and everything would get much brighter to this person. Person would say, "Terrific process! Absolutely terrific process. Never heard of



such a process before! When did you dream that process up?" I mean, dream a process up, be damned. You just start processing him on a part of the communication cycle.

Now let's get more esoteric. Let's get much more esoteric. If he says he hasn't had any auditing, we obviously would adjudicate that he can't have any auditing. But we'd have to repair something of the communication cycle of "What question wouldn't he mind answering?" before we could ask him a question that he would answer. Quite obvious, isn't it? So you'd have to take first things first. And then we would have to find out about this auditing thing, and I think you'd find out, as your second process, it'd be necessary for you to get him to get the concept of wasting auditing, and others wasting auditing. Well, if he can't have it, he's wasting it, because it's sitting in front of him. Can't have auditing.

Well, if you got him to waste it in concept for a few minutes or a half an hour or a session or something like this, "Get the idea of you wasting auditing. Get the idea of someone . . ."—not have him pick up anything on recall, man, because if you're auditing a case like that, you're obviously auditing somebody who doesn't dare go back on the backtrack. So don't say "What auditing have you had that you wouldn't mind?" you see, because you're asking him to go into the past. Well, obviously, that is like going out into the outer perimeter. The past is not in the session. That's going abroad, isn't it? Memory processes, and that sort of thing, are out of the session and out of the communication cycle. That's something you repair after you've got somebody in session.

So your next process would be, as I said, waste auditing. "Get the idea of wasting auditing. What could you do here that would waste auditing?" That's very good, you see? "What could an auditor do here that would waste auditing?" Because a person can't have something, they must waste it. If he isn't getting auditing, he must not be able to have it. I mean, let's get elementary. Let's go way back to 1952, get Elementary Have. The ability to do. You could also get him to waste communication or anything else, but I'm just dreaming up three processes in a row here. Your first one is what question could he answer, see, wouldn't he mind answering; your next one is "Get the idea of wasting auditing"; and the third one, "Who would I have to be to audit you?"

Now you've done a subvert, here. You've gone below the session. See, you've brought him up to a point where he could hear the fact that you're going to ask him a very significant question. After I did that, I'd maybe work on his memory. Because those three points would really be healed. You'd see that whole case change. You'd see that whole case change. And yet you're worried because he keeps talking about his lollipops running out with—away with his wife, or something of the sort. And you just get fixated on the fact. You say, "This guy can't be audited because he talks all the time, all the time, all the time, about lollipops and the chauffeur, and it goes on and on and on and on and on. And, therefore, if we don't remedy this button about the lollipops, the chau . . ." Why, hell's bells, he doesn't even know what he's talking about.

It's whether or not he can receive an acknowledgment, whether or not he can receive an auditing question, whether or not he can have an auditing session, whether or not he can sit in an auditing room, whether or not he can have an acknowledgment, whether or not, you see, he can say something to the auditor, whether or not—so forth. You get all the little processes that go with this, see? Now, the person took twenty minutes to answer an auditing question and didn't answer it for those twenty minutes. Three processes. Based on what? Just your knowledge of Scientology and what the pc is doing in front of you. Simple, huh?

All right, we got a pc who's sitting there, and he doesn't say anything. Let's take another case, let's just do all this off the cuff. Pc isn't saying anything.

"Yeah."

"All right. Do birds fly?" (You're running some process, you know?) "Do birds fly? I'll repeat the question...."

“Oh, hmm. Oh, hmm. (sigh) Yeah.”

Well, let's dream up a process. We obviously can't have “What question wouldn't you mind my asking you?” because he's sitting there silent, man. Probably not a question of being asked a question, it's a question of not being able to respond to a question. Let's take it apart, let's find out what the pc is doing, dream up something accordingly, see?

So we say, “What could you say to me?” Elementary. Long comm lag, and he finally says something he can say to you. You get this question over somehow to him. What could he say to you?

And he finally says, “I . . . I could say hello.” Good, big win, see? All right, let's build this up on a gradient. Next thing you know, you've got him talking to you. But you see, if you don't have the auditing cycle going from the pc to the auditor, if you have tremendous communication disabilities on the part of the pc, you actually don't have any auditing cycle going that will discharge energy, and so you don't have tone arm action. That simple? That's all there is to it, actually. So, as soon as he can talk to the auditor, don't get so overjoyed about this wonderful change in him that you cease, now, to inspect his communication cycle. Because if you've cured that, you will now find another piece of it that's missing. In other words, you can go the whole way. Do you see?

After he's gotten so that he can say something to you, well now, now you might have to figure out what would he answer, don't you see? And now you might have to figure out if he could have an auditor. Now you might even go so far as to find out what constituted getting better. I don't think you have to invent a process as complicated as “What would be worse than getting better?” But what the pc isn't doing is where . . . Well, let me put it this way. There's a little formula involved: It's what the pc isn't doing that it might be possible for the auditor to get him to do, see? That's the formula. It isn't what isn't the pc doing that we're going to get him to do—what is the missing ability? Because obviously he's not OT, so you say, “All right, be OT.” You're going to have a lose here. I'm afraid that's going to be a lose. Do you see? So, it's what can you get the pc to do that the pc can regain the ability in doing? See, that's the formula on which you're operating.

And, operating on that formula, you can find all sorts of things. You can thresh around in the environment of the pc, one way or the other, and if you're an alert auditor, you'll see these little disabilities showing up here and there, and so forth. A stammerer is about the easiest diagnosis anybody ever had anything to do with. But how many stammerers have I seen being audited on processes and techniques? Well, it's absolutely foolish to audit a stammerer on a technique. He obviously is having difficulty communicating. What are you doing in an auditing session, doing anything but to improve his ability to communicate to the auditor?

Now, you might find something silly like this happen if you were auditing somebody who stammered: that he would talk to the auditor eventually with complete clarity—still stammered to other people. Well, this is quite obvious. This is extremely obvious what you would now do. You don't now instantly extend it to other people, because there are other pieces of the communication abilities right there in the session to be straightened up before you go out into the outer perimeter of the society. And usually where the auditor gets his lose is he repairs something, gets a big win, and then there's thirty other things to be repaired, sitting right in front of his face—right in front of him—and he doesn't. He does some kind of a jump into memory, or engram running, or something. My God, just because the pc is now perfectly willing to talk to you is no reason that the pc—who a few minutes ago could not remember anything—it's no reason he now can remember something. That's another ability.

Let's say somebody is trying to improve their memory. Well, you improve somebody's memory after you've got somebody who can receive an auditing question and answer it, and then receive the acknowledgment resulting therefrom, and who can sit there in an auditing session and be a pc and be audited. Now you can go about improving memory, but oddly

enough, memory improvement starts with being able to remember something in the auditing room, not something that happened to him eight trillion years ago. It begins just a minute ago.

I've seen a pc absolutely ruined, become unauditably, by repetitively being asked questions having to do with memory that the pc couldn't answer. So another rule in observing the communication cycle, and so forth, is don't ask the pc to do things the pc can't do. And if you've inadvertently asked the pc to do something the pc now can't do, well, for heaven's sakes, be enough on the ball, be sharp enough, be really bright on this and recognize that you've asked the pc something the pc can't do, and therefore you've given a lose, and you better not compound the lose. Don't ask them to do the same thing again that they now can't do.

This goes very elementary. You talk about flattening processes. Very often you're asking a pc a process, you see? "From where could you view catfish?" see? "From where could you view catfish?" "From where could you view catfish?"

And the pc finally says, "That's all the answers there are."

And you know, the process had better be flattened. So you say, "Well, from where could you view catfish?"

And he says, "Well, that's all the answers there are."

And you say, "From where could you view catfish?" And now he has to invent an answer, and you're running a create process. Your pc, if he doesn't ARC break, snarls up right there.

I always respect a pc saying "There aren't any more answers." I bail out of there in a hurry. And when I ask the pc "From where could you view catfish?" and we just took off into the blue here—"From where could you view catfish?" See? That's the question I want you to answer now. Answer the question"—and the pc says, "I'm sorry, I . . . I never viewed any catfish," I know right away have been guilty of giving the pc an auditing question which the pc couldn't answer, and I am guilty of not having cleared the auditing question. I've gives the pc a lose.

Let's have a pc who is very deathly afraid of touching mantels—mantel pieces. Just invent a nuttiness, see? All right, we'll say! "All right, walk over there and touch that mantelpiece." (We already knew he was this way, see or we don't know he's this way.) We say, "Walk over there and touch the mantelpiece."

And he says, "Ughh, I . . . I . . . I can't do that."

Soon as you've gotten into that situation, you got yourself a lose. Let find out if the pc could do these things. Let's discuss this process a little bit with the pc. Like, "How's about . . ." I don't care how grammatical or esoteric or patterned you are about this, you see, because sometimes you have to be very communicative. And you say, "How's about if I ask you to walk around here and touch parts of this room? What would you think about that? What if I ask you to do something like that?"

And the pc says, "Oh, my God, I couldn't do that! Ho-ho-ho-ho, no oh-oh! Particularly a mantelpi — Oh-oh-oh, no! Don't ask me to do anything like that."

You say, "All right, I won't."

See, swift recovery. Now, you haven't given the pc any lose. In fact you might have given him a little win. This caused him a spooky feeling "You know, I'm really—I don't really want to walk around here and tour the room."

Ah, he's interested now. "Well, is there anything around here you wouldn't be too upset about touching? How's that? How about some question like that"

“Oh, I could . . . I wouldn’t be too scared of touching that . . . that spot on the floor.”

“What else wouldn’t you mind looking around here and . . . ?”

Smooth as glass, you see? See? You cleared it, he said he couldn’t do this intrigued him, now you can hit a gradient that he can do and build it back up, and you’ve got it made.

Every once in a while you see something like this. But if you’re not observing what the communication cycle of the pc is, why, you’re adrift all the time. Pc isn’t answering the question. Well, that’s obvious. Maybe there’s a hundred thousand remedies could be dreamed up for this particular activity, all within the perimeter of the auditing room. Pc is this way, pc is that way, pc... Every time they sit down in the chair they dust the chair off very carefully and take some Kleenex and wipe the arms of the chair, and then they sit down very gingerly into the chair. You’ve observed this a couple of times. Well, there’s no point in bringing it sharply to their attention, but you must realize, it must be borne home to you—with that much exaggeration, certainly it’d bring it home—that this pc doesn’t want to touch very much around an auditing session. I mean, that would be an elementary observation, don’t you see?

It might have to do with chairs, it might be a GPM, but you can’t run all of that. Let’s just chalk this up. Let’s chalk this up. Pc gingery on this subject. Obviously, somewhere up the line you’re going to run some objective process on this pc—somewhere up the line. But ahead of that there might be some much more attainable, but much less obvious thing, such as the pc never looks at the auditor. That might be touchable. “If you looked over here, what would you see?” Doesn’t really require him to look over there. He only need guess at it. “What might you see?” You could even soften it up to that, don’t you see?

There’s all kinds of things here that depend on auditor observation. Where the pc breaks down in his communication cycle with the auditor and where the pc breaks down in his communication cycle with the environment is your entrance point to the case. Those are the entrance points to the case. If you haven’t got him squared around so that he can respond to the auditor, he of course can’t answer any auditing question, so what’s this technique worry? Why are you worried about a technique? No technique you ever dreamed up is going to arrive.

Well, you have some fortuitous feeling that an automaticity will turn on in the pc and answer you. Well, that’s how you’re going to get the pc getting well and never finding out about it. They ran into that in Dianetics. They could actually run ‘em through an engram. The engram was so easy to trigger, and the bank responds to the auditor so beautifully, that practically the whole session could be carried on without the presence or benefit of a pc. Pc didn’t have to enter into it—and case loses occurred resultingly.

But these are the ways you crack cases. And the best way to study it is just walk around it and take a look at all possible ramifications that could be done about it, get some acquaintance with processes from ‘52, ‘53, ‘55, wonder which one of these processes are applicable to what, don’t you see? There’s all kinds of these processes. First Saint Hill, “Who would I have to be to audit you?” see? That’s a nice process, see? But there’s tons of these processes you can . . . Oh, Lord! Well, they’re being cataloged now, lots of them. But they’re honeys. They’re honeys.

Sometimes you find a pc can’t, absolutely cannot run some process because one leg of it is wrong. Let’s say SCS, and yet the pc can’t stand still. And it’s required in the process to stand still, and yet you’re running Start, Change and Stop on the pc.

Well, the pc’s disability is the pc can’t stand still. The pc can start, the pc can change and the pc can stop, as long as they don’t have to stop much. So you say, well, we can flatten stop—this will be all right. Oh, no, there must be a leg underlying this. See, a pc disability—the pc cannot stand still.

Well, what would you do about something like this? Well, I'll tell you what not to do about it: neglect it. Don't keep on running SCS, SCS, SCS, and the pc is going on, and they go on, because what are they doing? They're running with a prior consideration of the process. Therefore, they never really take on any of the auditing commands.

They are running each auditing command, ("When I say 'Start,' you start that body" and so forth), "All right, I just—that . . . that'll give me a chance not to stand still," see? The pc always amends it. Always amends the auditing question, always amends the auditing question. Don't you see? "I'll stop it, but I'll stop it quick enough and get off of it so at no point during the stop have I stood still." See? You get this idea? Well, a little discussion with the pc will show up these various things.

Now, you can take a process and you can walk parallel with SCS, and you can repair that point and run SCS afterwards. Well, how would you go about standing still? Well, the crudest way to go about it is just say "Stand still. All right." "Don't stand still. Thank you." "Stand still. Thank you." "Don't stand still. Thank you." That's the crudest thing I know of, see? This is obviously right out of the textbooks and technology of Scientology, you see? "Stand still. Thank you." "Don't stand still. Thank you." "Stand still. Thank you." "Don't stand. . . ." Automaticity is going to go away; this must be some kind of an automaticity that's all ready to trigger there. So if we get the person into any familiarity with it—because the person already realizes they can't do it. That recognition tells you that it's within the range of itsa.

But if you get somebody walking in on crutches that don't know they're walking on crutches, you wouldn't say "Throw away your crutches. Now walk." See, too high a gradient. And they don't even worry about it. You get somebody walking in and saying, "I got to get rid of these crutches, man"—worry, worry, worry, present time problem, see?

Well, the thing to do is inspect their communication cycle and their communication cycle with the auditor, communication cycle with their mind, the communication cycle with the environment—see, there's many of these little communication cycles—let's inspect these various things. Let's find out he's all right before we say "All right. Throw away your crutches. Thank you." You got the idea? See?

Normally, what the person is worried about is in actual fact not what the person is bugged with. You very often will get somebody running off on a total automaticity of what's wrong with them, and they're not even listening to themselves talk. Actually, they will run off a total automaticity of what's wrong with them, and they're not even listening to themselves talk. Sometimes they listen to themselves talk to find out what's wrong with them. When you get into that situation, why, it's elementary to repair the existing livingness of the pc, but only after you've repaired their auditingness.

An auditing session is a highly artificial action. Highly artificial. It's dreamed up, invented from scratch. Nothing like it has really ever existed before. That's why a psychoanalyst would lay an egg a minute—in a minute—if he cracked a textbook on Scientology and took it back to the office to run it on one of his patients. Aughhh! And boy, do they lay eggs! Why? Well, they're running Scientology with a psychoanalytic auditing cycle. And, of course, that's a wild auditing cycle if you've ever inspected it.

One psychoanalyst said, "I don't see how you can stand to listen hour after hour after hour," and the other one says, "Who listens?" But that's their appreciation of the auditing cycle, and it's too bad to produce any great effect, which is probably fortunate—because the theory which goes back of it, and so forth, is highly artificial. They don't produce any impingement, the auditing cycle isn't there, and so on.

But this artificiality of an auditing session approximates—it's only artificial because it approximates in such harsh, staggering, visible reality, the exact precise points of contact with existence. And what it is, is a hopped-up, gunned-up contact with beings in existence, don't

you see? Way up! It's something like putting [taking] a Model-T Ford and putting a Lycoming aircraft engine in it, see? And bzzzz-zzzz!

Well, all of communication always has consisted of cause, distance, effect. Well, you jam it up into an auditing communication cycle and it's full of bombs, man. See, bang! Things are going to happen, because it's highlighted the exact important points. For instance, you ask somebody on the street out here, "What's important about communication?"

They say, "Well, being polite."

"Good. What are the parts of communication?"

"Oh, there's uh . . . past participles and there's uh . . . present participles and uh . . . there's grammar and . . ."

See, they couldn't tell you any of this, don't you see?

All right, you gun in there, with cause, distance, effect, you see? Ask a question, get it answered, acknowledge it, see? Porowww! See? Wrooof! You're handling raw meat. And you rehabilitate any part of this, and so forth, and then something wakes up. Thetan can't help but wake up. The ability to communicate is always terribly visible to a reporter, or somebody doing work in this particular field. They get around Scientologists, it knocks them flat. And this photographer that was here today from the Saturday Evening Post, and so forth—who has gone now, I imagine—this boy's first remark to me is "They're all so uninhibited!" after he got through taking pictures of you, you see? "You're all so uninhibited."

He sees communication happening. He's very impressed with you, you see? You're walking straighter, and you aren't all tightened up, and you're not a bundle of nerves, don't you see, and all this sort of thing. And he can't quite express this thing, but he's already in a state of shock because he's been hit, you see, with too much life, livingness, you know—just hit him in the face. And yet, none of you really probably said anything to him. It's that apparent.

Well now, you take this up and gun this up into an auditing cycle, and the auditor is saying, "Do birds fly?" and the pc is supposed to listen to this, and he is supposed to understand this and he is supposed to sort out the answer to this, and he is supposed to deliver it up now. And he's going to get for that, "Thank you" straight into his skull. And it isn't the parts of grammar, and it isn't this, and it isn't that and it isn't the other thing, and . . . If he can stand up to this, he'll start getting the idea that he can communicate. And he goes out of session, and he'll start communicating with the environment. And the only thing really wrong with people is, is they've withdrawn from contact.

If you wanted to capsuleize the entirety of difficulty with the mind, take somebody who is no longer looking. The last time he looked, there were three saber-toothed tigers ready to bite him. Now he is no longer looking. of course, he believes that there are three saber-toothed tigers there. He'll sometimes put up screens between himself and the tigers. And then, of course, he never dares take down the screens, so he never finds out if the tigers have gone. And he does this throughout enough trillenia, he's got an awful stack of tigers—all of which have left! But he doesn't know it. He can't be sure they've left.

And so he's in a condition of total withdrawal—from his environment, from himself. He's safeguarded himself with an automatic bank; he's safeguarded himself with an automatic beingness; he's got a valence standing where he ought to be, and he knows that he came straight from mud and that he is mud and that he'd better not be anything else, because mud is relatively unpalatable when eaten by saber-toothed tigers.

And a capsulization of all aberration is just a total withdrawal. I don't care—that's a psychiatric term, of course. They have some condition; they say "total withdrawal." The psychiatrist is standing there totally withdrawn, telling you about somebody who has gone into a withdrawal,

which I always considered very interesting. This is not an apt term. It's one point where we're crossing terms. But we're not talking about the psychiatric withdrawal, we're just talking about the fact the guy has retreated, that's all. He no longer dares put out a beam a mile away. First he could put one out a light-year, then he put one out a year, you see, and then he put one out a hundred yards, and—pardon me, a mile. And then he got down to a hundred yards. And each time he got enough “being bitten,” don't you see, that he no longer puts out to distance, his remedy is always shorten the reach. And the thetan has, as his standard remedy for safety, shorten the reach. And what does he do when he gets into zero reach?

He actually can figure out how to invert a withdrawal into an inverted withdrawal, and you get the cycle of the dynamics coming on down, which is—he comes away from actual reach, don't you see, and he comes down to zero actual reach. Well, he's got to reach somehow, so he figures some other way to reach, don't you see? He reads travel books or something, you know? And he goes into these various cycles. And there's always a zero of what he is doing, which then has a remedy which is lower than that, and he gets down into not just a total withdraw, he gets down to an inversion of the inversion of the inversion of the inversion withdrawal. of course, the first point this shows up is in an auditing session, and his ability to talk to the auditor—about pertinencies.

The sensibility of his communication is also in point here. You've asked him, “Do you have a car?” And he has explained to you that General Motors stock has gone down for the last year or so, and drops it at this point. So pertinencies—he didn't answer the question, did he? So you get him into some condition where he can answer the question, he can speak up, where he can hear what you're saying, where he can therefore receive the auditor. Because you've got somebody on total withdrawal, one of your best remedies is to see that he gets reached, don't you see? And you reach him in order to get him to reach, don't you see? And these are the conditions which you're trying to remedy with an auditing cycle.

Now, if you want to be an absolute gee-whizzer to end all gee-whizzers on cracking cases, don't you ever go around drooling about this fellow sitting there, and he's saying, “And my wife lollipped with the chauffeur, and . . . and it's just all too tough, so on and so forth, and so on and so on.”

And you're trying to say to him, “This is—you know, the session has ended.”

And he says, “. . . and so on and so on and came down the chute, and there were eight sides of it, and so forth; they were all hexagonal, you see, and so forth.”

And you said, “The . . . the session—the session ended some time ago.”

And he says, “. . . and so on and so on. So I've always said to chauffeurs since that particular time, I've said it lollipped the chauffeur!”

Don't now go to somebody, or try to crack a textbook to find out what technique to run on this case. It isn't a case of technique. He hasn't got anybody there to talk to. He isn't talking to anybody. If he is, it's somebody else. He isn't talking about a problem he could have, see? He isn't even talking about a problem he's got! He probably isn't even listening to himself anymore. He has no familiarity with the environment, he is disoriented as to where he is and so forth. And you want a technique?

He's got a paw. Well, you could say, “Now pick up your hand and put it on the side of the chair and feel the side of the chair.”

He might go right on talking for some time without noticing you're doing this. Then eventually say, “Hey, there's a chair here.” Big win.

But if you're going to deal in pcs at all who have disabilities of any kind whatsoever, you've got to have a session before you can have Class IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, IX, X. You get the idea

nose? You've got to have A session before you can have a technique operating. This is the value of the auditing cycle, this is its use, and this is how to become one of the wildest. case crackers anybody ever had anything to do with. You get to be a screaming genius on this subject, and something.

Oh, you make errors, you'll get too accusative, you'll all of a sudden find you overcut—you've overestimated the pc's ability here and there, and so forth, and you have to cut it back. But remember that it always requires adjustment.

The only other thing I would teach you, and like to teach you about this, and I really wish I could, is that after you've remedied it, it's been remedied. And don't keep on; because this pc had a lot of tone arm action on what question he could receive from the auditor, and so forth, don't make that a lifetime profession. Because this is just another method of non-observation. Now that he can do this and is doing it, note that he is doing it. See? He feels all right about it and he is doing it. Note that, and now notice—notice, in other words, that he's changed—and then notice what else you can put together.

So there's two more things to notice, don't you see? Is when has that condition been remedied?—when has that little ability been regained?—so that you can pull foot out of there. And the other thing is observe now, newly and freshly, for something else to do for the pc.

The reason I give you those other two is that sometimes it happens so rapidly that you're just rocked back on your heels. Pc has never talked to anybody before in their life, and you all of a sudden have them talking to you pertinently, in a blue streak. Well, let's not go on remedying their ability to talk to the auditor See, ability regained. So you want to be able to notice that, and that's all part of the observation.

And the real hot—the real hot auditor, the real guy that gets case wins all over the place, is sitting in there observing what is going on in the session, and if things are going all right, doesn't remedy them, and if things are going all wrong, picks up that point that can be remedied and remedies it, until they are all remedied, and then carries on. Those are the magic ways to go about this sort of thing.

Well, you take over the technical aspect of some Scientology organization. You're sitting in there doing nothing but coaching up cases, doing nothing but coaching up cases. Don't pay any attention to the auditing of the cases—consider that's sincere and it's being done as best it possibly can be. Ignore that aspect. Don't keep picking on the auditors; that's a training job. But just keeping watching—watching those communication cycles. Note the communication abilities and so forth, the appearance and that sort of thing, of a pc. Don't depend on large tests having been made every fifteen minutes and fourteen pounds of auditor reports to tell you whether or not the pc's had a change. Let's look at this pc. Let's listen to this pc in session. Is this pc talking better, answering more pertinently, and so forth? If so, fine! We're winning, and 80 forth. Let's not worry about that pc until we get a bog, and there's a no-change condition begins to take place with that pc. And the pc looking brighter and got more spark in the eye than they had: Well, their eye was—remember that this is a gradient—their eye was absolutely complete pebble, stone, flat, lightless. And now you can see a trace of color through the fog. That's an improvement. See? Note the improvements. Don't just be cynical about it the whole way, you see? Note the improvements, because they sometimes take place rather slowly.

And just keep them moving up, and only pay attention to—only pay attention to—the communication cycle and the ability of the person to handle the environment in his immediate vicinity, particularly an auditing session. And only pay attention to those things.

Never pay any attention to the person's problems, never pay any attention to their goals in session, never pay attention to any of these other things—because obviously, any auditor they got would take care of these things if the pc was in session.



See? Auditors are good at that. What they're not good at is having somebody there fully in session. Because, of course, that's the hardest trick. That's the roughest trick. But there lie the biggest gains. And it looks so easy, looks so kindergartenish, that you very often neglect it.

So you see that somebody is all straightened out, he can talk to an auditor, an auditor can talk to him, that an auditing cycle can take place, the person can receive an acknowledgment, the person can have an auditing room, the person can have an auditing session—all of these things are possible everything is fine, and so forth: Well, aside from occasionally catching somebody with a tremendous goof on the subject of—they're running the service facsimile on the person, and when it got [to] a service facsimile, the auditor in this particular case couldn't find any service facsimile because the person had been raised in a poor family and didn't have any maids.

Then the thing to do is to get hold of the D of T and say, "That auditor needs some training on service facsimiles." Not to go into it. But the only trouble you're going to run into from there on, don't you see, is going to be the application of technique.

And that is never the trouble in Scientology, and it is not the trouble, it is not the trouble with your pc that you're having any trouble with at all. The techniques work like mad, but all of them have the dependency of the pc fully in session. The pc is fully in session, you can run almost anything on them a they'll sail, don't you see? Pc not in session, won't. The big bog is people do not get the pc into session before they start running something. And therefore they expect a technique will remedy something that's sitting right in front of their faces, which is the pc is not at all in session. Do you see?

All right. That's actually how to undercut cases left, right and cent make a wide swath in all directions. And I think you can do it.

Thank you.