QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD: PROCEDURE IN AUDITING

A lecture given on
5 July 1961

Okay. What is this, the fifth of July? Do you realize yesterday – yesterday was the anniversary of George III's considerable upset.

Female voice: That's sacrilegious.

I did a terribly sacrilegious and irreverent thing, though. I found a guinea, a golden guinea with George III's head on it. Had it made up in a tie pin and took his head back to America. Terrible thing. What makes it doubly funny – what makes it doubly funny is I was, of course, on the other side of that war. I was an observer on Howe's staff during the Battle of Bunker Hill. Wasn't even British, but I was there. Yeah.

Well, anyway, I haven't given you a chance to ask any questions for some time, so how about a question? Gee, I'm glad you know this Stuff Why, I'm really glad you know it. Yes?

Female voice: Well, I think it's stupid asking this question, but when you're doing Goals Assessment . . .

When you're what?

Female voice: When you're doing a Goals Assessment . . .

Yes? When you're doing . . .

Female voice: . . . do you cancel out that there is no more question at that time. I mean really go after it hard . . .

Hm.

Female voice: . . . before you begin nutting them . . .

Hm.

Female voice: . . . or is it all right just to take the list the preclear hands you and then start in on that?

Is it all right to do what?

Female voice: or just to take the list the preclear hands you or the list you already have....

Hm.

Female voice: . . . and start in on that.

No.

Female voice:.. . I mean you can say to him, "Well, do you have any more goals?" and if he says, "No," not search for them or you can actually search for them.

No, if you're not – you don't have an option. Now, the question is, is "When doing Goals Assessment and you come to the end of your list, should you ask for more goals or not?" Isn't that what it'd boil down to? Or, "Can you get away with just going over your list and not asking for more goals" Does that add up your question?

Female voice: Not quite, no. I mean should you actively search for more goals? Actively search?

Should you actually search for more goals? Yes. Well, it's – I think this is the same thing. Should you ask for more goals? Should you search for more goals? Yes. This is mandatory. In doing an SOP Goals Assessment, when you have gone down and finished off the list, you must always search for more goals in *all* categories. Not just more goals, but goals by categories. Antisocial goals, secret goals, hidden goals, goals that you would like to hide. Any kind of goal that you can think of or goals about health. Any kind of a goal that you might think this pc still has, you ask for this and add those to the goals list. And of course, every time the pc gives you a new goal spontaneously, you also add that to the goals list.

The goals list is a continuing action and it must always be continued. And as a matter of fact, when you think you finally have the pc's goals, you *don't,* unless you get a null on, "Do you have any more goals?" You say well, I've got the pc's goal, and it continues to fall, but the checkout might demonstrate that the pc still had more goals. Now, if the pc still has more goals, the one which you found with such ardure is liable to go null.

But what is adding auditing time. .. And I'm awfully glad you asked this question. It's not a stupid question at all. It's something I should take up. Here I'm neglecting the piece de resistance and talking about the hors d'oeuvres all the time in not talking to you more about SOP Goals. Because it's a pretty precise activity, and if you're going to get anybody Clear, you're for

sure going to get them Clear by running SOP Goals and not by doing anything else. Therefore, any question with regard to SOP Goals is very germane. And this is probably the only place in the world right now you could learn the straight dope on SOP Goals. So it's very far from a bad question, Evelyn.

All right. Now, let me give you a rundown on this. Should I? Just let me give you a very squared, cubed, triangular rundown on it that all buttons up very nicely. You are making a mistake in running SOP Goals Assessments, which winds up in getting fantastic numbers of goals. And the mistake is this, and in view of the fact you haven't been *told to do it* precisely, therefore, it can't be added up as a mistake. But it's one of these things you wouldn't think you'd have to tell somebody.

When you get to the end of a goals list . . . I have a feeling maybe you've got some part of your question I'm not answering.

Female voice: Yes, but maybe you'll get there.

All right. But what is the part – what is the part of the question I'm not talking about?

Another female voice: What she's – what she's trying to ask is, is that when you get the – you have a preclear and then you ask him for his goals list and he turns you in a list of goals, should you at that time (before you begin eliminating them) ask him for further goals according to the E-Meter, or could you just begin assessing them?

I see. The question got lost back in the beginning here. Yes. You don't assess the list he gave you. Not until you've got a complete list. That is the precise answer to it. Now I see the tension go off

Preclear comes in, hands you a list of goals; yes, you add to that list. you add all categories to that list. you do not look on his having handed you a list of goals as having anything much to do with it. You're just richer by having a few more goals that you didn't have to sweat for. It is simply an assist. And you would – he'd take his list of goals, and then you start in on SOP Goals search just as you would in any case.

You want goals in all shapes, varieties and categories. And you just go on and on and on listing goals, goals, goals, goals, goals, and you list goals until you've got a null needle.

Now, here's the mistake you're making You are making a mistake. You're asking for more goals, having nulled a lot of goals without running any rudiments in between. And therefore, you are getting falls, falls, falls that have nothing to do with more goals.

You are getting falls on "Oh, my God! Not any more goals. You mean, I have to give him some more goals. Ohhhh." And you get a fall.

And then you immediately got the fall, and you say "Well, then obviously, obviously the person has more goals, because he has a fall here." Oh, that's not true.

Havingness. There are several things run the same way. you ask this individual, "Do you have a present time problem?" It very often occurs this way. you ask the person . . . This is true of meter. This is E-Metering. This is a part of E-Metering.

You ask the person, "Do you have a present time problem?" and you get a fall. Do you know that that can fall on having been asked for a present time problem? He doesn't have a present time problem, but he's upset because he thinks maybe he's going to have to spend the next two hours in auditing, running one, and you already ran one yesterday fruitlessly, and it didn't get anyplace. Or somebody has done something to him, and the present time problem didn't get handled, so he thinks auditing will handle it, and you're getting a fall, you see.

And here you are. You're getting a meter reaction on a present time problem. The meter is never wrong. The meter is never, never, never, never wrong, but you can sometimes ask the wrong question. See, you can ask the wrong question, get a fall, and then get the wrong idea of why it's falling. It's like this silly drill on, "Have you ever been a victim of pain-drug-hypnosis?" you see. And of course, you get a fall, and so you search it down and you find out that the cat PDHed him on the twelfth of July at midnight, you see. And it all is idiotic. Well, the meter isn't wrong. The meter isn't wrong. You just have asked a dull question.

The pc has a charge on "victim," has a charge on the word "pain," has a charge on the word "drug," has a charge on the word "hypnosis" and drowned a cat at twelve midnight – twelve July, midnight, see. Well, obviously, the whole thing adds up all wrong and backwards. So you have to take your questions apart, and you have to know what you're asking, and you have to ask what you're asking to find – in such a way as to find out whether or not you're – get a reaction on the sensibility of it or some odd side effect.

So you say to this person, "Have you got any more goals?"

And the person says to himself, "Oh, no!" you know. And you get a fall.

And you say, "Oh, well, he's got more goals." "Well, what is this more goals?"

And the person says, "Oh, no. I've thought of every goal I've ever had. I've thought of a lot of goals I haven't ever had. I've tried to please this auditor. I've tried and tried and tried to please this auditor. And there's just no pleasing this auditor at all. And he hits me, so I'd better create.

The auditor hits me, so I'd better create some. So all right. Well, let's see. Let's see, goals . . . What the hell is a goal?" you know.

And this is how your lists get so extended. It's because you're not clearing what the meter is falling on.

So I'll give you a remedy for this. Run a rudiment before you ask for more goals. Now that, of course, applies to your question too. Because, you see, the person comes in; he's got a goals list. He thinks this is all the goals he's ever had in his life. He hands you this list, and you promptly don't go down the list and say, "Oh, well, that's it. That's it. Let's get the show on the road." Instead of that, you ask him for more goals. Well, this in itself is rather odd sometimes. It's not always invalidating, but occasionally even *that* could be slightly invalidative to the pc, don't you see, in some rather sensitive pc.

So here's what – here's what you should do. And here's what you would do anyhow. You put him into Model Session in order to get more goals. You don't just take off: He hands you the list; you start asking him questions. That isn't the way you do it. you put him in Model Session. So you're in effect running all the beginning rudiments between his having written the goals list, you see, and your asking for more goals.

So, you get an opportunity to sort of clear this subject up because you've got the rudiments, don't you see. And you can ask some burning questions about goals while you're doing the rudiments. "How do you feel about goals? How do you feel about people searching for goals on you? How do you feel about giving up all these goals?" You can ask anything you want to like this. And you start to get a fall on this sort of thing, clean it up. See?

You say, "Well, now how do you feel about – you did all these goals and you've given them to me and so forth, and all right, and you realize I'm going to ask you for even more goals than this. How would you feel about that?"

You watch it. You'll see – sometimes you'll see a fall. And you'll say, "Well now, what's the matter with that?" Well, you immediately believe that he's got some goals he doesn't want to tell you about. No, he may be falling from just the idea of exhaustion. See? So get this cleared up.

"Now, what's that fall? What's that fall for? What does that fall fall on? More goals. What is that?"

"Oh, I don't know. Ah, yes. It's my father. He used to bang at me all the time about what I was going to do in life." Or some poor girl – I've seen a lot of girls practically spinning on this, trying to measure up to the ambitions of their parents. Girls seem to get this more heavily than boys. Boys get bored with it and run away. But the girl, she's sort of pinned down, you see. And

people come along and, "What are you going to do with your life? What are you going to do with your life? What are you going to be? What are you going to be, little boy? What are you going to be, little girl? Are you going to be a fireman? Are you going to be this? Are you going to be that? What are you going to be?" Of course – the schnucklehead – he's being a little boy. He's perfectly all right.

I've seen parents do this on babies and absolutely drive babies halfway around the bend. The kid is only six or seven months old, and yet he is being hammered and pounded. Nothing he can do is pleasing. He's always got to be able to do something else and something more. And they get it hot and heavy, these little kids do. you know?

The kid actually learns to pick up a milk cup, you know? He thinks that's pretty good. He's pretty smart, you know. And right away his parents want him to pick it up with one hand, you know. So he learns to pick it up with one hand, and so he learns to pick it up with one hand and drink it without spilling any milk at all which is rather terrific, you know. Or even actually be able to pick it up with one hand and splash it all over the room, which is equally terrific.

And do the parents say anything at all about this? They say, "No, dear, you must learn how to drink milk without or with splashing it all over the room," you see. "You must learn to drink milk differently. You must learn to drink milk differently." So he learns how to drink milk, and now he's got to learn how to drink milk differently. See, here he is busy being a little boy and they say, "Well, you better be a grown man," see. But he's *being* a little boy, and nobody ever notices that he's being anything. All they notice about him is an alter-is.

Well, this adds up on some pcs particularly to be an allergy, to get – sometimes will get practically allergic to being asked for goals. "What are you going to do in life, little boy," adds up to the auditor's, "Do you have any more goals?" See, it's reactive.

So the smart thing for you to do before you ask for more goals is to run end rudiments or something of that sort. Give him a little break there. Run some end rudiments. Run some beginning rudiments. And now, before you actually ask for the goals as actually part of the rudiments, you clear up this subject of goals. "How do you feel about goals? Anybody ever pester you about goals very much?" so forth.

And the person, "Oooooh, yeah." All right.

You get no reaction on the idea of the word "goals," see – no reaction on this. Dandy. Dandy. Now let's say, "Have you got any more goals to add to this list?"

And the pc will say, "No."

And you won't get a fall on the needle either. But the way you can continue to get long, long lists and add to them forever, you see, is by mistaking what your meter is reading. Your meter is reading on an allergy to giving you any more goals, so you're reading it as though you've got now to get more goals. You get the misinterpretation?

But this isn't as bad as it looks, this isn't as bad as it looks, because a person who is having a rather hard time in life will give you five, six, seven, eight, nine hundred, a thousand goals. But this at least saves you from getting in the additional two hundred you wouldn't have gotten, you see. I mean they just made up a couple of hundred there just to fill in time or something like this. Something went wrong.

So before you ask for more goals, whether the pc just gave you the list and you're just beginning or if you've just finished working over a whole column of goals, for heaven's sakes, clear the subject of goals, asking for goals and rudiments. And if you do that, you'll find your Goals Assessment goes more rapidly. Okay? Sound wise to you? It is.

Well, that's more question than you asked, but I have had it on the back of my mind for some time to speak to you about this. That okay?

Female voice: That's okay. Thank you.

All right. Wasn't any other part of that, was there?

Female voice: No. I've got it now.

You're sure?

Female voice: Yeah.

You're sure? All right. Any other question? Yes.

Another female voice: This follows right along and is equally – mine's being – quite dumber. When you have been nutting them, you still have not completed your list, do you keep on nutting at the beginning of the next session or do you ever ask for more goals before you continue? Do you . . .

No. You just keep on nulling. And when you've totally run out of goals to null – that is to say, you've just completed the list.

Female voice: Yes.

When you've gone through the list once, even though many goals remained live, you ask for more goals. But the smart thing to do is to clear up goals and run rudiments before you ask for more goals. Got it?

Okay. Any other questions? Yes?

Male voice: With Routine 1A, would you run one for one with the Security Check?

Yeah. In Routine 1A would you run one for one with the Security Check? Yeah. But what do we mean by one for one? We simply mean if you're going to spend six hours running Recall a Problem, then you're going to spend six hours security checking and so on. you always bring a process up to a flat point before you do something else, because you're in collision with the Auditor's Code.

And you're going to find out this is pretty hard to do with Recall a Problem, Routine 1A. Pretty hard to do, because you're not going to flatten that very soon. And the guy can practically go on forever with a wobbling tone arm and so forth.

The best way to run Routine 1A in an HGC, would be to take Routine lA's Problem Process and get that audited in formal session. And then take another auditor or take another period of the day as an entire separate activity and do a Security Check. And this supposes a unique problem. You actually should flatten a process before doing something else or going on to another thing or changing, you see.

Routine 1A – in its infancy right now – yet shows no great promise of flattening rapidly. Certainly not flattening rapidly enough to do a Security Check. And to follow the rule, well, flatten the process and then do your Security Check, which you should do on the other routines . . . You know, you shouldn't do the CCHs. You should bring CCH 4 up to a flat point and then do a Security Check or something like that, you see. Or even CCH 2 up to a flat point and do your Security Check.

Well, you're dealing with one now in Routine 1A that doesn't have such flat points – liable to go on forever. So you could get around this by setting up an entirely different session, see, or atmosphere or period or something. And just break it down so that we're running the pc at one time of the day on problems, and running him another time of the day on Security Checks.

You're going to find out Security Checks go more rapidly with Routine 1A than they have been doing on CCHs. Routine 1A can be terribly slowed down if the Security Check is omitted. And I would never go more than five hours of Routine lA's Problems Process without doing a Security Check. I know that sounds like a rather involved answer, but I'm having to answer it on my feet. This is a new routine. Okay? Right.

Female voice: on this point, you said in an HGC you could do this by haring two different auditors . . .

Yeah.

Female voice: . . . doing the job. Well, as a private auditor, could you, by agreement with the preolear beforehand, set aside the morning for. . .

Uh-huh.

Female voice: . . . auditing problems and the afternoon . . .

Right.

Female voice: . . . for auditing checks.

Yeah. As a private auditor – HGC, you could give them a couple of different auditors. A private auditor could probably most easily set aside a morning session, just as you've said, and say we're going to run problems in the morning and going to security check in the afternoon. Or we're going to run Security Checks in the late afternoon; we're going to run problems in the evening, or however we want to do. Or on alternate sessions, or something like this, we're going to run one or the other.

This does pose a slight difficulty because Routine 1A can get awfully hot. It can get awfully hot. And the pc will feel like you're tearing up the whole universe around him. And havingness gets badly shot in Routine 1A, apparently. And the apparency of the havingness shoot, of course, is the fact that by taking off the confusions, you're knocking out the stable datum which are havingness to the pc.

If the pc is looking on all these stable data as havingness, and these havingnesses are disappearing because you're knocking the confusions off of them, you've got the agitation and confusion of the problem agitating the pc, and all problems are a "can't-have" anyhow. And then you've got the stable data disappearing, and it looks rather – rather messy. And you've got TR 10, which you can always run as part of Routine 1A. I personally don't believe it is necessary, as long as your auditing is pretty smooth. Auditing has to be pretty smooth to run 1A. You can't fool with a beefy process like this with rough auditing

But if an individual is apparently getting very agitated and running down and that sort of thing, be assured that you are running the process which also runs it out. You've got the pc up against all of his "can't-haves," almost simultaneously. So of course, he looks like a "can't-have," you see. It's not really running down his havingness. But he has the feeling that it is. And it makes him nervous and agitated and misemotional and so forth. You'll run a lot of . . . This process runs pretty hot.

Now, if, however, this seemed to be too bad or something of the sort, you always could find the pc's havingness process. Or you could use TR 10. I mean, good auditing is good auditing. And as far as cutting off suddenly, running problems – you know, the pc's got this terrible somatic. His head is just half off, and it moved over to just here, see. And now you say, "Well, that is the end of that process." Then you say, "Now we're going to do a Security Check." I'm – I'm afraid you'd get a backfire.

So that's why this different sessions or different auditors running the problem and the Security Check or a preagreed idea that at certain periods we're going to security check and at certain periods we're going to run problems. And you don't create the ARC breaks, you see. A pc isn't given the sudden feeling like he's going to be left in what he has just been plunged into, don't you see. He knows he'll have to face that up again tomorrow, so it's all right. And he becomes content to do that.

You say, well, can't we do this in one session and give him understanding in one session? Well, I personally doubt it. I personally doubt it because you're – you're now violating, *in* the session. . . One session, you've got a preunderstood situation going here, and the pc is not liable to examine his contract while he's in session. So you better let him go out of session and have him remember his contract, which his contract is, we're going to do alternate sessions on problems and Security Checks. And he knows this. This is easy to remember because it's two different parts of the day or it's two different people. You've – I think you'll find on the whole, it's a much happier situation.

Otherwise, you've got a big problem here. you got a big problem here with problems. It is a problem with running it, and that is that it isn't going to flatten fast. It's not a fast-flattening process.

I was very amused on an auditor's report last night to see somebody said – they said, "Well, tomorrow or the next day when we get this flat, can we go back to something or other?" and I thought, what hope. What hope. It – it isn't going to happen that way, see. He's going to run this on here for quite a little while, and it's just going to go and go and go and go and go and go and go. It's a marvelous way to get all of the problems out of the road that the pc's got so he isn't always coming up with PT problems. Your future sessions are going to go rather easily. But to give this thing a lick and a promise and leave it while it's in high restim would be a dangerous thing to do, and in addition to that to hope that it's going to flatten in the next session or so is not optimistic; it's foolish. It's not going to.

It's just like the guy who'll sit there forever. You say, "Now, how does that problem seem to you?" you know.

And the fellow says, "All right."

And you say, "All right. Now describe the problem to me. And the guy will give you a different problem. Every time you'll get a different problem. When you're running this, "How does it seem to you?" and "Describe the problem." Well, it's, you know, the old – one of the earliest versions of problems: "Describe the problem. How does it seem to you? All right. Good. Describe the problem. How does it seem to you? Describe the problem. How does it seem to you?" And if you've ever had any experience running that, you know, he always gives you a different problem. He never gives you the same problem.

And he comes into session and he says, "Well," he says, "my wife and I have just had a quarrel, and she has just thrown the silver coffeepot down into the areaway. And it was a gift from my grandmother who is about to die at any moment. And this – our total future of economics is dependent on her remembering us in the estate, and she's going to call this evening," you see. It's a very involved problem.

And you say, "All right. Well, now that you described it, how does it seem to you?"

"Oh," he says, "it's pretty grim."

You say, "Describe the problem to me."

"Well, the problem's not being able to work, you see, because I expect my grandmother at all times, you see, to leave this estate."

You say what the hell happened to this coffeepot? You know, you've got a coffeepot down in the middle of the areaway. Well, as far as that's concerned, it'll stay in the middle of the areaway for the rest of the session.

That's why we don't use, oddly enough, that is why we don't use any fancy problems processes in rudiments. We don't give them any opportunity in rudiments to do anything but *run that problem they came up with.* Now, the – Change as a level in the Prehav Scale was developed to cure alter-is. And it turns out that was a stopgap. Good as it was, it was a stopgap. What cures alter-is is problems. And your pc that's obsessively alter-ising anything, he'll run problems like a shot rocket. And problems is alter-is. Because, of course – look at it – the guy has a problem, so he solves it. Well, the solution to the problem is an alter-is of the problem, isn't it. So you get this as being the modus operandi of alter-is. I've made this discovery recently is why I suddenly am stressing and moved over onto 1A. I've been trying to cure alter-is.

Here was the factor that stood in our road from time immemorial The factor that stood in our road was a very simple one. We gave the pc an auditing command, and then he chewed it up

and converted it into cellophane and exported it to China, received Chinese taels for it, converted these into rubles, went on an exploration to the North Pole and answered you with blubber. And it might have sounded reasonable to the auditor most of the time, but this tremendous chain of vias was going on. So you couldn't say this process doesn't work on this pc, because the process had never been administered to the pc. you know?

Now, there's ways to counteract that. you sit on top of a pc, practically on his lap and breathing down his larynx, and you say to him every time, "Now, exactly what did you do then?" or "What did you do with that auditing command?" It's very good practice every now and then to ask a pc, "How did you do that one?" You know? And he'll give you. . . And you will sometimes get the *wildest* concatenation of transferring taels to blubber, transferring it this way and that way. And then it goes out to a little spot that is eight feet off of the head, and then this spot plays a small tune. And then he knows because his toe is getting warm that the proper answer is... And it'll be some wild via-via-via-via-via, you see.

Well, now, you're running into this so strongly, so strongly, continuously, in running problems that you have to check up on this often, only it isn't *"How* did you do it?" that you check up on; it's "Did you *do* it?" You ask him for the problem he just recalled. Now you're going to be amazed if you haven't been already, the number of times the person really hasn't recalled a problem. Have you noticed that? Have you? They haven't really recalled a problem. They've just gotten the foggy notion of all of the confusion, see.

All right. So here's this fellow in a foggy confusion of some kind or another with about three somatics, and you all of a sudden say, "We're going to security check you." Now, I tell you, that's wonderful productive of ARC breaks. I don't care what understanding you've got, what contract you've got written and how many witnesses you had when you signed it with the pc, it isn't going to hold. Not even if you took it to court would it hold on some pcs. Say, "Oh! No wait! What do you mean – what do you mean Security Check? What? Are you kidding? My head's – oh! and so on. It's a terrible pain here, and so on. And there's something going on – and you want to security check me. Oh, you're not taking care of me, auditor," see. So he goes right out of session. So you'd have to do it on different sessions or with different people if you're going to run Security Checks before Problems shows any signs of flattening

I sight trouble up the line with this, that's why I'm stressing it so hard. Okay? All right. I overanswered that one, but I hope that's all right. Okay?

All right. Yes?

Male voice: What's the matter with overcoming the problem of the preclear not actually getting out an answer by having him verbally answer each command ?

Yeah. Well, of course, that's time-consuming Spot-checking was an early auditor mechanism to keep the pc in communication without wasting all of the time. Now, as you know, you've run a lot of pcs who are extremely verbose.

Male voice: Yeah, including me.

Yeah. Well, you give them – you give them an auditing command and you ask them to answer it aloud. You, by the way, would never give an understanding you were going to answer all these auditing commands aloud. There isn't anything like that. You'd have to tell him every time to tell you what it was all about, and by the time you've wasted four or five session hours out of an intensive just because he was stumbling around on this you'll say, well, this pc would have gotten further if he'd simply recalled it.

So that you're doing a police check really. You're doing a spot check, and that's all you want. That's all you want. you don't want every question policed, you see. But you want it random enough so that it takes them by surprise and keeps them disciplined. Every few commands, particularly if the pc looks a little bit *wuuhh, you* know, it's a very good thing to say, "Now what was that problem?"

"Oh, oh, what was the problem! I don't uh – what problem?" so on.

And it's about time you said, "I'll repeat the auditing command. Recall a problem."

"Ohhh. Recall a problem. That's what you want."

"I'll repeat the auditing command. Recall . . ."

Say, by the way, I wonder if I've mentioned to you, every time the pc says anything or repeats the auditing command after you, or makes any comment of any kind on the auditing command – not cognition – you say, "I'll repeat the auditing command" and do so. Do you do that routinely?

Audience: Yes.

Well, don't drop that one out of your works, because the pc very often feels he has answered the auditing command.

You say, "Recall a problem," and he says "Cheesecake." And, you know? Chee hm – you know. He'll nod. "Recall a problem" – nod, you know. What's happened? He's said to himself

"Cheesecake," you know. And well, that's all right. He'll look vague, and then you could check up on it. That's one part of this.

But the other part of this is more important. You say "Recall a problem."

And the person says, "I never knew oak trees grew that large."

You say, "I'll repeat the auditing command," see. "Recall a problem."

"Oh, oh, oh, oh, yes, yes. Ah-ha, yeah. Yeah. I missed that for a minute."

You say, "Good. I'll repeat the auditing command. Recall a problem."

And the pc says, "Yes." He did, see. He gets a feeling that he's answered the auditing command. You can actually get into a silly situation where you think the pc is comm lagging, when as an actual fact, he thinks he's answered the auditing command. And when a pc repeats the auditing command after you, you've got a circuit in bloom. And if you don't repeat the auditing command, he is being audited by his circuit.

So the rule is, when the pc says anything after you've said the auditing command, which isn't an answer to the auditing command, you say "I'll repeat the auditing command," and do so. But there are two versions here of this.

Cognition (which is an internal comment of some kind or another or a realization; a cognition is a realization): If the words repeating – "I'll repeat the auditing command" – would tend or look like they were an invalidation of his cognition, you don't use them. you just repeat the auditing command. You got the idea?

If you're very good at this and your intentions are very good at this, there's no confusion in his mind that it is a different auditing command. He knows it's the same auditing command. You see how that works? But don't take a chance. There's two sides of this: (1) You can be so pedantically insistent on repeating the auditing command, the pc feels he can't communicate with you. And there's Clause 16, Auditor's Code, out. you can very easily shut off a pc's communication with this "I'll repeat the auditing command." Let's take the other side of this picture, however, and have the pc saying things and commenting on things and then have him sink back. Well, he must have kept that in some circuitry or some sort to keep the auditing command alive, don't you see. So you have to say the auditing command again. So you have to be clever enough to acknowledge what he said – acknowledge what he said – without ending the cycle of action. It's a semi-acknowledgment, by the way. These are half acknowledgments, and you acknowledge what he said without ending the cycle of the auditing command, and then you say the auditing command, see.

You say, "Mm-hm. All right. Recall a problem." See? You say to him, "Recall a problem."

And he says, "Gee! I haven't – haven't thought of that – I haven't thought of that for a long, long, long, long time," and so forth.

Well, in that case, you're not quite sure so you'd say, "Did you recall a problem?"

"Oh," the person says, "No. No. As a matter of fact, I – I didn't."

"All right. Recall a problem." See?

If you put a little insistence on your auditing command, it doesn't sound like a new auditing command. It sounds like a repeat.

You get how this is? It's an interestingly narrow border. Now you say, "Recall a problem." New command. "Recall a problem."

And the pc says, "Gee, it's getting late, isn't it?"

And you say, "Mm-hm. Recall a problem."

"Oh, oh-ho, oh, you want me to recall a problem, yeah."

"Recall a problem."

"Well, I – I don't know. I'm all confused about it," and so forth.

And you say, "I'll repeat the auditing command. Recall a problem."

He isn't under any illusion but that is the same auditing command that you are repeating over and over, don't you see? If you get good at this, you can actually drop out a lot of this "I'll repeat the auditing commands." If you're good at this.

There is such a thing as half acknowledgment, and there is such a thing as actually repeating the auditing command in such a way that there is no margin of doubt anywhere. He knows it's a repeat of the same command that you just gave him. Okay?

Audience: Yes. Mm-hm.

Right. Always get the auditing command you asked answered, by the way. Always get that answered, otherwise your pc goes out of session. Yes.

Male voice: Ron, could you ask the pc, "Do you still have the auditing command ?"

Yeah, you can. But you would ordinarily ask that while he was comm lagging and drifting around. It'd be almost an emergency situation. Its use would be very rare. Very rare. It's usually a

very bad thing to interrupt a comm lag of the pc. The pc is, you know, looking for this. He's looking for it, he's looking for it, he's looking for it, looking for it. And all of a sudden, the auditor distracts him.

The most basic source of ARC breaks with auditors which are legitimate ARC breaks, is the auditor taking attention – the pc's attention off of his own case and putting it on the auditor. You'll find out that statement right there is the common denominator of ARC breaks. In other words, the pc is – got his attention on his case, and the auditor does something to pull his attention off. And that just about will practically finish some pcs. What happens is you get a sudden change of attention. And change of attention is associated in all minds with accidents, pain, casualties and so forth, you see. The fellow was standing there minding his own business, and all of a sudden this sixteeninch shell hit him in the back, see.

Well, that's a sudden change of attention. And if the auditor yanks the pc's attention off his bank and puts it on the auditor, what the auditor's trying to do or say, then – in the case of an auditor flub, or in the case of an auditor intruding during a comm lag, or in some other case of – analogous – then the pc gets the sensation of having been hurt or struck.

And you have to be kind of careful about this, so that if the pc is sitting there, and you're saying by this time, "Well, good God! Eight, nine, ten minutes have gone by. He sure can't still be thinking of the auditing command," you know. I'd wait till he sort of looked up for a moment dazedly in my direction. I would say to him – not very specific or not very intrusive – "You still got that?"

He'd say, "What?"

You say, "All right. I'll repeat the auditing command."

"Oh, well, yeah. I was drifting off. . ." And you don't get an ARC break. But the pc is deeply interiorized, and he's thinking, he's thinking. He's running through his mind and through his mind. He hasn't said a thing. He's still got the auditing command. He's doing what he's supposed to be doing. He is the soul of purity and goodness. He's doing everything you said. He is in control. He's interested in his own case. He'll give you the answer as soon as he's got one.

And you stick your number 10's in and you say, "Have you still got the auditing command?"

And he says to himself, "My God, I give up. Here I am doing everything I'm supposed to be doing," you got the idea, "and here you have given me a sudden shift of attention." And then you'll get the blowups and there's your fruitful source of ARC breaks. Okay?

Male voice: Yes, thank you.

All right. You bet.

Female voice: Um, should the preclear ask you to repeat the auditing command or say he's lost the auditing command, is it necessary to say, "I will repeat the auditing command" before you repeat it to him? – should he ask you for it.

Oh, I very often omit it. If you say – the pc thinks he's lost the auditing command and he asks the auditor to repeat the auditing command, does the auditor then say, "I will now repeat the auditing command," and do so? Yes, this is formally, exactly, absolutely correct. That's absolutely correct. It can, however, be omitted as a preliminary statement to repeating it. The pc says, "I haven't got that command. What did you say?" And just simply say, "Well, recall a problem." He won't take it amiss. You bet.

Female voice: Is there any way that you can tell on the E-Meter what the pc is doing, if he still has the command or if he doesn't?

Yeah. Yeah. It'll wander around. Needle – needle will wander around. Tone arm will move. If these things all of a sudden become still and there's nothing happening on the meter at all, it's almost legitimate to assume that he has lost the auditing command or is thinking about something else or is doing something else. you can tell on a meter if you watch the meter whether the pc still has the auditing command and is still doing it.

If the pc is still doing the auditing command, of course, he's plowing through energy masses of one character or another, and this is the first thing that the E-Meter registers. So of course, it does register whether or not he still has the auditing command. I would not say it was totally vital, because I think a pc could give himself an auditing command and give himself some other auditing command, and you'd still get a meter reaction. This isn't a foolproof answer, but it is an answer. Okay?

Female voice: Thank you.

All right.

Another female voice: You mentioned that in running Routine IA, the preclear may need havingness or he may look as though he needs it, but not really need it.

Mm-hm.

Female voice: Well, you can... Could you just check that up with a hand-squeeze test? I assume you can.

The pc may look like he needs havingness or may actually need havingness. It goes like this: It's how gaunt and wan does this pc start looking. It's a question of degree. You will find in running Recall a Problem, that the havingness will drop and then resurge. You know, goes down and then he comes up and he's all right.

All right. Supposing it just kept going down, and he just kept getting hollow-eyed and he's deeper and deeper and further and further gone over a period of a half an hour or something like this, and the bottom had practically dropped out. Well, I'd bring it up to a point that wasn't disturbing anything, you know, where he had a couple or three answers that were fairly close together, and I'd run some havingness on him. It's a question of degree. It's a question of how bad off does this pc look. But he can look pretty bad, by the way, without going by the boards. He can look pretty bad without going by the boards.

Female voice: Would the hand-squeeze test not be valid in that situation?

Perfectly valid. Hand-squeeze test would be perfectly valid. But you start running in and out of problems, you're going to get stuck needles, loose needles, stuck needles, loose needles, stuck needles, loose needles. And the fact that a needle is stuck up for a moment or two would not be a criterion that he needed havingness.

You'd run havingness the same way as you always ran it. We could run the Havingness and Confront Process over into Routine 1A as far as that's concerned. I mean, you don't have to worry about that. May do so. Perfectly legitimate. Havingness and Confront Process are not an integral part of Routine 2. They've just been stuck in Routine 2 because we didn't have any other stowage for them. Okay?

All right. Yes.

Male voice: Would Routine 1A flatten a hidden standard ?

Would Routine 1A flatten a hidden standard? It sure would. That's a very good thing you asked that, Robin, because frankly that's what it's looking for. The alter-is and the hidden standards – if you can get these things out of the way, man, you can clear them with a swish. And if you – if they've still got hidden standards, even while you're doing Goals Assessments, their hidden standards can remain a little too effective. It certainly gets the hidden standard out of the road. And if you've got the alter-is out of the road, the obsessive change of the auditing command so that you can give him auditing commands (which is what the CCHs are for) – and if you can get the hidden standards out of the road, *voila! You* really got it made. Answer your question?

Male voice: Thank you.

All right. Yes.

Female voice: What if you – in running 1A, you have a preclear who volunteers oral answers? Do you tell him to shut up?

In running Routine 1A, what if you have a preclear that volunteers oral answers. Such as what? Now, give me an example.

Female voice: Well, such as for me – it is being run on me – and I have – each time the command has been asked, I have given the preclear a verbal answer. I mean, the – the auditor a verbal answer.

Ah, yeah. Go on.

Female voice: Well, this has been going on for several sessions. Should I quit doing it?

Oh, no . . .

Female voice: You know, it's the natural way of doing it.

. . . no, no, no, no, no, no.

Female voice: And I was wondering, if – when I was an auditor, if it should be prohibited.

No, no, no, no, no. you see, let's get back to the definition of an auditing command. It goes back to this fundamental: An auditing command when executed has had performed exactly what it said, and nothing else. An auditing command has no understoods about it. There's no prearrangement about an auditing command except maybe learning the language.

So if you have said "Tell me – Recall and tell me about a problem," then, of course, you would expect him to do it always. If you have said "Recall but don't tell me about a problem," you would expect him to recall one but not say a word to you – neither one of which are workable commands. I'm just giving you – they'd have to be that. And that is the only way you would be able, by the Auditor's Code and all standards of auditing, to regulate whether the pc talked or not. It'd have to be inherent in the auditing command.

Now, when you've said, "Recall a problem," you haven't told him to do anything but recall a problem. Now, he has recalled a problem, and if he then elects to tell you about it, all right. If he elects not to tell you about it, all right. That is not part of the auditing command. So you can't have a prearranged agreement with the pc in any event as to anything he was going to do. you got the idea?

Female voice: Yes.

If you understand that very carefully, you never get in trouble with a pc. Remember that it's very difficult to get into trouble *as* a pc being audited by *any* auditor if you only do what the auditor says. This is quite interesting Never do anything else than what the auditor says. Only do what the auditor says. This is an interesting index. It's very difficult for you to get into trouble.

I had an auditor finally get past that one, one time by simply changing the command before it could be answered, several times. And that you couldn't do anything about, see. Gave you one process then gave you another process and another process, and each time waited for no answer and said, "Oh, no," or something like this, and then gave you another one. And then finally says, "Well, answer the auditing command." And I had to say, "Which auditing command?" And the auditor practically blew up.

Well, I had to know. I mean, I didn't even have any understanding about whether – whether you answered the first command first or the last command first or what command did you ask first. And I had four auditing commands, and they had all been asked, but no answer had been waited for on any of the auditing commands. *Coo!* Where did we go? What did we do? So that point of confusion can – could happen, but. . . or the auditor who just won't give any auditing commands, who just sits there silent. Best cure for that, of course, is go in the other room and get a gun and shoot them, put them out of their misery.

But that is – those are the two wild tricks that can be played by a person who is pretending to audit. It'd only be a pretense of auditing, but those are the two wild tricks, is not give any commands – just remain silent – or give a whole series of different commands without wanting any answer to any of the commands. And between those two things, you'd have about all that you really could do wrong in auditing.

Give auditing commands that can't be answered. Don't let them be answered. Don't wait for them to be answered. Give other commands before those commands can be answered, preferably different commands on a different process; or say nothing. That is the most maddening thing to a pc, is the pc gets a horrible somatic and waits for the next auditing command, and there is none. Fifteen minutes go by, and there is no next auditing command. The auditor is just sitting there. Can you imagine that condition occurring? Well, I have seen the condition occur a few times. Quite amazing.

What happened to the auditor? Where is the auditor? Why – and wha – . It's a question of the auditor went totally out of session. You know, he's not supposed to be in-session, so he's gone out of session, what do you do about it, you see? There isn't anything you can do about it.

Beyond those two things, you're always perfectly safe to do exactly what the auditor says. And oddly enough, you sometimes make a monkey out of some auditors when you do exactly what the auditor says and you do nothing but *what* the auditor says. The oddities of some auditing commands suddenly come to view. I can't think of an example readily on the thing, but you will run into them from time to time. you do exactly what the auditor said, and – he didn't tell you to do that. Oh, yes, he did. He said – distinctly, he said, "Think of a time when you weren't answering an auditing command."

And he says, "Well? Well?"

And you say, "I am."

"Well," he says, "when, when?"

"Well, right now. I'm not answering an auditing command."

And he'll say, "By golly, that's right. Well, let's see, I'd better phrase this auditing command so that it can be done."

That little game I used to play. I always used to do the exact auditing command that I was given. They're pretty wild. you listen sometime when you've seen somebody, particularly making up commands of some kind or another.

If a command is unanswerable when I'm being audited, I just simply say so. But this is not even an advice or a discipline to a pc. you cannot give advice to a pc. That's an evaluation. That's telling the pc how to act. you mustn't ever tell the pc how to do the auditing command in addition to the auditing command. It was – all must be inherent in the auditing command you expect to be answered. And that's the only direction the pc has.

If the pc is doing something else, well, you better rephrase the auditing command if you don't want him to do it. Because if by the standards of the auditing command he could do this thing, that would be very incorrect in auditing to censure him for doing it. you got it? That comes under the shuns. I'm covering that rather heavily because it's one of the great fundamentals of auditing. It was thoroughly disregarded in most psychotherapy that has ever been practiced. It just has never been a factor that has ever come up.

They talk about all sorts of things. They evaluate and they invalidate, and they never let the patient give an answer. They don't ever expect the patient to answer all these various things. I hope that answered your question.

Female voice: Yes.

You should just go on answering. Your specific answer is whatever the auditor asks, you do it if it can be done. And if it can't be done, tell him so.

Female voice: You do it the way – as a preclear, then, you do it the way you would do it.

Yes. You just always do it the way you do it.

Female voice: And as an auditor, you don't ask him to do it any different than he would do it.

That's for sure. If you want him to do it some other different way than what he's doing it, you'd better add it to the auditing command.

Female voice: Now I understand.

Yeah. So you'd have no understanding going on it. It would simply be a statement. You know, it wouldn't be from – we clear at the beginning of session that each time he answers the auditing question, he's going to put both feet flat on the floor. All right. That's valid for *one* answer – just one answer – because it's sort of part of the first auditing command, you see.

You say, "Well, now every time I ask you an auditing command – *every* time I ask you an auditing command, which is going to be one – you put both feet flat on the floor. All right. Now, here is the auditing command. When was George born?"

And you put both feet flat on the floor, and you say, "October the 2nd, 1716, or something."

And you cross your legs. And he says, "All right. When was George born?"

And you say, "October the 2nd, 17 – ."

He says, "Wait a minute. You didn't put both your feet on the leg – on the floor."

And you say, "Well, you didn't tell me to either."

"Let's see. Let's see. That's right. I didn't," you know.

There are no understoods. No carry-overs.

You'll sometimes see one of these things in as a sleeper. You won't notice it, but it's a sleeper. It's a sleeper in a session. And it's actually interrupting the session. You've got some understanding that you're going to quit at 4:15. That's an integral part of every auditing command. See? You can very often introduce these weird things. The auditor makes a contract with the pc, or the pc makes a contract with the auditor that it's going to be so and so and so and so. Well, of course, that's good for the first auditing command. That's all.

There is no contract between the auditor and the pc from the pc's viewpoint. There is a contract from the auditor's viewpoint. The auditor is there to give him some auditing for a certain period of time, but even the period of time disappears as far as the pc is concerned. There isn't anything else. There is nothing but the auditing command. That is all. And then there's this acknowledgment and the various guidance that he gets from the auditor. That's it. When it is given, see, each in each unit of time. Otherwise, auditing scrambles, becomes bunched up, the pc doesn't know what he's doing and is not in-session.

So that you can hang a pc in the first auditing command of the session by having an understanding You can hang him on the first auditing command, and the rest of the session, he will be on the first auditing command.

And during this seven-hour session, you have asked and got answered just one auditing command. That's all. That's the first command. I don't care how many times you repeated it, you asked the first command. That was the only thing that you asked. Got it?

One of the great fundamentals of auditing: Get an answer to every auditing command, and the pc only has to answer the exact auditing command which he is given at that time. There are no other understandings. There is no understanding that he's in-session. There is no understanding that he's got to stand in the auditing room. There is no understanding that he hasn't got to have a present time problem. There is no understanding, you see, that at 5:13 he can walk out of the room. There is no understanding for anything. You got it? It's just the auditing command at the moment when given.

There is no *way* to be a pc. There is no way to be a pc at all. No modus operandi. This is violated in Book One, by the way, with great enthusiasm. Old Joe Winter, and John W. Campbell, Jr., and several other guys around, wrote a pc's code. And they wrote up this pc's code, so I think we shoved it in the book. I don't think I've even ever read it. What trust and confidence I have in some ways.

Actually an HGC contract to obtain auditing is in violation of these principles, but in view of the fact that it's an administrative matter, there it is. But that it applies to auditing, the staff auditor is not bound by it. Couldn't be. The questions in the session are not monitored by it. It couldn't be. The HGC administrative contract has to do with the conduct of the pc when he's not being audited, and therefore that's all right, but cannot regulate the conduct of the pc *while* he is being audited in any way, shape or form. And no auditor can, beyond exerting control for one question at a time. That is the control he exerts.

Now, you can only get in trouble with this when a pc, out of session, comes up to anger or something of the sort and goes screaming at somebody out of session. And in New York City, they had a pc one time, years and years ago, that would come up to anger and go out and bust up a hotel room or something and would be upbraided by all of his relatives and knocked back into apathy. So the auditor would get ahold of this pc again, and they'd audit the pc, and they'd bring the pc up through 1.5. And the pc would get close to 1.5, go bust up a hotel room or a relative or something of the sort, and all the powers of creation would all come together to smash him back into apathy again.

And you know that this kept up for the better part of a year I think it was. It was a fantastic performance. There wasn't anybody going to let that pc get well, and the auditor auditing the pc had no facilities for restraining the pc in an auditing room for the duration of the twenty-four hours, you see.

What he needed to have been done was auditing in a padded cell; of course, the pc was a psycho. But – that would have worked all right. But that was the most piteous example of the society being totally against anybody getting back on his feet that I have ever witnessed. It really went on, I think, for the better part of a year. Yes?

Female voice: But if you had a case, and let's say that they did answer the problem. They said, well, the problem was how to get along with Joe. And – but then they went on, and then they began to tell you how they first met Joe and how – the reasons why they had this particular problem. Well then, you wouldn't – you wouldn't – that isn't answering the part of the answer to the auditing command. You would try to use your acknowledgments to . . . Yeah. Well, this comes under the skills and tools of the auditor. I was talking about the jurisprudence back of it. Now, far as the skills and tools of the auditor are concerned, he has asked the pc an auditing command. He expects that auditing command to be answered. And that is all he expects.

Now, you get into the control factor of the auditor. This goes over into another field entirely different, and your question, for instance, was, "Well, do you tell them to shut up?" Yes, an auditor can tell a pc to shut up. I have done so. I have said very elegantly in my best possible formal auditing fashion, "Shut up and answer the auditing command." And the pc looks at me blankly for a moment and then answers the auditing command. I never have an ARC break for some reason or other, any more than "Now, sit back in the chair there and answer the auditing command." Pc is going to leave. They're through. They're finished. Anybody ask an outrageous question like "What criminalities have your father ever engaged in?" or something like this. It's insulting. It impinges upon the family honor, you know. "Sit down and answer the auditing command."

And so they sit down; "Yes, he spent seven years in prison." And – some reason or other there's never any ARC break.

This comes under the heading of control. You can control pcs. The mistake is *not* to control pcs. The mistake is to be kind. I gave you a lecture on that the other day. That's the mistake, man. Or to be social while you're auditing. God! Social auditing, kind auditing – boy, they kill more pcs. Pcs get all off the rails. It – in the final analysis, it is much better to say to a pc that is burning up all of his auditing time, "Shut up."

The pc says, "Aw, I'm talking too much?"

"Yes. Yes. You're covering things I haven't asked you. Now, come on now. Let's answer that one auditing question, now: Recall a *problem."*

"Oh, oh. That's what you want. why didn't you say so?"

"I have. Recall a problem."

And you'll find your pcs like you better. That's for sure.

Now, there's a polite way of telling a pc to shut up. you say, "Recall a problem."

And the pc says, "Mmm, with Joe. Well, yes. Oh, with Joe. Yeah. Oh, yeah. I had that problem for years. Yes, my mother also had that problem, and my cousin Joanne, she had that problem. And sister Betsy, she had the problem, too. The problem originally originated back in the back hills..." Well, if you've let them go that far, man, you've had it, see.

No, the proper way, actually, to handle it if you can do it, is to say, *"Thank you." you* know, plant it right in their skull. *"Thank you."* They shut up if you're good at it. Look at you kind of blankly. They agree with you, too. They were running off to the hills. Valence is running away with the session. They know a valence is running away with the session. If it can run away with you too, they go out of session.

Aw, I remember this – one guy, he's had a bad history in Scientology because he keeps falling off the marijuana wagon. And he goes out and gets jobs with bands and so forth. And then he gets to smoking the tea or get – "hitting the tea," I think they call it, or "having the tea pad" or something. And – he goes to ramming around and then all of a sudden, why, he realizes he isn't doing right, and he'll turn up again. He has a bad time, this boy.

He – nobody is sufficiently interested in him. The main difficulty is, is none of his fellow Scientologists are sufficiently interested in – with him to make him sit down and get some auditing, see. He keeps getting away with it. But this guy pulled an interesting, proper trick one time. A very proper trick.

He was auditing an HGC pc. This fellow had a wife. And this wife sounded like one of these tape recorders when Peter is copying tapes, you know, at high speed. And he was going over to this fellow's apartment to audit him, and this wife would tear off and tear into Scientology and so forth, and tear into this, and then intrude her own problems, and difficulties this fellow has, and this fellow had always been silly about his mind. And oh, my God, you know. Just run on and on and on, miles a minute and disassociatively too. you know, start talking about the China teapots and all this kind of thing. So this guy – this guy pulled a Tone 40 "Thank you" on her. He got his face right up against her face, you see, bending over sideways as she was talking, you know, and put a Tone 40 "Thank you" right in the middle of her thetan. *Bang! You* see? And she didn't say a word for two days.

And that pc was absolutely fascinated. He might or might not have gotten anything too much out of that intensive, but he went home perfectly satisfied. There must be something to Scientology because it's the first time in his life he'd ever heard his wife quiet for twenty-four hours. I remember that silly case. you remember that one?

Female voice: Yeah, I remember that.

Yeah, man. He really planted one. Rest of that day, man, she didn't have a thing to say. she had no – no ARC break of any kind with the organization or with that auditor. After that, she thought we were all right. Fascinating, isn't it, huh?

The mistake is not to control the pc. That's the mistake. And your – all of your social training and all of the other trainings which you have, go against that point. And you think a pc is talking too much, you can give them an acknowledgment, just before they – in full flight. But watch it, because you've announced yourself at that moment as a control unit, see. You've announced yourself as a person who is controlling the pc. And the next few seconds are very crucial. Will you continue to control the pc or won't you?

And if you will continue to control the pc, you're all right. But if you really didn't mean it, and you're going to back out on it and you're going to apologize for having controlled the pc, you're going to be in trouble because the pc will make a test of it. Rather, the valence will make a test of it right at that moment. The valence is running on and on and on and on and on, and very non sequitur, and hasn't anything to do with the session. And you say, "Thank you."

And they're liable to get a little something sometimes, you know: "Well, you couldn't quite have said that. you interrupted me, you know," kind of fishing "Is he going to keep on controlling me?"

And you say, "Well, I'm sorry I interrupted you, really," and chicken out on it, see. you got an ARC break.

They say, "Well, I hadn't finished what I was saying. You know." If you don't chicken out, you get away with it right straight across the boards.

You say, "Yes, I know. Here's the next auditing command."

And they say, "I've met a tiger. Hmm! I've met a tiger with red stripes. I will now do the next auditing command and stop this nonsense."

ARC breaks proceed from lack of control. They actually always proceed from lack of auditing. You don't give auditing to the pc, you don't give control, you don't give auditing commands to the pc or you don't let the pc do the auditing command, you've got an ARC break. That's where your ARC breaks come from.

But as far as creating ARC breaks by being rough with the pc, positive with the pc, definite with the pc, and so forth – *no, you* do not get ARC breaks. The pc sort of says, *"Wheeew. I've been sitting here for the last three sessions wondering if this person was ever going to get on the ball and really, really, really get this thing in – into its proper pocket. And he did. Huh-huh! Good! That's really some auditor,"* they'll think, you know.

I remember one pc didn't make any progress. Didn't make any progress of any kind whatsoever under one auditor who was being very, very kind, very understanding, very sympathetic. Pc would spend about two-and-a-half-hours answering one auditing question, just running off at the mouth, and the auditor would sit there and let her do it. Just burning time, burning time, burning time, burning time, burning time.

Basically, what you can get away with is the degree that you can impinge upon the pc. Impingement has a lot to do with this, a lot to do with it. If you haven't made any impingement on the pc at all, the pc isn't going to do the auditing commands easily and isn't going to gain very fast. But if you do make an impingement on the pc, why, fine.

You start making a misemotional impingement on the pc, however, and you have bolstered up the valence which is always – a valence always is, by the way, a misemotional entity, and you've bucked up the valence, and you've permitted the valence now to overwhelm the pc, you see. Valences are usually in a misemotional state and – down under the surface, and so on. They're low grade. And you've supported the anger that's about to cave in the pc and the pc will cave in. That is the wrong way to go about it.

If you're going to exert control, you exert it just as Tone 40 control. That's all. If you're going to exert fast, hard control, you simply say, "Well, that's it." And you say, "Do it." If you don't *like* what the pc is saying and you engage in a misemotional debate with the pc on what the pc is saying, oh, you've had it because you have now bolstered the valence which has already got the pc overwhelmed. So you have overwhelmed the pc, not controlled the pc. And there's a considerable difference between these two points.

So if you're going to do any of these things, if you're going to tell the pc to shut up and sit down, don't say, *"Shut up! Sit down!"* Oh, no. Nice Tone 40, "Shut up. sit down. That's it. Thank you. Thank you very much. All right. Now, let's get on with this session, shall we? Here's the next auditing command." Bang!

Pc says, "I've met a tiger. Well, I guess these aberrations of mine have finally met their match."

But you can actually drive a pc off his hinges by becoming angry with him or using an angry tone of voice in trying to monitor or control. And if you don't shoot misemotion at a pc, you can say anything to a pc – if you don't shoot misemotion at him.

It's a bum thing to comment on a pc. It's a bum thing to make any comment of any kind whatsoever, on anything the pc has done. The pcs is – practically looks like they're pleading for a comment. They say, "Well, I burned down this church, you see. And I guess that was pretty bad – wasn't it?" And you, you knucklehead, say yes. Hmm, you've had it. you evaluated for the pc.

He asked for it. And you evaluated for him. And you say, "Well, then why in the name of common sense have I created an ARC break, and why is this pc out of session, and so forth?" You've made a comment. It is not up to the auditor to comment.

The pc says, "I've been sick for eighteen years, and I've had lumbosis in my zorch. And I have just been caved in all over the place, and that's pretty bad, and the doctors have really done me in, and everybody has done me in, and that sort of thing."

To say "Yes, you're in pretty bad shape," is a lousy thing to do. That's a bum thing to do. Just acknowledge it. Well if you're going to get him in auditing, you're going to get him to be audited, don't run a sales talk that is based upon an agreement with this sort of thing. Just say, "Yes, I am sure you need auditing. Now, the next auditing session begins at 7:30. Now, why aren't you there?" You see, that's the end of it. That's control. That's control.

But agreement about how bad off he is, agreement of how badly he's been treated or anything like that or agree that some auditor has bunged him up, or, you know, make – this is evaluation. Whether you like it or not, it's evaluation. The individual says, "Well, I feel pretty bad

about having done that to that girl," and the auditor says, "Well, I guess you should." You just watch him hit the toboggan. You can – you can – you can drop him two, three points on the Tone Scale *tus-ku-whish,* like a bang, you see.

Why? Because you are able to control. So therefore your opinion doesn't become an opinion to the pc; it becomes a stable datum. Now, God help you if you are now faced with the necessity of auditing out all of your stable data. You've made a lot of comments to the pc. You've agreed with the pc on a heck of a lot of how bad it all was and so forth. Now you're liable to get up against the situation where you actually are auditing out your own agreements with the pc on this subject, because you'll come up against them sooner or later. The pc will come out from underneath them.

Don't make comments to the pc. Don't comment on his data. Don't evaluate in any way. A comment is an evaluation even though it's apparently a kind of a null evaluation. I just don't pay any attention to it. I acknowledge it. I do this habitually enough that sometimes people think I've agreed with them when I've only acknowledged them. They want me to agree with them so hard that about the only trouble I ever get into is they think I've agreed with them.

They say, "It'd be a marvelous thing if we took the roof and moved it down on the lake, and so forth." And I've acknowledged that I heard them talking. See? And I'll say unfortunately or something like that, "Good. Good." And they say, "Well, he said we could take the roof down."

Well, that's how hard – that's how hard a pc will work to get you to agree with them. You're not out of agreement with them. You're not in agreement with them. That isn't your role. Your role is the role of administering auditing and control, don't you see. That's the way it is.

Well, I've kept you terribly overdue.

Thank you very, very much.

Audience: Thank you.