

WISDOM AS AN AUDITOR

A lecture given on
28 April 1964

Thank you.

That umbrella is the Einstein touch. I don't have to have the Einstein touch, you see, to cope with Scientology research. It's with Melbourne.

How are you today?

Audience: Fine.

What's the date?

Audience: April 28th.

Twenty - eighth. What month?

Audience: April.

What year?

Audience: AD 14.

All right. Twenty - eight April AD 14. Planet?

Audience: Earth.

Earth.

Earth. This lecture is being given on Earth. All right.

I want

to say a couple of words about Australia. Australia is only in one difficulty: it has yet to take any instructions or orders concerning its status or activities. I've just gone through three days of the rock crusher just trying to get one simple instruction through to Australia. Just that, see?

And I finally landed and got it through and now I'm - was unstabilized the following day. I don't know whether it got through or not. If I feel a little bit abstracted or if I look a little bit that way, you'll know why. I don't know, I think it's been two or three thousand words on the telex have been typed, some of it sent, some of it not sent.

You see, everything sent to the Australian office is picked up by the Australian government, you see, and used at its - ha! - inquiry.

Now, I wanted to gen you in on this inquiry and by the time this information gets around anyplace it will already have happened, so it's perfectly all right to tell you.

But when the opposition decides to cut a theta line, they should be advised that when you try to cut a theta line it explodes. Sooner or later it will explode. That you can be absolutely confident of with regard to all such villainous and vicious activities.

I have seen this happen time and time and time again. You always get an explosion on cutting a theta line. Guy is trying to give some truth, something like that or it even gets worse than that, don't you see?

You're trying to wish somebody a happy birthday or something like that, don't you see, and somebody villainously stops the card, you see?

Now, they've done something there, see? And the doingness of that type of thing will all of a sudden catch up with them in some mysterious and fantastic fashion. It's very - it's not really metaphysical. You can see why; because the only power there is, is on a theta line.

All other power is derived from cutting theta lines. The secret of power is just that. Power is truth. You can extend untruth in a certain direction and derive power from it for a certain time, but you're only deriving power from the amount of truth in the situation. This is why, in a war, a government can engage in war and talk to its citizens about how they must engage in war against this other power and that sort of thing. But they are at that - and you notice every war is followed by, usually, an overthrow of the government and a disillusionment of the people. We want to know why. Well, actually, there weren't that many reasons to go to war and the line they are cutting there is simply the line of friendliness and decency from people to people, see?

So somebody jumps across this line, you see, and cuts it up and then when the war is all over everybody sits down and says, "I'm not mad at the Sloveronians. Why were we fighting the Sloveronians?" You hear this after every war, you see?

You also have an overthrow of the existing regime. No regime really ever lasts through a war and they never notice this. It always emerges on the different side of it - some other government. It's the most remarkable phenomenon you ever cared to see. It's obscured by the fact that the state is still there or somebody may be still king, but there will be a different government sitting there - entirely different.

What have they done? They have cut the natural ARC of being to being for their own ends and it blew them up. Now, the violence of the war is a temporary action, but this other thing carries it on for a very, very long time. That's the long continuing action. Those are the wounds that have to heal.

It's very interesting. Now, there - there it is on just cut ARC from people A to people B and whatever violence occurred - and even though it is very bad and very difficult for a while, it recoils on the people who cut the line. It inevitably recoils.

I saw one time as simple an action as this: a manuscript telling how to give a 36 - hour intensive was carefully put in a safe and not issued. Well, it was put in the safe because it was valuable material and everybody all over the place was trying to find out how to do a 36 - hour intensive.

This person was going consistently and continually mad trying to cope with the amount of traffic - and activity resulting from randomness from everybody trying to do a 36 - hour intensive without realizing that the manuscript had been carefully parked in his safe because it was so valuable. Do you understand?

It was just one - two, see? Well, now, that's a very simple - a simple type of thing. But you go into this; this is the mechanism which makes people have an almost pathetic belief in retribution. They say the villain will get it in the end. They don't really know how he gets it or why he gets it, but it's this mechanism I'm talking to you about that brings about and fosters that particular belief

You cut ARC: the cutter of the ARC will explode, sooner or later. There is going to be an explosion at that point.

Mechanics, electronics and so forth continue on down this line to a quite marked degree. You've got to cut a flow or do something with a flow before you get much of an explosion as a result of a flow, see? You don't get any commotion with regard to a flow unless you interpose something into the flow.

And that's what you as an auditor have a lot of trouble about every once in a while. You're wondering why you're having trouble with the pc and you never look at the amount of theta line which you cut by a chopped acknowledgment - not letting him complete his communication. See, the whole auditing cycle is based on. this. And then the auditor wonders why he's getting his head blown off and the pc is mad at him and everybody is chopping him up and everybody is down on him, and so forth.

He's the unwitting victim of having accidentally done this through his inexpert timing of his acks and that sort of thing. That's the exact mechanism we're talking about. He has cut the natural cycling ARC with the pc inopportunistly. He hadn't let the pc originate or something of this sort, you see? He's busted it up one way or the other and he - in other words, he cut the theta line of the session (let's put it that way) and sooner or later, boom!

Well, it oddly enough always explodes on the auditor. You want to know why does it always explode on the auditor? The pc recovers but you'll see the auditor staggering around for a while longer. One of the reasons is he isn't getting any processing. And the other reason is he has unwittingly, himself, in person, cut that line. When he has cut the line and then doesn't recognize that he has cut the line, now he's really in trouble because he has no explanation for what's happening to him.

Hence, we get this drill of - for heaven's sakes, listen to your taped session and keep turning that tape back till you find the point where you first cut the line. Got a dirty needle? All right, let's take the tape back to where the auditor cut the line.

We're not interested in the ramifications of what happened at the point of the explosion. It's foolish to look at the point of the explosion to find out what happened at the point of the explosion, because we know what happened at the point of the explosion. The explosion is the result of a cut theta line. See? That's - so why do you keep looking at the result?

And you'll find out when you first try to train an auditor to do this, you practically will go around the bend yourself in trying to drive it home to the auditor.

"Look, I want you - we're not interested in what caused the ARC break in terms of 'you did this or that,' or something of the sort, which then resulted in the ARC break." And then the auditor goes on at some great length explaining what the ARC break happened and the pc said this and the pc said that. We're not interested in that. We're interested in the first cut of the theta line which then began to mount up to a point where the pc became aware of the fact that it had been cut and it went from there to the explosion. And you know a real, fast, hot ARC break - do you know that it takes up to an hour and a half to work one up? I mean, the comm lag is so great between these two things that the auditor seldom ever recognizes at first glance that he did it to begin with.

He'll turn it back - he'll turn it back five or six inches to where the pc's rather snarly origin was chopped by the auditor and he'll say, "Well, that's it. I (of course, perfectly justified in doing so) answered the pc rather sharply and abruptly and there we had an ARC break."

So you'll get in these reports, "I answered the pc sharply and abruptly and then a minute or so later had a dirty needle."

Well, that's fine. He's now joined Kindergarten at this art. He is just in Kindergarten at this art. He's gotten the point now where he can actually recognize that it was a snarl back at the pc after the pc snarled at him which caused the meter to snarl at both of them, see?

He's gotten up that high. You'll have a little difficulty getting him up that high, but there is an awful lot further to go.

How did this get into this situation? Now, you keep reeling that tape back a few inches at a time, a few inches at a time - or feet at a time - and you all of a sudden will find back there a mistake in an acknowledgment. The whole situation is riding on that first little flub. The mistake in acknowledgment made the auditor less secure, made the pc very much less secure and the line has been cut at that point, you see? So therefore, more little mistakes result in that particular cycle and the pc is more difficult to follow and the auditor makes more mistakes. And then it gets down to this point, finally, where we get the explosion of the cut line.

Well, that may not be very violent; it may just be a dirty needle. But as far as the tape is concerned of the session, it's actually - can be as far as one and one - half hours; actual measurement in an auditing session.

An auditor can see an ARC break coming - when he is very sensitive - he can see an ARC break coming over a long period of time. Now, the only thing we're trying to make him aware of with the drill - the only thing we're trying to make him aware of - is that it was his flub, not taken care of, which let this thing keep working up.

When he does get some awareness that all is not quite well, he then doesn't take it up. He just hopes it will all go away - the black panther mechanism, you see - he just ignores it and it may go away. And he is usually very good at this. He is expert at this. It's marvelous. He has greater capacity for ignoring than is easily measurable.

And it's his favorite hope that the black panther will yawn and walk out of the room undetected by anybody. And the black panther never does. He just - he just starts lashing his tail faster and faster and he starts flexing his claws and then he starts snarling and then he starts getting a little bit more hate in the eye and then the next thing you know you can get him rocking back on those haunches, so forth, and the auditor still says, "Now, if I just pay no attention to it at all, the black panther will still go away," you see?

The black panther is now - has left the ground and is halfway through the air in the spring and the auditor says, "Now, if I just ignore this completely and pretend it isn't happening, and so forth, all will be well."

And all of a sudden there he is with a snarling, roaring ARC break on his hands. Pc slams down the cans, gets up, walks out of the room, something or other happens on the thing.

Aw, he had - he had a warning from a friend, see? He had telegrams, you see? He had wigwag signals; he had everything you could think of. They were all coming his way and he paid no attention to any of them, see? Something is wrong in the session. Well, the only thing that goes wrong in the session is somewhere the theta line has been cut. Now, that's the only thing that's wrong. You try to trace this down and get its genus and you will run into all other varieties of bypassed charge.

Now, you frankly could take somebody that has been processed or has been treated or has merely lived and simply treat this as a front - rank auditing problem. Just treat this as a front - rank auditing problem. "When has your ARC been cut?" See?

Now, the oddity of it is, is you can't keep running this as the only problem. Now, let me call to your attention that there are some unworkable processes - real unworkable processes - and they'll catch up with the auditor sooner or later, too.

One of these processes is, "Look around here and find something you can go out of ARC with." This is what we call the psychiatric process - because it's only run on psychiatrists.

Sounds marvelous, doesn't it? Sounds absolutely marvelous. Doesn't sound like there is a thing wrong with that process. It's the wildest sneaker you ever had anything to do with in your life. You might even get some tone arm action with it. And your pc will start going down, down, down, down, down, down, because you are cutting his theta line right in the room. This is really the only sure, absolutely guaranteed, silver - plated, Madison - Avenue - advertised method of knocking a pc to smithereens. "Look around here and find something you could go out of ARC with."

I don't care how else you phrase it. You understand that could be phrased as "What one of your friends wouldn't you have to talk to?" Sounds like a process, doesn't it?

"What wouldn't you have to touch to know what it was?" You get quite inventive with this type of process. "What doesn't necessarily have to be real to you?" See how innocent it sounds? It sounds very cultured. It sounds as though you really have arrived there with some, some greater reality than real, see?

And it's completely guaranteed that the pc would be very interested in running it, would continue to answer the auditing question and would go right on out the bottom. And they get paler and paler and more strained and more strained and more upset and more upset and they will finally explode.

Because you are saying, "Sit in that auditing chair and Cut your ARC. Thank you." "Sit in that auditing chair and Cut your ARC. Thank you." And that is really what the process consists of.

Now, I'll give you another version of it off into havingness, and you can put this down in your book. These, by the way, are GAEs - gross auditing errors - they're high crimes. High crimes. Everybody should know this. We've known it for years. If it's received as news to you, you were deaf someplace or another along the line, see, because I'm going over old material but I'm just showing it to you in a new frame of reference.

Now, here it fits into the havingness cycle. "What don't you have to have?" Isn't that a marvelous clearing process? Obviously it educates the person into not having things. And after a while it gets him conditioned to a point where he doesn't have to have a bank and he would simply go free from the bank. Isn't that a nice rationale? Perfect rationale.

That's a psychologist process. Medical doctors, we run "What part of the body could you get along without? Thank you." That's just known as an ARC reverse process, but you understand it's expressed in a havingness phrase.

"Look around here and find something you don't have to have. Thank you. Thank you. Hey, hey. Thank you. Hey. Wreee, wreee, wreee. Hey. Answer the auditing question. Look around here and find something you don't have to - hey, hey, hey. Hey! Oh, he's conked out."

"Well, wake him up. Wake him up."

"All right. All right. Now here is the auditing question. Look around here and find something you don't have to have. Thank you. Look around here and find something you don't have to have. Hey, he's conked out again."

Hey, wake him up. Give me a hand, Joe. Wake him up."

"Hell, he's dead."

What's absolutely fantastic in this particular frame of reference is that the pc will run any of those processes, industriously and marvelously. In fact, I knew of somebody - was diagnosed as being in compulsive ARC with everybody. And somebody, to cure him of this, ran that process on him of "What could you go out of ARC with?" And I don't know what happened to the poor bloke, but you know, I haven't seen him since! And I've actually put out some little lines at one time or another, trying to get in touch with him, trying to find out what happened in this.

Everybody is covering it up like the Rue Morgue murders, see? I don't know what happened. I mean, I know he's not in Scientology anymore but I don't know anything more than that. I just caught it too late, don't you see, to do something drastic about it, you know?

It - oh, nothing physically happened to him. He just sort of drifted off one way or the other, I suppose. I suppose he's still around, but who knows?

You see how peculiar this is? Now, he would never in God's green earth have attributed any difficulty he was having to having been run on that process - to which he consented with the greatest of glee. He was simply told that he was in compulsive ARC with people and this would have to be cured so that he could audit better.

The only difference between this process and Russian roulette is Russian roulette has five empty chambers and this doesn't have any.

Now, this is all on the basis of cutting ARC and this is quite, quite a - quite a big rationale. It's a big package, all by itself. Affinity, reality and communication: cut thereof. Every time you cut it, expect an explosion. Maybe you'll be able to handle the explosion, maybe it won't be of long duration and so forth, but every time you cut it expect an explosion. See? Don't go walking like an innocent babe, you see, straight into the black panther's cage and saying, "There's no panther here," because I'm telling you, there is a panther there, see? And he is quite visible.

Now, the way the psychologist, particularly the child psychologist - who has a lot to recommend him since he has to get in there and pitch in numerous ways, and so forth. They have them in schools trying to advise people, and so forth - the way he gets into trouble left, right and center, is he doesn't know this datum. And not knowing this datum, therefore, he cannot predict child future behavior. There's another datum he doesn't know: A thetan never gives up. He doesn't know that datum. That's a very terrible datum to know.

It cures many impulses toward tyranny. If jokers like Caligula knew the data - knew that datum - before they started to Caligulize things, I think they wouldn't have the temerity to go on Caligulizing, see, because a thetan really never gives up.

This also - this also is - is some bloke like the Cardinal of Spewjaw, or something, see? He's all of a sudden decided to cure everybody of sex. See, he is going to cure everybody in his diocese of sex. Small project. No.

He may go down in history, but I can guarantee you he will certainly - he will certainly get buried somewhere. The thetan never gives up - on an ARC line or in any other direction.

We got a bunch of wild - eyed revolutionaries - bunch of wild - eyed revolutionaries. Let me give you a - let me give you a right and a wrong on handling a wild - eyed revolutionary. Reform him by giving him a good talking to. Hm - mm - mm, do - oo - oh. Shoot several of his companions. Ho - oh. No, sooner or later you're going to have a revolution. Sooner or later, you know? He just never really gives up.

Now, that's the wrong way to handle a revolutionary, is to de - revolutionize him. That would also apply to a conquered people. A conquered people really never gives up. That impulse may go on and on, it may sail along for ages; they really never give up as long as there is any there at all. It gets more and more subconscious or more and more unconscious or whatever else you want to phrase it as, but it's still there.

Now here is the other way: Take a revolutionary - take a revolutionary and the very least, or the very most, you can do is to simply directionalize, to some slight veering, his revolution.

You maybe can slightly alter the direction of his revolutionary tendency. See, you could maybe persuade him not to revolt against the king but to revolt against the prime minister, see? Change his vector a little bit, See?

You could say, "Well, don't revolt against the - why revolt against the state because you can't win; they've all got machine guns. A very much better activity at the present moment is revolt against its educational system and eventually overthrow it thereby."

"Oh, yeah," he'd say. "Yeah, all right. All right." That's okay, see? He'd go on in that particular direction. But understand he really has never given up revolting against the state.

In other words, you could veer to some slight degree the direction of purpose of an individual, but he really never gives up. And what fools everybody is - he says he gives up! He goes through all kinds of mumbo jumbo and prestidigitation to prove conclusively he's given it all up, see?

You just never saw so much window dressing. Sometimes you see in a conquered nation, and so forth, flags lining the street in all directions, you know, and everybody's standing out there saying "Viva Castro" or something like that, see? And then they don't turn out any more Bacardi rum, see, and then somehow or another the fires in the cane fields - they just don't seem to abate; they seem to get more

frequent. And production doesn't turn over and machinery keeps getting jammed somewhere, and there's no - and Castro's going absolutely stark staring batty.

"Why can't this economy work? Why are all the trucks in Cuba broken down suddenly and simultaneously? I'll solve this by buying hundreds of new trucks from England."

Why, they are going to run just long enough to let somebody turn out - to pull off the distributor cap. Because, you see, the Cuban didn't revolt to be a communist. See, he revolted against Batista. And Castro tried to change his vector of revolt too far, too fast, and that was the end of that.

They became a subjugated people suddenly after their revolution, don't you see? So now he's wondering why he's having trouble! We'll rename him "Rocks - in - the - head Castro," see? He can't have anything else but trouble now. He'll go on having trouble to the end of his days. He would have to take every person in Cuba - every single person in Cuba - and ship them complete to Venezuela and repeople Cuba a hundred percent with something else to win his revolution, because he didn't have a revolution.

There was a revolution of the Cuban people and then Castro gave them another revolution. You remember, it wasn't for months that they found out they had been a communist revolution. And everything just quit and that was the end of that.

No production. Now, everybody comes along and he says, "What is the political significance of this? Let's see. What is the political significance of this?" I can see Toynbee now. The great masterpiece of shallow thought that he would turn out on this would be marvelous.

"Let's see what - what could possibly be the significance of this? Is it true that communism turns out less production than capitalism?" "Are - are the comparative factors between this and the Spartan regime, which didn't exist on the left - hand side of the bistro.. ." you see? Figure, figure, figure, figure, figure, figure, figure, figure. And the Cuban people have no willingness to go in the direction they are now going, so they will go in that direction not. And the way they don't go in that direction is take everything down in front of them and don't produce.

You see, a nation which can't produce, you know that it is unwilling to do what it is doing. That's the first thing you know about it. It's unwilling to support what it's having to support. The ARC will be very poor.

Now, it doesn't matter how much communication is put into them - and Castro, as an example, puts in plenty. I understand his television broadcast lasts several hours per day.

This is all very, very fascinating, but the communication may be there. But of course, reality isn't there at all and affinity doesn't exist - this is from his particular side - because no man could have much affinity for people if he gives them another revolution after they've won a different one.

No, the ARC is all missing from the other side. And remember that ARC has two sides: There is the ARC from B to A and there's the ARC from A to B. So you could put in a tremendous amount of C without very much A and practically no R and if you did manage to generate anything on the other side, it would be some pale shadow of the same thing.

The other side would also probably develop a lot of C or a lot of no - C or something like this. But they certainly wouldn't develop any R and they certainly wouldn't develop any A.

Now, if anybody stood up there in Castro's boots who really was putting A, R and C to those people, then he would have an opportunity of seeing these people express A, R and C to some degree or another. But he'd have to stand up there without any past connotations, don't you see? He wouldn't have to be dug in, in his own past and background in order to do this.

Actually, it doesn't mean that a fellow could have no past in order to do this. The fellow - anybody, I suppose - if he just suddenly went honest, you know, just that, just come down with an outbreak of honesty, you know, break out all over with it. If it were real honesty - would probably get a response

from the other particular side because the target which is presenting A, R and C to that degree would have diminished, see? Although they'd never given up against this other target, they don't have anything against this target they now have, you see? So there is ARC possible with that target.

Honesty. Honesty. Frankly, you can make a tremendous number of mistakes, but never be dishonest about your mistakes. That is the big thing to know. Don't be dishonest about your mistakes. You become unreal to the degree that you're dishonest about them.

And don't go over into the field of self - immolation, either. There's ways to commit suicide with this sort of thing, you see? But that's also a distortion of A, R and C because you are cutting out your own life in order to glorify your own mistakes.

I don't know if you ever read any Russian literature. It's really not worth reading. But Dostoevski - The Brothers Karamazov, and so forth - each one of Dostoevski's works has some character who is busy selling himself down the river with great violence, you know?

He's explaining to everybody what a dog he is, you see, and so on. He goes on and on. He really is a dog, too. Anybody trying to rule Russia would have my sympathy.

But - not knowing much about the country, I'm a great expert on it; almost as great an expert on Russia as Boston is on slavery. They've never had to cope with it, so therefore they know everything there is to know about it.

There is nothing like complete inexperience to bring about enormous bravery. Now the North, which was very authoritative on its various racial problems - not having had any experience with them - is getting them all in the teeth. And it's the people of the North have all of a sudden - have started voting madly for these mad dog anti - ra - you know, these racist - conscious candidates, and so forth. Everybody is scared stiff because some place, I think like Wisconsin, turned out a third of its vote the other day as representing preference for racially prejudiced candidates. This is just a recoil, see? No R, so their A, R and C was very lousy. They had no R on the situation, so they had a very distorted ARC.

And it all blew up in flinders the second they started to get some experience. So they go to the other side of the thing, see? Now they cut any potential ARC they might have with the whole situation and from "Give them all cake," they immediately jump over - "Shoot them all down like dogs," you see? Neither one of these things were real; there was no reality in either one of them.

See, there wasn't any particular reason to give them all cake and there's certainly no reason now to shoot them all down like dogs. You see, here's the two sides of the coin. Neither one of them had anything to do with theta. What were they talking about? Well, they didn't know then; they don't know now.

Now, there is nothing like complete, complete and utter inexperience to bring about a great deal of bravery. Also brings about many wonderful opinions. Marvelous opinions.

There's many a professor who has spent his life in beautiful seclusion who is the most wonderful expert on things he knows nothing about and has never met. It's like the Scholastics. They believed in this. Their whole method of education was based upon the principles here: You never inspected anything. You just lectured about it, see? You never go out and at a sturgeon to find out what sturgeons look like. You just go ahead and give lectures on sturgeons which are based on, I think in their particular case, Aristotle's opinion of a sturgeon, which I think was out of a different ocean and was inaccurate to begin with. And if anybody had tried to bring in a real sturgeon to show them what it was, the person would have been instantly and immediately flunked - hands down. That would have been the end of that.

That was the system called Scholasticism - an actual system on which we get "scholastic average" and other things. But the Scholastics lasted for about 1500 years and they were the total dominant philosophy of education. And they lasted all the way across the Dark Ages, and when they finally packed up and people began to look again, we ceased to have dark ages.

I don't care if somebody like Toynbee Attributes the Dark Ages to the left - hand square root of the ruddy rod or why the virgins were no longer in church and that ended the Dark Ages - that has nothing to do with it. It's the fact their system of education absolutely debarred, and their religious beliefs absolutely debarred, the inspection of anything that they were supposed to know about. It was a system of education based entirely upon noninspection.

It wasn't that they neglected noninspection. It was that they insisted upon it. And we had the Dark Ages.

Well, we had no educated people. I imagine if you had nobody educated you'd have a dark age. It's quite elementary. If you kept every child in school so that he couldn't learn anything about the universe around him for the period that he was curious, and then you turned him loose thereafter to run the affairs of man, I imagine it would be very dark indeed. And the Scholastic was a champion at this. He became expert at this.

In other words, he was cutting the ARC of knowledge. "You are all supposed to know about rocks. Don't go look at any rocks." This was how he cut the ARC line.

If I were educating you as auditors: "All right. Now, this is the way you behave as auditors! This is what you do as auditors! And don't let me ever, under any circumstances, ever let me hear you talking to a preclear."

That would sound pretty wild, wouldn't it? That would sound pretty unreal. You immediately - up to your mind comes this question: "Well, if we're never supposed to talk to a pc, if we're never supposed to hear a pc, if we're never supposed to have any touch with a pc, we're never supposed to audit a pc, then how the hell would we ever learn to become auditors?" See, that immediately enters up.

But remember, you are already talking in a zone of informed wisdom. Supposing you didn't know enough to ask that question. You'd have a picture of a dark age, wouldn't you?

See, a dark age would be composed of people who didn't know enough to ask the question of "Why is our ARC being cut?" They wouldn't know their ARC is being cut. So part of the very, very intellectual individual, part of the very wise person, is a recognition of this principle of when and where is his ARC cut?

And he is wise to the degree that he can perceive this in existing situations. And this would be not necessarily his wisdom, but his ability to exercise wisdom.

I'll give you an example. You're an auditor - Class V Auditor - you know your business. You go into a factory, they're having a lot of trouble, they want you to audit staff, something like this, you know? You want - patch up somebody. You say, "What's the matter? What brings you to the conclusion that your staff or your managers or anybody else needs auditing What brings you to that conclusion?" See, if you were a very, very smart auditor.

You'd want to look over, "What's the Condition of the pc? What's expected here?" Obviously you're not being asked to audit any pcs at their own volition. You're being asked to audit some pcs at management volition.

Well, you'd either have to talk the pcs into being audited of their own volition, which is quite possible, very easy to do, as long as you are good and factual about it and don't use any of the management arguments which are not factual. They inevitably would not be factual, you see, because they're not auditors. And you're talking to these people about auditing.

Your ability to estimate the existing situation wouldn't necessarily measure how successful you were, but would certainly measure how wise you were.

And how would you - how would you exercise this as a wisdom? How would you be wise in relationship to one of - this. Well, you just look at the number of ARC busts there were on both sides of what fences existed. Now, you may have preconceived the idea of thinking there was management and labor and

immediately believed that you had a problem in management and labor because you read it in some textbook. See? And you might not have a problem of management and labor at all.

You might have a problem of management and management. I know of a hotel in the immediate vicinity which suffers from four problems of management versus management versus management versus management. See, that's their problem.

They don't have any trouble with their help. They really don't. It's a marvel that anybody works for them at all. Their help goes on and works, but every once in a while its upper strata of management gets interfered with. The head of this department or that department gets shifted, moved or sacked, see? So it's only a problem of management within management.

Well, your recognition of the thing must be - just based on looking it over carefully - of what A, what R and what C is being Cut between what terminals. That'd be the whole formula on which you could have to adjudicate that situation in that factory: what A, what R, what C? Not just what ARC is being cut - that's too careless, see? What A, what R and what C is being Cut amongst what terminals?

You might find out the ARC was being Cut between the shop stewards and the mechanics. Now, to locate that, all you'd have to locate is maximal Confusion and minimal production. Just look over all the records and find where was the maximal number of despatches (maximal Confusion and the minimal production from expected production).

This department has two - thirds of the plant employees and turns out one - sixth of what they're expected to. I'd think about that time you would decide that there was something wrong with it.

Now all you have to find out is where is the Cut A, R and the Cut C in that vicinity. Now, there must be two terminals there, otherwise there is no flow of A, R and C to Cut. So one must be trying to flow ARC and the other must be trying to Cut it; or this one is trying to flow ARC and the other one is trying to Cut it; or to some degree, they are both trying to flow A, R and C and they are both thoroughly cutting it.

So one of those conditions will exist. And if you are being very wise, you would simply look that over as the Condition of affairs and you would say these people are unhappy with those people. And you don't even have to do it on a formula. I tell you, that's the only thing there. You don't have to look for something else there, but you just look for that thing and you find it and then you say, "All right, I'm going to group process the shop stewards in the presence of the foremen. And then we will process foremen against shop stewards and we will get this thing. . ." In other words, all you do is start unblocking the ARC. You wouldn't even have to handle a case. Just take the existing situation of the real universe. Just accept the fact they're all nuts anyway. Don't bother about it in any other particular direction. This is it.

Now, if you know this other thing: do you know that all PT problems are suspended in nondelivered communications? I suppose a guy is trapped where he is today because one day he started to talk to God and it didn't get there, you know - or something of this sort - something wild of this nature occurred.

Now, let me warn you that if you tried to run this as a process, look where you'd get. "What communication has been undelivered? Thank you." "What communication has been undelivered? Thank you." The thing is selfdiscrediting because it won't run as the process. In other words, the way he came down the line, it doesn't go back out the same way.

These are simply the problems the guy has had along the line. How he has solved those problems is the clue. See, even though the genus of the problem was an undelivered communication, he then made it real rough by solving it in some way. See, he didn't give up.

We're now talking about R1C, R1CM, see? We're talking about very elementary processes. This fellow comes in, "Oh, my God, I have this terrible problem! I - I don't know whether I'm coming or going. I'm - love - love - awful problem." And he's holding his head in his hands, you know, and rolling from side to side. He's so worried he's almost out of his mind.

Histrionic. Has fantastic numbers of ramifications. Obviously, his whole case is sitting behind the thing and charging it up. Obviously, you're dealing with a tremendous instability to begin with. Obviously. Obviously this, obviously that. You got factors, factors, factors, factors, factors, factors here. You could add them up on IBM comptometers. But you know one thing for sure about that condition. - that it exists here and now. See? This guy is in this Condition here and now. This you know.

Yeah, that's rather obvious, because there he is rolling around and screaming and yowling, so he's obviously in that Condition now. Let's start with certainties. Let's get our own ARC in with it, see?

So what's the reality of the situation? It exists. What's the C of the situation? Well, that you can talk at him but he doesn't hear you. And what's the A of the situation? Why, you'd like to give the guy a hand. Complicated, isn't it?

That's your ARC with relationship to him. If your ARC includes "I've got to solve this fellow's problems for him; I've got to give him solutions to all of his problems," of course you're not establishing ARC with him or getting his ARC disentangled. See, you're winding him up in the soup.

Therefore, this thing called marital counseling will always wind up in the scrap bucket. You could just about counsel two characters on the marital front into amity as you could tie two cats over a clothesline by their tails and expect to kiss each other. They just won't - won't do it.

You could just stand there and keep saying, "Now, now Puss, you should kiss Tom there and make up and..." There's obviously something hurting them. Even a fool would stand back after a while and say, "There's apparently something here I have not quite embraced in my analysis of the situation." There's all of the factors that are right there.

Now, let's look at the fellow now. Now, what's his A, R and C with his environment, see? Well, C: he isn't talking to anybody. If you ever notice a fellow in that Condition, he is not talking to anybody; he's talking at everything. He really doesn't expect that anybody is even listening to him. He's just going on, you know?

And his R: you'll find out he contradicts himself every three minutes. You don't quite know what he is talking about, because the target of his conversation is so consistently shifting - the subject of his conversation is so shifting, so consistently and his words are "I don't know" and "I can't find out" and "I haven't," you know, "been this." It's all full of doubt, you see? There isn't any solidity there anyplace. So his R, his R is obviously shot, see? He just hasn't any reality on anything. He hasn't any grip on anything.

And his A: well, he doesn't know whether he hates everybody or they hate him. It's kind of a tossup. He's worried because everybody might or somebody might hate him and he's worried that he might unjustly hate somebody else, you see? He's in a Confusion. He wouldn't know what his affinity was. His A, R and C are right down there running on the bottom.

Is there any particular button out of a theta line that you could trip that would cause this odd jam to unravel? Is there anything you could trip? Remember, it'd be a terribly unlimited process - pardon me, a terribly limited process, no unlimited process in connection with this. This is real limited.

But there is something you could say to him - just the one - shot situation - "What communication haven't you been able to deliver?" Let him tell you all about it and he, to that degree, is somewhat delivering it and you will see his whole Condition alter. Interesting, isn't it? If you could get the insane to answer as much of a question as that, they'd probably unravel, same way.

It's not - it's not you understand, a repetitive process. And it has nothing that refers to the past. It's the right - now communication you haven't been able to deliver. Because maybe this was a past question and all that sort of thing, but it's still the communication he hasn't been able to deliver right now, and he's trying so hard right now to deliver this communication that he's got himself completely snarled up on the R and the A.

I imagine people used to get that way in prayers. As a matter of fact, that's why I think certain organizations - there's no point in going on discussing their depravities, but I'd think there would be some organization or another that was - I'd think they'd sit down calculatingly to spin people in by giving them something they couldn't pray to.

I'd say that in some villainous, past, uninformed period - some barbarous age - that people would even invent something like, "Well, there's a being that's everywhere, all the time, and you're supposed to say your prayers." They'd call - you know, invent some word like prayer and say, "You're supposed to talk to this being all the time and give him the hot dope." I'd say in some dark age - not on this planet - but someplace, they'd dream up some mechanism - just spin people in. Because sooner or later somebody out of that lineup is going to say, "I am not being listened to. My communication has not been delivered."

For instance, I'm always hauling sideways the same operation as applied to Santa Claus. Santa Claus is a mythical being invented by Madison Avenue of yesteryear in order to sell merchandise.

And this bird gets written to and, oddly enough, mainly gets replied - you know, replies come from him one way or the other. That's why you have department stores: to reply, see? But I always make sure that the communication always goes through reliable channels like HCO, see, and acknowledgment comes back down the line, solid, see?

And I find out that this brings a great deal of cheerfulness about it all. But, I also find out, by inspection, that the ragamuffin doll that was scribbled ver - vuh - um - umdmn on the list and that nobody could read and that didn't get delivered is all that gets talked about Christmas Day. So you see, this thing has many sides.

But it's all on the subject of just A, R and C in its interchange and delivery and cutting the theta line and that's all there is to it. That is what it is.

And you now start to walk away on thin ice from this very secure little footbridge and you're liable to go through. Now let me give you an idea, see? Let me give you an idea. I know this will come as a shock to some of you, that you shouldn't do this - but your pc, your pc is talking to you about bananas, see? The pc is talking to you about bananas and we're getting along just fine with the pc talking about bananas. But the pc accidentally, in passing, mentions watermelons - and we instantly ask him to talk about watermelons. He mentioned them; we ask him to talk about them. And then, when he is busy talking about watermelons, he happens to mention greengrocers. And the moment he mentions greengrocers, we then ask him to talk about greengrocers.

Now, I know nobody present would do anything like that. We call it Q and A. You may have heard of it. Well, what exactly are you doing in relationship to A, R and C?

There's a much easier explanation of what Q and A is. Q and A is just not completing a cycle of action. That's all. You can Q - and - A on a pc over 500 hours of processing. You just don't complete the cycle of action laid out to be completed in the 500 hours of processing. You have Qed - and - Aed. You don't even have to be the pc's auditor to Q - and - A on a pc. You can be the auditing director and mark the folder some other way, shift off of this process which you started on last month, and this program (not even process, see), but shift off of this program which you started the pc on last month, now, and go on some other program, even though he's still getting tone arm action on the program - not process, but program - which we laid out last month, because there's something more recent. Q and A. That's all.

That's just an interrupted auditing cycle. An interrupted process cycle or an interrupted program cycle - any one of those things is just an incomplete cycle of action. And if you don't complete a cycle of action in any category - you know, the little auditing comm cycle or on up the line to the session, on up the line to the process, on up the line to the program - you fail to complete any of those, you've just Qed-and-Aed.

But what's wrong with it? Why? Why is this so important? When this fellow was talking to you about bananas - you see, trouble is, once in a blue moon you get away with it. He just accidentally was finished talking about bananas when you asked him about watermelons, so you thought that was all right because

it was all right that time. But, let me tell you, that it's only one - about one chance in a hundred of it being all right. You sometimes get away with it, you see, which rather tends to trip you up.

So he was finished talking about bananas. But supposing he hadn't really told you what he wanted to tell you about bananas. You cut the theta line right there in the session.

Now, supposing he was just getting good on the subject of watermelons - he was just getting good on this particular subject - and he really realized that he had something to communicate on that subject, and you Qed-and-Aed and transferred him off to greengrocers.

Oh, you'd have by this time two, not - let's put it banally and technically - we'd have two unfinished communication cycles, which doesn't sound like very much. No, but back of that you've got something far worse. You had an undelivered, complete communication. You have an undelivered series of communications.

In other words, you've cut this fellow's theta line. From that point on it's inevitable that you, sooner or later, will blow up as his auditor. It's just - it's just fate. Fate has intervened at this point. Kismet. You just got out your knife and started working on the tightrope you were walking, right in the middle of the chasm.

Now, you wonder why you have trouble with pcs. You wonder why a pc's needle roughs up. You wonder why some auditors rough up pcs' needles. You wonder why you see some pcs ARC break. You wonder this and you wonder that.

You wouldn't wonder very long if you got ahold of a tape of that session.

You wouldn't wonder very long. You'd - cut it into the first third of the session, something like that, and you'd say, "Well, we'll pick up something here."

And you hear this little note of asperity, you see, in the pc's voice. He's - he sounds a little strained. He's still enthusiastic, but it's sort of an enthusiastic strain. There's a note there that you don't quite like.

Let's go back just a little bit further than this and we find the auditor is, "Okay! Yes!" you know, "I got that," you know, and letting the pc go on and on, and then making very sure that the communication was acknowledged - . Well, what the hell is making this auditor act that way? We don't take it that he just doesn't know his drills, see?

I have two different frames of reference by which to look at an auditor's auditing. One is teaching him how to do it and whether he is doing it the way he should be doing it, see? That's one frame of reference. And the other frame of reference is: What did he do that is making him do it wrong? See, that's the other frame of reference. How is he behaving in this session? And under that heading I always assume that he knows perfectly how to do it, but that something is just disturbing him. Something has gone awry.

I assume that he knows all his drills, see? There's something haywire here that we are looking at, that is making him go adrift. I don't immediately then go into the subject of dressing him up on the subject of drills. I start looking for something that is gone adrift in his auditing. I'd simply - see, so you'd have to have two frames of reference.

One is the frame of reference of a critique of his ability to handle preclears and the other is a critique of his ability to handle drills. See, there would be two different points of view. And you can't mix up these two points of view and train an auditor or you're sunk.

Otherwise, every time the auditor mishandles a pc, you put the auditor back on doing a drill. You should be teaching him about pcs, and you are teaching him about the drill.

Hell, he knows how to do the drill! Well, why isn't he doing it? See, that's this other frame of reference. Well, he isn't doing it; like he's mucked - up somewhere or another here.

On what? Handling a pc. That's where he's fouled up. He isn't fouled up on being able to say, "Good," "Thank you" and "Okay." See? That isn't where he's monkeyed up. He's monkeyed up on handling that thing sitting in the chair across from him that he knows not wot of, somehow. And you hear him: "Good! Than - thank you! Thank - thank you. I - I got, I - I got the communica - I - I heard you. I - I - I heard, heard you - what you said. Now, do you - do you know that I've acknowledged you?"

And you say, "What the hell is going on here?" Well, it isn't that this fellow's drills are out. It's his pc handling is out here, somehow or another. He doesn't understand something that is going on here.

All right. So you roll back the tape a few more feet, see? Let's find this thing, see? How come he's - how come he's doing such a lousy job of auditing, is what we are asking, see? How come it's all getting so difficult? How come it's an unaudited, auditable pc in an unauditing situation, see? So we get this tape back here, and we all of a sudden we hear it. We hear it.

"Well, yes, I know. We heard all about your mother in the last session, and so forth, and we are not going to take that up now. What we're going to go on into now is your family in general, and so forth."

My God, it lay right in the R - factor. What a corny R - factor. The auditor took off from this point of view with an incomplete cycle of action on the subject that he was addressing in the last session. The pc's been thinking about it all night. Instantly and immediately the pc starts the session with a present time problem because of the R - factor, see? - an incomplete cycle of action, an incomplete communication.

Definition of present time problem: an undelivered communication. See? If you really want to handle present time problems, don't ever define them any other way.

I don't care how gross or how crude or how stupid all this sounds on the subject, or how it doesn't quite seem to apply. You just keep looking at it and you will find, stupid as it is - well, for instance, we find out this fellow feels very batty, and we trace back to where he feels very batty. And he didn't shoot a sniper in World War II, see? Undelivered communication. Well, what the hell do you - you'll say, "That's a funny communication: a bullet?"

Ah, but it follows the communication formula. It goes from here as cause across a distance and arrives at an effect. Do you see?

Now, if we want to understand what an overt act is, we go around to the other side of the coin and we find out it was a communication he didn't want to deliver, he delivered. See? And that's what an overt act is.

And what saves your bacon in auditing is the fact that the overt act is worse than the undelivered communication in terms of aberrative value because you have now perverted the ARC theta line, you see; you've perverted the theta line by causing it to carry harm.

Now, that really mucks up a theta line. Just not delivering at all is infinitely better than delivering harmfully. I don't care what GPMs say or anything else, see? You're too prone, perhaps, on occasion, to say, "Well, we are all aberrated because of certain basic deep - seated woof woofs, and so forth."

It's quite interesting that the deeper and further research has gone - it isn't that I have found we are less and less governed by these predetermined impulses. I have gone through phases of blaming parts of Scientology on various parts of the mind. I inevitably will come up on the other side of the stream, dripping wet but with considerable relief, looking at it and recognizing that we were still above, in our basic understandings, the aberrative influences by which the mind has previously been understood.

So we are really above, in our technology, what life has been up to in digging itself in, don't you see? Our understanding is superior to the aberrative impulses.

Let me give you the idea - a very short, faster idea. For instance, Freud continuously stressed sex, see? And later on, his apologists said that if he had just talked about social implications as well as sexual

implications, his work would have been more successful. No, Freud's work ceased to work when he got - they got off the subject of sex.

The big libido theory of 1894 was his top, top climb. That was his summit; and anything else went down from there. That was as close as he got to the moon. And when he started walking away from that, or his apologists started walking away from that, he got into trouble and he ceased to cure people.

Why? He was as close as he could get to the GPM create series. See? He just walked in close on that perimeter, had a big cognition, laid it down as what he called his libido theory and then any time he tried to minimize this or walk away from it he was denying and invalidating GPMs. And so, therefore, it wasn't true that Freud should have mentioned social implications. No, hell, Freud should have kept right on pounding down the line of sex, you see, with a capital Freud. See? He should have hit it all the way, see, because he was right in there, see? He really did have his paws on something.

All right. Now, he was below - he was below the point of mental dramatization, in other words, he was interpreting the mind through a dramatization of a mind. In other words, he was dramatizing a bit when he was doing this, see?

All right. To that degree we have not been guilty of this particular line, and our materials, the further we go on this, start to stand clear and pure as a total command of understanding of livingness, life, and so forth, than before. Do you see? I mean, they separate out rather easily.

I go through some bad periods once in a while on this. I think "Oo - oh," you know? "Oh, no," you know? Not too long ago I looked with sudden horror - oh, actually about a year ago - I looked with sudden horror at the idea that the whole Tone Scale was simply based on something out of a series of implants, see? Uhhgh! And I thought, "Oh - oh, oh - oh, oh - oh." And then it turned out they weren't there. And - so more recently I said, "Well, obviously the Tone Scale all came out of GPMs, obviously. Obviously." Heh! It's not there.

And my pc read a great deal of significance into GPMs to a point where we developed a full process one time to run GPMs. It had nothing but in - Scientology injected into the GPMs. We had to turn around and un - inject it.

In other words, we knew more about the mind than was in the mind, don't you see? So we could - it was R1C. R1C. For a while I thought we couldn't run R1C because I thought it was my solution. No, we understood more about life, do you see, than was understood by the thetan himself. Because he was not down the line on solution or anything like that, see? We understood that solution was an aberrative factor. Solution is a real aberrative factor. The GPM only brings about; it doesn't solve. You get what I mean?

So once in a while you can get real hot. And one of the difficulties we have is we understand the situation we're looking at too well. We understand it with such great pervasive thoroughness that we inject an awful lot of data into it that isn't there.

In other words, it's just total screwball - the situation. It's like this. Now, we could go on and on and say the present time problem is a present time problem because it's postulate versus postulate, and so forth. Oh, yes, that's basically true of problems. That's the anatomy of problem. Oh, yes, that's why GPMs hang up. Oh, yes, all these things are very, very true.

But let's draw back to the level of ARC. Now, that's not a mild understanding. For instance, I'm talking to you today at ARC at the level of 4. I'm not talking to you about ARC at the level of 1C.

Now, I tell you, all these things are true - completely true about postulate versus postulate and it's mass versus mass and it takes an impulse versus an impulse to make a problem and because it's this and it's because it's that and because there are disagreements involved and all of this and that and so forth.

All these things are true, you understand? But let's go right on upstairs in a complete purity of understanding. Philosophically, what is this thing: a problem? This thing is a problem because it's an undelivered communication.

Now, you have to be a pretty smart cookie to take a case apart knowing that, and knowing at the same time that it's an unrunnable process. It's an undelivered communication. That's made it a problem. An overt act is not a problem. An overt act is a withdrawal from putting out an ARC line because you know you will abuse it. It's a self-discipline. It's an abuse of ARC, so one doesn't ARC because one possibly might abuse ARC, so then one doesn't ARC. You see?

Self-discipline, here, is involved. An individual is putting an awful check and brace on himself. And this is the basic withhold. "Don't shoot anybody, see? Don't cause harm. Don't harm."

I don't care what kind of GPMs are developed by the thetan coming down the line. They probably louse him up no end. You could probably get an awful lot of mileage out of doing these things sideways. But when the chips are all down and you've got them all processed out, you'll find the answer is still there the same way. You understand, this is - this is the way the critter operates. See, he doesn't want to undertake this particular communication because it is harmful, so therefore he withholds that particular communication.

All right. There's that source, then, of not communicating - there's that reason for not communicating - which is - looks a little more involved than the other reason because it includes the overt - withhold sequence. But there is this other simple one, which, of course, you understand now - is the same statement as the other one. The other was a more complex statement - it's an undelivered communication. Even O/W is an undelivered communication.

He's delivered one far too well. Pow! Oh, well. He better not deliver any more communications along this line. And he better not have delivered that one. So he'll develop a whole section of his bank out of communications he had better not deliver, so he is not delivering the communications he did deliver.

"What communication did you deliver that you hadn't ought to have?" would be guaranteed to set off an automaticity.

So you look at somebody who's having a hard time with life, and he's got a lot of present time problems. And he comes in and he says, "I got this present time problem tawowowow - I - tawowow. Oh, what am I going to do?" and so forth and so on.

You know one thing: that he's having an awful time. And the other thing you know, is for whatever reason - because he's breaking himself, because he might communicate, don't you see, and therefore is withholding because it will - these are all just rationales. You know two things. One, he's in that state and you know he's in that state because he hasn't delivered a communication. So you know those two things about this individual at once. Bang, bang. Simple as that.

Take off from there - remembering at the same time that there is no repetitive process: "What haven't you communicated to?" There is no process: "What don't you have to have?" There is no process: "What could you get rid of?" These are all "What could you go out of ARC with?" you see? Brutal processes that go right straight downhill.

There is only a process along the line of "What have you communicated with?" see, and so forth. Now, you get your ARC break process - that mainly depends on regretted communication. See, you're running in some other factors.

And out of this understanding you could tailor - make a lot of processes that would go into a lot of various lines. Just look at it at - offhand. "What had you ought to have communicated that you didn't have?" See? All right. "Now what had you ought to have communicated that you didn't have?" All right. That is, "What did you go out of communication with?"

All right. You are going to run that process. You say it's absolutely necessary to get rid of this. Well, how are you going to get away with running that process? That process is unrunnable. Oh - ho - ho. You will have to answer it up immediately with "What did you go into communication with?"

Now you've got a half - cursed, half - blessed process. You can probably get away with it. You could say, "Look around here and find something you don't have to have." "Now look around here and find something you have." See? Now you've half - cursed it and half - blessed it, so you - you understand this isn't ideal. But this is - run a sufficiently workable process so that you can run an unworkable process, so that you can simply get rid of the points he is hung up on in order to run a better process. Do you understand that?

So, you could go as far as that down into the shades of hell for the pc, and you would - after a little while, by the way, you shouldn't be too puzzled why this process doesn't run marvelously, why it doesn't run endlessly, why the pc occasionally has headaches. These things should be quite understood by you. You're simply getting some problems out of the road that - so that you can run the case. So you wouldn't go on very long along this direction before you shifted over into, "Well, what communication did you deliver?" You could run that kind of a process: "What communication did you deliver?"

Well now, he doesn't understand that. Communication, to him, appears to be a rather high order of thing, and that he delivered it means that he was all right, and so forth.

So you say, "What overt act did you commit?" And you run the same one. "What communication did you communicate that you didn't think you what - ought to have communicated?" In other words, "What communication - what delivered communication is regretted? What are you trying now at this moment not to have delivered that you did?" Do you see these ramifications?

Work these things out and you've got it made. The only difficulties that are going to happen anyplace in this universe, the only difficulties that have happened in this universe and the only difficulties that would occur even if it weren't here are simply based on this same information I am giving you.

Whether or not there are GPMs, whether or not there are not GPMs, whether there is a universe, whether there is no universe; you still have this same potential of difficulty. You see somebody in difficulty - it would be this same reason, see?

"What communication aren't you delivering because you have delivered so many lousy communications?" Do you see? Unrunnable process, but a complete understanding of the situation.

Now, what have you got to do? Well, you've got to do what you've got to do in order to get him to communicate where he should be communicating. And that may be have to be approached through the R and that may be have to be approached through the A as well as - and you may have to work it around in some way, but you're trying to multiply his ability to communicate and get the barriers of noncommunication out of the way. And if you did that, why, you'd have it made and everything would be all right and okay.

What I have been talking to you about is wisdom as an auditor. And don't ever really think you could degenerate a hundred percent to a wound - up doll and get a result. You have to know something of what you are doing; and the pc across from you, you have to be at least aware of the fact that he does live and that he follows the laws of life and he isn't different just because he's acting different. There must be some thing that you are doing to make him act different. Perhaps those are hard lines, but that's nevertheless an understanding an auditor should have.

Thank you very much.