AUDITING QUALITY

A lecture given on
30 August 1961

Thank you. Well, this is the what?

Audience: 30th.

Let's see if you're right – by George, you are. 30th of August, AD 11. The year of the Clears.

All right. There's probably a lot of questions you'd like to ask. The first question you should like to ask is whether or not if running an auditing session is so important, why, then that omits all of the rudiments, doesn't it? Well, I said yesterday, you see, that if – the – if you had to choose between the two, why, you'd run a session. And if the pc rudiments were very upsetting to the pc, and so forth, and he felt he was getting no place with rudiments, and so forth, of course you have a pc out of session, but I said there is an adjudicative thing here.

There is a point where you can have far too much rudiments, you get the idea, and far too little session. And there is also – and I said this yesterday and I want to point it up again – there's also a point where you can have far too little rudiments.

Now, if you expect 1A. . . I just got a subjective reality on this just a little while ago. If you expect 1A to handle all the present time problems and, therefore, not handle a present time problem which the pc has given you to be handled, every now and then you're going to make a terrible mistake. Every now and then you're going to make a terrible mistake, because you can put it down that a present present time problem – you know, short duration present time problem – is not necessarily handled at all by any process in 1A. You got that? You got that?

Here's an example. I just had this, matter of fact. Pc comes into session, gives the auditor a goal. He wants to get rid of a present time problem – and life and livingness – says, "Well, I'd like to get this particular person out of my hair," you got the idea? One, two. Rudiments are run, needle falls off the pin on a present time problem. Auditor goes ahead and runs 1A. Net result, no session. Why? Well, 1A is not addressed to the present time problem, so one doesn't feel that the auditor is participating at all in the auditing of the case.

The permissive wandering around looking at unknowns or present time problems or something of this sort – particularly a 1A version in which no problem is ever mentioned; you know, just "Look at unknowns, look at unknowns, look at unknowns" – and a pc could very

well go out of session, very thoroughly. You see, he's really got it bugged. He doesn't want anything to do with this present time problem, so actually he's sitting there in a state of no-confront. You got the idea? So, of course, you run a permissive process, he will not then confront the present time problem even though he wants to get away from it. you see, he just bounces off the problem, and he's running a – you're running a case who has a present time problem in wild restimulation. Got the idea? But of course, the reason he's got a present time problem is he doesn't want to confront some part of it.

So, naturally, you're permitting the pc, then, to do a non-confront on the present time problem even while you think you are busy running a process which handles all problems, so we won't bother it. you see, the very problem that he *will not* have anything to do with is a present time problem which he told you he wanted to get rid of and that you found in the rudiments.

Therefore, 1A does not scoop up a present time problem. You got it? Present time problem of a short duration, something like this, or actually a present time problem of long duration has a great deal of no-confront mixed up in it. And you got this tremendous quantities of no-confront. All right, you run a permissive process on that exact subject, the auditor is then not controlling the pc. And the only thing that comes through to the pc is that the session is not controlled.

You see how that would be? Quite interesting. Quite interesting. But, all of these things are subject to judgment. The safe way to play any auditing session, of course, is to have all your rudiments in, to get all of your rudiments in.

Now, I didn't say that you couldn't run a *1A-type* process immediately against that exact present time problem. But the auditor is in there making the pc confront it, see. So that isn't then 1A. You're using a 1A-type process to handle a present time problem with a pc, which is what fell on the meter, and, of course, the pc'll be getting someplace if you did this.

Well now, a pc never feels he's wasting his time if the auditor is fulfilling one of his goals. It's when the present time problem, the handling of it, is absolutely no goal to the pc, and the pc sits down and hopes to God he doesn't have a present time problem. He isn't really aware of having one, but he hopes to God he won't have one. He wants to get on with his Prehav run on the goals terminal and get the show on the road, and all of a sudden the auditor looks up and he's got that moving-needle-look in his eye. And the pc says, with faint heart and despair creeping over him, "Oh, no, there isn't a present time problem here?"

And the auditor says, "Oh," he says brightly, "yes, there is."

Well, the pc says, "Well I don't know what it could be."

And the auditor says, "Well, let's see what it is."

Now, the only thing that'd get you over that barrier is smart auditing. Pc says – he knows dimly they're going to repossess his car tomorrow or something of the sort and he doesn't want to think about it.

Well, I'll clue you: If you pass that up or if you pass up any falling rudiment, or any reacting rudiment, you've just set yourself up for no session. That's why there's judgment involved in this thing. It's one of these horrible facts of life. Every once in a while, why, Mama will get daughter and take her down, and sit down in the kitchen, pour her a cup of coffee and let her in about men. The horrible facts of life, you see. Or tell her about Father.

And this is – this is an analogous sort of thing, you know. "Yes, Gwendolyn, you were actually born in a cabbage patch. You weren't born, really, at all. You were found there." And it's just one of the brutal things you have to face about auditing, is that as you come down the line you've got rudiments to cover. If your rudiments are out, assessment cannot occur, and also you're going to set up problems and trouble in the auditing session. Pc has a present time problem. Present time problem isn't handled, the immediate next result is an ARC break. I mean it goes one, two. ARC breaks always stem from a present time problem. The present time problem, however, should not be looked at by the auditor as always exterior to the auditing session.

If you preconceive what a present time problem should be, well, that's just an ought-to-be that you're running on the pc, don't you see. What is a present time problem?

I remember in one ACC I startled all of the students by finding that 50 percent of the class had present time problems known as an auditing session. It was the auditing session which was the present time problem to the pc, but nobody had ever inquired about an auditing session. I think it was the 18th. Nobody had ever inquired about an auditing session.

"Do you have a present time problem?"

"Well, yes, and yes, and so...." and they didn't know, and the auditor would guess at this and that, and the pc didn't know and the pc would be saying, "Oh, my God, don't tell me we really have to run a present time problem here. I want to get on with this Help on the Rock," and so on, and this was the way it was going, you see. But factually, the session itself had some present time problem factors in it and none of the auditors ever sorted these things out.

I looked over a few shoulders and realized that what was going on here is, the idea of asking for present time problem sometimes restimulated a present time problem which was dormant up to the point it was asked for. And that can happen too, you know. The pc's sitting there, he's minding his own business, he's being a pc, everything is going along just dandy, and splendiferously, and he hasn't got a care in the world. And all he wants is an auditing session, and then the auditor says these fatal words, "Do you have a present time problem?"

And the pc says, "Let's see, now. Oh God, yes, yeah, oh-oh, yeah."

But he – would it – he'd tell you at the same time, "I wouldn't have unless you'd have asked me." you see, present time problem wasn't worrying him, and he sort of postulates it into view as a present time problem. You get the idea? Actually, he probably could have gone on to the end of the session and straight on out, and he never would have thought of the fact that he's supposed to take cake home to his mother-in-law, you know. It's always a present time problem to give something to your mother-in-law.

Well, I was very shocked one day. I was around and found out that this ancient joke about mother-in-laws wasn't necessarily true. I found a husband who was very enamored with his mother-in-law and hated his wife. He and his mother-in-law got along fine, you know? Used to go around to the dances and everything. Anyhow, wife was very disapproving of the whole thing.

Anyway, he's got to take cake home to his wife and he hadn't thought of it, and he probably wouldn't have thought of it, except it's labeled under the heading of "problem." "Do you have a problem?"

And he sort of thinks to himself, "Problem – that's something that you're supposed to do something about. Am I supposed to do something? Yes, I am supposed to do something, I was supposed to take cake home to my wife. Well, God, I'll have to sit here for the rest of the session and remember this now, because I'd comfortably forgotten it, of course, and never intended to take any cake home to my wife." you know, some kind of a weird, oddball combination goes through, and a present time problem charges into view that wouldn't have been into view. So the subject is – sorts out amongst the facts of life.

The rudiments are dangerous ground.

Saw a picture the other day of a Ford Interceptor motor-powered boat. All the advertisement was about a Ford Interceptor motor going up the Grand Canyon, going up the Colorado River at some fantastic rate of speed. And the ad was all about this motor, see. It's had me in total mystery ever since. You talk about a not-know! What the hell kind of a boat is this that can go at about thirty or forty miles an hour up against the Grand Canyon, banging its stern and so forth, and it's bows onto rocks at a high rate of speed, don't you see, and actually make it 365 miles upriver? And the other thing is, who the hell did that? You know? Had me in mystery ever since. I got a record up here that says the "Grand Canyon Suite," or something of the sort, and I sat there and during the whole time, you see, I couldn't hear the music at all. I was thinking about this Ford Interceptor going up the Grand Canyon. Stuck me in total mystery.

But if I'd never seen the advertisement, I wouldn't be worried about it, you got the idea? And I'd probably be able to enjoy the "Grand Canyon Suite," and life would be marvelous. When somebody shoves this advertisement under your nose, you know, and you're being audited, and – so help me Pete, we never have realized before there was such an unknown, such a mess about it, and we postulate at that moment that it is a problem, and then

we go on and have to handle it as a problem, and this becomes very boring. And we find tremendous amounts of auditing are being consumed on present time problems. And this itself – now listen carefully – is the only present time problem: getting auditing

So it solves very nicely that the pc who is a – gets bugged every time you say to him, "Well, do you have a present time problem?" He says, "Oh, my God, oh yeah, oh yeah, I do. Hmm," and so forth. The only thing you're running into is scarcity of auditing pc is afraid he isn't going to get audited. There's a tremendous scarcity of auditing. All right, that amounts to a present time problem, so you have a pc there trying to make two sessions out of every one session. And as a result you get very slow gain.

There are numerous games that men play. you go out here on the golf course, other places, and you'll find they're playing all sorts of games. The Scots invented this game because it only requires one ball. And you'll find these fellows out there, and they have such an anxiety to hit the ball right that they go into the woods, the trees, knock the caddie off on the 18th hole when they're playing hole number 7, you see. But they have this terrific anxiety. I've heard pro after pro say, "Relax! Now just relax and go through the motions."

Every once in a while the fellow wouldn't have anything on his mind, and he would accidentally step up to the ball and go through all the proper motions and there goes a 265-yard drive, you know, right down the middle of the fairway, you know, right on to the other green. One small putt and he's in. He's got an eagle, you know! Well, his anxiety now sets in. How did he do it? So he's got a new anxiety.

I suppose golf pros never, never, never would get rid of this anxiety problem because otherwise they'd never have any pupils, don't you see. Because this particular pressure – you know, "have got to do it," "have got to get it," "have to press, to press" – somehow or another is just too much, you see. And it gets everybody upset and then they have to have golf lessons, of course, to overcome this but, of course, the golf lesson doesn't ever overcome it. It's quite remarkable when you look at it. The anxiety to do right often winds up, you see, in a total fiasco. You're just so anxious to do right, you see, that you wind it up and it's just a total fiasco, you know. The ball is in the woods and the pc is flat on his back weeping silently to himself someplace, you know, and there's been no session, no golf game or anything. It's just anxiety.

Well, it's the postulate. The trick is, about golf – and you'll understand it about auditing – the trick is – is a very simple trick: The guy has already postulated he can't do it. He must have, if he feels nervous about it. He's postulated that he can't do it, you see. So this fellow has an idea that he can't have a session before he starts getting worried about trying to have a session. So it's – it's just a red flag that's hanging up there with storm warnings from the truck to the foot of the mast. It's very obvious if you'll take a look at it. Anybody who starts pressing on the rudiments has a present time problem called "How am I going to get audited?"

So don't – from here on just don't worry about that phenomenon. You go down the rudiments – I say, well, it's one of the facts of life that you have to face that you have to go down the rudiments. And you go down the rudiments – don't make a big deal out of it – but you get to the present time problem, the pc starts sighing and moaning, and so forth, and he didn't know he had one and now he's got one. Don't you see what he's doing? He's trying to have a session and of course, this triggers the fact that he can't have a session, so the best way not to have a session is to have a present time problem that is mixed up in the session, and "Oh, my God, I don't want a present time . . ." Well, what does all this add up to? Don't you see. It adds up explicitly, instantly to the fact that he has a scarcity of auditing. He's got such a scarcity that it's very, very valuable, therefore, it has to be done terribly, terribly right, do you see. And he's got to get the most session he can possibly get into that unit of time.

Well, he's pressing so hard as a pc that he will actually sit there and do additional commands and try to make a session out of it in some oddball way. And you the auditor often sit there watching a pc getting audited, not realizing that the pc cannot do the auditing command. But the pc is pressing so hard, trying to make a session out of it because of the scarcity of auditing, that he doesn't give any real evidence of not being able to do the auditing command. There's something wrong with the auditing command. There's something undoable about the session. And yet he's in there trying to make a session out of it.

Now, maybe you could do the process, but that is no criterion on whether or not the pc can do the process, don't you see. So he'll inevitably substitute a process in there that he can do in some fashion or another; he'll put additional auditing answers in there or commands in there or something of the sort, trying to make a session out of it. And all this comes under the heading of "trying to make a session out of it." And if you've got a pc around who is desperately trying to make a session out of it, you have a pc who has a present time problem called the scarcity of auditing.

Now, it's perfectly all right, right off your bat to call for that one. Only it sometimes may be phrased as a scarcity of treatment. You get one off the street – raw meat walks in off the street, and so forth and you say this person has never been audited before, how could he possibly have a scarcity of auditing? Well, of course, he's got the greatest scarcity of auditing there is: he's never had any; he's never even heard of it. But the point is, he does have a scarcity of treatment.

There is a terrible scarcity of effective treatment. As a matter of fact it has been zero on this planet as nearly as I can trace for about fifty thousand years. It's just been zero. There was always a repercussion on the treatment. You go into the Aesculapian temple and they slipped you the hellebore, and after you've had your fit and your dream and a few things like that, why, you were all cured. You didn't have paraclosis, or something, but you certainly did have – you went on having these fits. you get the idea, you know. And keep having these dreams and these fits, and that's worse than the paraclosis, you know, and all these things.

So you go to a medico, and the medico, he cuts out your zorch and there you are: you're zorchless. And you say, "Well, that was good. That was awful good to get rid of that zorch, the horrible things it was doing," and so forth. Only now you're operating without a zorch. And this'll catch up with you sooner or later because the body is designed to be run with a zorch.

Every once in a while the medico elects some part of the body as dispensable. And now it's tonsils, now it's appendix, now it's this, now it's that, now it's something else. one of these days they'll elect the head.

And the – the general situation as far as this is concerned, of course, is – is a consequence to treatment. So treatments which have consequence make, of course, effective treatment very scarce. Bad treatment makes effective treatment very scarce, naturally. The person is then frightened of having any treatment. He's frightened of having any treatment because he's had so much ineffective treatment. Got the idea? I mean that's – in other words, somebody has run a "can't-have" on him.

You know, the medico up here with the chromium plated, zitherproof operating theater, where only two colleges of surgeons and eight universities full of students are cheering in the amphitheaters as he delicately amputates a zorch. You know, nice, quiet, orderly operative procedures, you see. And everybody knocked out cold unable to perceive anything that's going on, you know. And it's a real ball, you know. And you wake up in the hospital room with no awareness of having gotten to the hospital room and you say what happened and you fumble around and, by God, you've got no zorch. You know, something of this sort.

And you lie there and you can hear the blood dripping on the floor; nurse comes around on her midnight rounds (she's been out having tea or something of the sort). You go up at this local abattoir, pardon me, hospital, and you find – you find accident cases and everything else just trundled into the front room, you know, and skipped. And hours and hours and hours will go by. Nobody ever comes near them. you think I'm kidding you but that's the way she rolls.

All right. Now, the more instances of that a person has committed, the more instances of that, you see, that they have received, why, the less treatment there is. Of course, because these things aren't treatment. So you can actually get somebody who gets terribly anxious for hospital treatment because he's never had any treatment in a hospital, you got the idea? He's kept going to hospitals but they never treated anything. And he just gets into a total anxiety, you know. He wants treatment, he can't have treatment, and – and there it goes. And he'll get into a terrific wingding. So it makes quite a problem. And it goes over into auditing. And auditing would almost inevitably have its roots in circa twentieth century maltreatment, instead of treatment, you see. Punishment instead of treatment.

They do some remarkable things of one kind or another. I myself have run into a few head-on. Had some sinusitis one time so they started pulling teeth, that was a great one. Had nothing to do with it, either. Became obvious even to the medicos a short time later, you know.

I was in a hospital one time and my stomach wall wouldn't heal. Been messed up. And so they kept feeding me custard. And after about the 465th custard, I just had some kind of an inkling – I was coming around a little bit. Actually, what was wrong with me was I was utterly exhausted. I'd just been in combat theater after combat theater, you see, with no rest, no nothing between. And it sort of came to me that this was not the sort of a diet that I myself would select of my own free choice.

So I used to slide out with a good-looking nurse, and – beg your pardon, she was a WAVE. And she knew where there was a wonderful Chinese noodle parlor. And so after I'd eat my custard, she would come in and we would go out the back gate and we'd go down and I'd have several egg foo yungs. And you know, soothing things like sweet and sour pork, you know, and so forth. I started to feel better, started to get back on my feet again. And it was those custards – I kept telling the doctors, you see – those custards were absolutely marvelous, particularly when served in Chinese restaurants under some other name. you weren't supposed to eat anything else, you see.

So then finally, finally, through the connivance of a couple of hospital corpsmen and several pals in the Marine, why, I got the wrong meal ticket issued to me, and there was a special diet table where they fed people nothing but steak! So I do know where all the steaks went that the civilians didn't get, because they were all served at that table. Huge piles of steaks would come in, you see, and I'd demolish four or five of these steaks and feel much better.

The medicos never found out about this. And I finally got restored to duty, "Certified for continental limits of the United States only. To stay where a proper diet and ration and adequate rest are assured." And of course, the next piece of paper back of that says, "Ordered to the Fifth Amphibious Force," you see.

And next hospital, just same sort of nonsense going on in all directions. I walked in the front door under protest and they said, "Go to bed."

And I said, "Why?" And I said, "I feel perfectly all right, and beside I have a date tonight in Monterey."

And they said, "Well, Monterey is much too far away, and you're going to bed." And the nurses around there – these girls got turned down for the women's teams on the Olympics, you know, they're really husky – and so I went to bed and, by damn, they put me there for two weeks. There was nothing wrong with me. I was just supposed to report to the hospital. Two weeks I spend in bed. Of course, you know me, I wasn't two weeks in bed, but that was what the orders said. Their windows open from the bottom and the top.

But after a while, you get – the dim notion starts to penetrate, you see, that there's no treatment available. You just get this dim notion. It somehow or other enters from – like a ray of light, through the upper windows of the cathedral. And it goes into your medulla oblongata and it goes *splank!* And you'd say, "There is no treatment being offered in any direction for anything What do you know!" So you start checking around and find out this is true. Of course, immediately it's a "can't-have" on treatment of various kinds whatsoever.

Sometimes quite the reverse has happened. Some kid's born in a family that they're all sold on the idea that if you bite rattlesnakes or, I don't know, something, you know – I'm indiscriminate as to races. If you just bite enough rattlesnakes, why, you develop strong teeth, or something like that. And this kid happens to have very soft teeth, and they need to be pulled every now and then and nobody ever pulls his teeth.

There are probably people in this room who had parents who had bugs on the subject of medical treatment. Either you had to go and get treated – particularly right in the middle of the basketball season or something of the sort – or you must never go and get treated, you see. Both of these two extremes result in, of course, no treatment. So it gets to be a problem. And it's carried over into auditing. Just the long and the short of the thing. It's carried over desperately into auditing.

Where you've had ineffective healing practices running on a planet for a while, nobody thinks anything can happen. So that's a terrific scarcity, don't look at it in any other way, you see. The – a "no treatment at all" could be a total scarcity, don't you see, but it still adds up to scarcity. And now we're back to *Scientology 8-8008,* scarcity and abundance in all things, and that applies to treatment, and that's the present time problem to the pc who's having trouble in an auditing session.

This pc will get up to this kind of a state where he'll demand auditing and won't have it when he gets it. All of that stems immediately and directly from the present time problem of the scarcity of treatment. How do you handle such a thing? Well, handle it in any present time problem process. It is a present time problem of long duration because, of course, it's this life-time. There's nothing to it, you just handle it. Just as you would any present time problem. Only you get it phrased – and the pc probably never thought of *this* as the present time problem back of all the present time problems he has every time you mention present time problem to him, see. He never thought of any part of this, so you've got to introduce some innuendo along about this point. It's not evaluation, it's innuendo.

And you innuendo him into the cognition that "My God, auditing is scarce!" Of course, you can run such a process as, "What auditing session have you been unable to confront?" or "When has there been no auditing?" I mean it can be this crude, don't you see. I mean you don't even have to be very adroit and you'll get him over it.

Now, you can use this pattern of process, the other day, that I gave you, which is: "What unknown in an auditing session would you want to escape from?" You can use any

process that has to do with present time problems and wind up at the other end with the pc with no more problem about having present time problems. That would be the way to cure this particular phenomenon and manifestation.

Also the pc who continuously has present time problems has obviously not told you anything about his present time problem. It goes back to this: Those things that are known are not aberrative. That's where it goes. That's a very blunt, blanket, wide, wild statement. Even though I, myself, and you customarily forget that particular facet of Scientology. That *is* a fact: That which is not known is the only aberrative factor.

Those factors which are known are not aberrative. The individual sits there and he says, "Oh, well," he says, "I know, I know what's wrong with me, it's my mother. And she used to just be cross with me day and night, and made me drink Horlicks. And I did nothing but drink Horlicks from the time I was one to the time I was twelve, and I know that's what's wrong with me." Well, you can just write it off, right that moment. You just write it off, just overtly. There is one track where we know nothing is wrong with the pc. Horlicks and Mama. You get the idea?

Of course, now after a while in auditing, you start revealing certain factors in the pc and your processes begin to reveal certain things to him. Those things which are half-known can still have the unknown portion of the half-known, you see, producing difficulty. You see? So the second the pc says, "I know all about it," does not necessarily mean that he has recovered from it if he found out about it in auditing. You see, it does not necessarily mean that that is now a known sphere just because he said so. Never believe a pc.

One of the things you should operate on. The pc says, "That's right," we better look. And that's operative in all fields except goals and terminals, oddly enough. The pc who has a goal is hell on wheels in the direction of this goal. His attention is – just gets totally wrapped up in this particular goal and his progress toward that goal, and so on. There is his attention, and that's why people clear on goals and terminals.

Well, you probably, customarily treat a goals question in the rudiments quite lightly. You probably don't think too much about it. you say, "What goals would you like to set for this session?" The fellow gives you four or five goals for the session. And you say, "Well, I'll pay no attention to those things." You say, "We'll just go on and I decided what I am going to run in this session, and we've got to flatten off so-and-so in this session, and such-and-such in this session."

Well, if the case isn't running right, you go back over your auditing reports. And auditing reports are quite valuable and every auditor ought to keep them meticulously. And actually an auditing report should be written at the time the auditing is given, and it should not be written from notes taken at the time the auditing is given. It ought to be the actual transcript.

Now, if you've got to have a copy of an auditing report, put a piece of carbon paper underneath the actual auditing report that you are writing. But don't turn in transcribed reports because you'll tell yourself lies and you will omit data. you see, because it's only notes which you are taking during the session, you therefore don't make a full report because you're going to transcribe it. But when you transcribe it, that data happens to be missing, don't you see. So it's only notes, and then it becomes only an auditing report, and these things are very valuable, particularly now in goals.

If we did not, for instance, have all of the goals lists of all of the auditors who attended the course in Washington, we'd almost have had it, you see. And they were going to type up – I just got a despatch today – they were going to type up the first couple of hundred goals of each one of these lists and send it to these students. And I said, "Oh, no you don't. Whistle them up and bring them in and find their assessment and get their goal," because it's, of course, in the first – really probably in the first few goals: the first 40, first 100, first 150 *for sure.* Now you're really reaching out. But by keeping those records, well, we know something about it.

Furthermore, if a clearing goes astray these days we can always put it right if the auditing reports of the pc are available to us. We know what processes and levels weren't flattened and where the case was so – got submerged. We know lots of things about the case then if we can go back.

If a case stalls it's a very, very good thing to go back over all of the auditing reports of the case. Now, one of the ways you go back over all of the auditing reports of the case is to find out if there has been a consistent statement of a goal in each and every session or every few sessions, see. It's a similar goal. It's the present time problem of long duration that you somehow or another have not recognized was there, do you see? And he actually may not have recognized that it was there, but he kept giving it as a goal.

The goals given in the rudiments are important. They are important for the location of present time problems of long duration, and they are also very important for locating present time problems of short duration. And the biggest boost they give you is solving the present time problem situation. That's what that goals question gives you. Because the person nearly always announces his present time problem of long duration in his goals lists. And it'll just be session after session. It'll make you weep sometimes. You look over an auditing report, whole sheaf of reports, and the person says, "I want to get over my zorch operation" you know. And you look at this, and it's just sheet after sheet after sheet, you know, report after report – goals of the session: get over his zorch operation. And you look in vain to find anything that's happening about the zorch operation. And you do worse than that, you look in vain to see much improvement of the case.

So that's an interesting way to go about tracing a case, is using those goals. You should pay some attention to those goals.

Of course, you're plowing madly ahead in the direction of clearing him and getting in auditing and so forth, but remember auditing is what the pc, to a marked degree, considers auditing. It is what the pc considers auditing to the degree that he will stay in-session. And you can do anything you want to do with the pc as long as the pc considers it's auditing. What does the pc consider auditing is? Auditing is the handling of his fixed attentions on the track. And that is what auditing is to a pc.

So you needn't ever quail at getting in a rudiment where the pc's attention is fixedly fixed because the pc will consider it auditing. And if you can't quite find out why the rudiment is out, and you insist on some half measure – you say, "Well, we'll just audit this, you know, because we can't – we're sure we must have found it." Ah, but did you? You see. The rudiment stays out, the pc isn't interested in running it, he's quite upset, and so forth. Well, we haven't got the rudiment. We haven't got the root of it. We're – we're not really running it. There's something wrong with our estimation of that rudiment.

Now, we may find the pc is ARC breaking, ARC breaking, ARC breaking along a certain particular line, and we enter into some line of inquiry about it after a while, and we should enter into a line of inquiries: Why is he ARC breaking with us? Might he not be ARC breaking with somebody else? It'll be a present time problem of some kind or another that's causing him to ARC break. And the present time problem will always be scarcity of auditing.

It's just as – actually as simple as that, but did somebody else make the auditing scarce before we came along? See. Has something else happened here? Is there something else? Now, maybe this pc was run consistently and continually – maybe they had three hundred hours of auditing and during that whole three hundred hours of auditing their dislocated zorch was occupying the totality of their attention and the auditor was running them on, consistently and continually, their wife. But their attention is not on their wife. The attention is on the zorch. You got the idea?

So auditing is what the pc considers frees up his attention. And when – when his pc is not being addressed where his attention is fixed, he doesn't consider it auditing. Also he doesn't get Clear.

I tell you every few lectures there's one thing you always do wrong, and you don't find out what the pc is doing. This is the oldest crime of the auditor. They never ask enough questions. They're always a little bit leery that the pc will ARC break or get upset, or have his attention dragged off in some fashion if they ask too many questions.

Well, of course, if they ask a bunch of irrelevant hogwash, the pc'll get upset. And the auditor gets educated into believing the pc gets upset by being asked questions by having asked pcs in his early career. This auditor has asked pcs a lot of hogwash that had nothing to do with it and, of course, the pc got upset. So they get the idea that if you ask the pc too many questions, why, the pc will get upset, and that therefore you should just sit there and run the session.

Well, the pc can become quite oblivious of you, he can become very upset with whether or not you're there. "Are you there? Do you know anything about what's going on?" And the big not-know of the session can become, very well, what the auditor is doing. The auditor know? No, the auditor doesn't know, so therefore the auditor has a not-know on the session. So if the auditor has a not-know on the session, the whole session becomes a not-know, you got the idea?

He gets the idea that he must be withholding something from the auditor because the auditor's never asked any questions concerning what was going on. Now, if you're going to ask questions, ask pertinent questions. But if you're asking pertinent questions, don't care how many you ask. Get very searching. I should give you more auditing demonstrations because I'll tell you I will just sit and ask a pc for minutes at a time, what he's doing, how he's doing it, what has been happening and if he's got any picture now and what he is looking at and if there's anything there that he hasn't noticed, and all kinds of things of this character, you know. And I'd ask him and ask him. Any pc I audit will always tell you that I'm very interested in the session, or I certainly am looking right down their throats. They get a sensation of presence, in other words. But, of course, these aren't just, thrown-away questions, they are very, very pertinent questions, always. Because I really do want to know.

I – I see a pc is going this way, I want to know what's this all about? I don't just say, "Well that's just boil-off," and skip it, you know. "What'd you run into?" you know.

"Oh, well, I just ran into the so on, so on and so on and so on."

Well, because you're asking him what he was doing, and not what's going on in the environment or what *you're* doing, of course, his attention is very thoroughly on his case. So, therefore he's in-session because you're keeping his attention on his case. By asking him about his case you keep his attention thoroughly on his case.

"What did you do with the last auditing command?"

"Well, I did so and so, and so and so, and so and so, and so and so with it."

And I say, "Well did you do anything else?"

"Oh, well, yes, I haven't found the auditing command was easy to answer so as a matter of fact right in the middle of the thing I always mock up a couple of matched terminals, you see, of the thing."

And I say, "Well, that's very interesting. And very, very interesting Have you gotten anything out of that?"

"Well, as a matter of fact I have."

"Well, now what part of the auditing command haven't you answered?"

"Well, so-and-so and so-and-so."

"Now, what was the first time you failed to answer that point?"

"Oh, well, it was way back at the beginning of the session."

"All right, now you just answer that one again, here's the auditing command."

You'd think under this much duress that the pc would be saying, "Oh, Christ," you know, "am I really being kicked around the track!"

Oh, no, he doesn't feel that at all. I ask him a couple times later, you know, "You still putting those matched terminals up there?" I don't tell him he mustn't. "You still putting those . . ."

"Oh, no, no, I . . . as a matter of fact I hadn't, uh, hadn't been doing it. Hadn't been doing it the last few commands."

"Well, all right, haven't been doing it?"

"Hm-hm."

"All right, that's good. Then the auditing command is all right, now?"

"Oh, yeah, there's nothing wrong with it. Let's get on with the session!" You know, that sort of thing.

"Well, that's right. That's what we're doing now," and give him the next auditing command, and so forth.

Where is that attention fixed? It is something on the order of examining small searchlights that are playing around in the dark. And you can actually find out where these searchlights are playing inside that pc's skull. All you got to do is ask. Find out what the hell is going on.

Now, you can always mark it down that a pc who goes anaten has had a drop of havingness. So, it must be his first and primary havingness, is the havingness of an auditor.

So if a pc ever goes anaten he's lost the auditor. I always just use that as a rule of thumb. Pc blinks out on me, I blink in. I don't ask him anything as crude as, or I never have but I might – I wouldn't put anything past me in an auditing session – but just say, (you know, it's an understood question whatever you ask), "When's the first time you lost the auditor?"

"Oh, well, oh, hell, that was a long time ago. Uh, yeah, five, six minutes ago."

"What happened?"

"Well, I just – I just – didn't – all of a sudden I felt very lonely standing out here on this plain."

"Oh, you're standing on a plain. I didn't hear about that. All right, what about this plain?"

"Well, I was standing there and I answered the auditing question and all of a sudden here I was standing on this plain, all by myself, and these cold winds are going by, and so forth, just like they are now as a matter of fact," you know.

And you say, "Well, how'd the auditing question apply, just right there?"

"Well, it applied s well, that's – that's gone! That's gone now."

And you say, "Well, how about these cold winds now; how did the auditing question apply about these cold winds? What did it have to do with being all alone there," and so forth?

"Well, oh, I see what you mean!"

"All right, what do I mean?"

"Well, here's the guy I was with, lying at my feet with a knife in his back, and you know I didn't notice that before? I didn't know that. I must have killed him! Let's see, there's nobody else here and I must have killed him. Could – it must have been me! Of course I wouldn't do a thing like that, you understand."

And we just got one Christ-awful overt off the thing. What did he do, you know. Well, he went into some kind of an avoidance mechanism of some kind or another and it compounded the felony, and he'll pick up some rationale that he's lost the auditor. And if you don't give him an auditor back along about that time he'll continue to go anaten.

I could grade your auditing – A, B. C, D, E, F. G – simply to the number of minutes of anaten experienced by your pc in a session. I could just rack it up and just keep count of it, you see, and grade your auditing. And then you'd find out that the pc – the auditor auditing the pc who had the greatest amount of anaten would have the least auditing presence. The first loss of the pc is always the auditor.

Now, the pc gets himself into situations and you think that maybe, mono-centrically, that it's just things that you do, you see, that cause him to lose the auditor. But no. I give you a synthetic case in point: the pc has answered the auditing question, finds himself on this lonely plain, bounces like mad, goes someplace else carrying this terrific feeling of loneliness with him of some kind, and of course he is now alone. The auditor hasn't done anything but give him an auditing command, but the pc feels alone. So, of course, he's lost the auditor. Because he's alone.

Now, a pc can get into that kind of a situation and go on auto so quick it'll make your head swim.

The number of minutes or hours of anaten of a pc in any given intention [intensive] are a direct indication of the presence of the auditor. And the solution to the problem is *find* out. Find out. Pc starts going anaten, the pc is alone, that's all. He's not with it. He's not with you, and something is wrong. He is doing a retreat, and it's more than a retreat from the bank.

There's inevitably a certain amount of anaten, but it ought to get as-ised rather rapidly with the processes you're running now. And it ought to get as-ised without a fog-out in present time.

Anaten and boil-off on the part of the pc – I don't want to put ideas in your heads as pc, but I have to tell you the facts of life – over this cup of tea in the kitchen – and the facts of life are that auditors who are out of session, from the estimation of the pc, have pcs who go anaten, and that's about all there is to it.

And the way you get over that barrier is simply just get snoopy. And of course, if you're finding out *where* the pc's attention is, you naturally will free up a lot of the pc's attention, which after all is the purpose of auditing.

So you can do any God's quantity of nagging on the subject, you can become the damnedest bore. The direction to err, however, is the direction of too much. Never too little. Get awful yappy and questioning in the midst of a repetitive command process, see.

Give him the auditing command, "How many needles can sit on the head of an angel?" you know, whatever it is.

And he says, "Well, eighty-two."

And you say, "All right. Have you got a picture there?"

"Oh, yes, as a matter of fact got a picture."

"Well, what is it of? Is it black and white? Is it 3-D? Oh, 'tisn't. All right, all right. Now, what – have you had any other pictures just before that?"

"Yes, I did. I had a couple. As a matter of fact I still got it," see, "still got one of those, one of those. It's stacked up alongside of this picture."

"Oh. Well, is there any part of the auditing command you didn't answer that other time?"

"Well, as a matter of fact I was too busy to answer the auditing command the other time."

"Well, just you answer the auditing command, now, for the other time." "All right? Yeah, all right."

"The auditing command was so-and-so, and so-and-so. All right. Okay. Now, did you answer that one for the other time?"

"Yeah."

"All right, you answered the other one for the other time? All right. Now, answer it for now. And the auditing command is so-and-so, and so-and-so. Okay. Now, how are these pictures stacked up?"

"Well, they've changed."

"Good, all right. Now, what's your attention on now? All right, attention is on this picture. All right, here's the next auditing command."

You get this kind of a yip-yap. Sounds awful yappy, doesn't it? Doesn't sound like the auditing sessions you've been giving lately, either, does it?

You can conceive the pc's attention as a small searchlight of which you are handling the handle. And you can just take the searchlight around in his skull and you can turn it on anything and up and down, illuminate the pictures, and so forth. After a while you can get pretty good at it. you yourself, of course, are looking at something which up to the moment you ask is an unknown. How come you can tolerate this much unknownness? I can't. When I go to a motion picture show, I don't like to sit facing the back. Almost never do. Almost never take cotton for my ears either. I like to see the movie. I get very interested in this movie.

Now, this is what's going on. You're – you're looking at the blood, sweat and tears of the Churchills of yesterday. You're looking at the come-to-realizes. You got come-to-realizes in this pc that would make Bernard MacFadden a deep viridian with envy. *True Confession* special. "There I was, a poor little innocent girl, sitting on my – the doorstep of my Astarte's Temple. Sweet, innocent, no overts of any kind. And these goddamn soldiers came up and here they are burning the temple down. And I didn't do a thing we were kind of strangers in the land, you see, and I had nothing to do with this."

And "What are you looking at?" you know.

"Well, I'm just looking at these soldiers."

"Well what are these soldiers doing?"

"Well, they're pulling down the altar."

"Good. What else are they doing? What else is there?"

"Well, there's nothing else there."

"What else is there?"

"Nothing. There's nothing in the place."

"What else is in the picture?"

"The dead body of their captain we stabbed – I stabbed."

You say, "All right, and when did this stabbing occur? First time I've heard of this stabbing, you know. When did this occur?"

"Well, in the first reel, of course. It was after this night of orgy."

"Well, what about this night of orgy?"

"Well, it's like this. The local governor paid us to put on a hell of an orgy so the invading troops would get so loused up they wouldn't be able to fight the battle tomorrow and that's the only overt I had – except of course killing the general."

"Oh, it was a general."

"Yes, it's a general. Didn't I say?"

"All right, good. Well, who won the battle?"

"Oh, well, hell, I never stayed around to fill that out. They killed me."

"Oh? All right. Here's the next auditing command" and so forth, so forth, so on. "What's happening now?"

"Oh, nothing much. I'm up here about fifteen thousand feet above this temple. It's a little tiny block."

And I say, "Fine. All right, come on. Here's the next auditing command . . . What's happening now?"

"Nothing."

"Did you answer the auditing command?"

"No."

"All right. Here's the auditing command, I'll repeat it . . . All right. *Now* what's happening?"

"Oh, well. you shouldn't ask."

"Well, why shouldn't I ask?"

"Well, it's messy."

"What's messy?" and so forth.

"Well, am I ever going to get out of this temple? I was fifteen thousand feet up, and everything was all right, and I'm right back in the middle of the temple again!"

"All right, what's going on?"

"Well, it's something I forgot to mention before. We'd poisoned all their wives."

"All right, good. Got a picture there?"

"Yeah. Oh, yeah, yeah."

"All right, here's the next auditing command."

Got the idea? This is a conducted Cook's tour of the bank and you can get away with an awful lot of auditing just sitting back and repeating the auditing command and never finding out what the pc's doing. Scientology is at a level today where this actually works,

which is rather fantastic. But there are ways, man, of speeding that up, that make that kind of auditing look something like a rickety one-horse shay, compared to, of course, a jet airliner. And it's big comparisons.

And believe me, when some pc has been audited like that he knows he's been audited. He knows it. He'll tell you, too. "Well, we got out of that! *Whoohoo!" You* see, "we" got out of that. I've even, way back when, in running engrams, and so forth, used the word "we," consistently and continually. "Well, where are we now?" Pc probably winds up with a bank where Ron is . . . But you got to find out what's going on.

If you don't find out what's going on, the pc's attention does this: It hits and bounces. Now, this escape mechanism I was talking to you about is always present to some slight degree. And he'll leave a stuck and he'll leave a stuck and he'll leave a stuck and he'll leave a stuck, and these stucks finally all compound to a kind of a dizziness, and where is he at? Well, it'll come out free in the end. It'll come out, one way or the other, just on repetitive auditing, rather permissive auditing. It'll go on. And it only adds five times the number of hours necessary to get the same result, that's all. That's why I've never been down with a crusher on this stuff, you see. I mean, that's why I never really raised hell about it one way or the other. Because there's no point if you're going to get there anyway rather smoothly.

The only thing that restrains me from forcing this type of auditing on auditors – I mean just forcing it on them and saying this *is* the way to do it and you better not do it any other way – is the fact they can be so damn knuckleheaded occasionally.

This guy runs into the temple, see, and he's just now looking with horror as they pull the altar down and find the dead general back of it, don't you see. And at that moment the auditor has this horrible feeling – you know, got an engram just like it; maybe he was the general – and will pull a stupid one along about that time, you know, get stupid about it.

But the reason I'm mentioning this to you now so bluntly is because you've got the mechanism for that. If you aren't doing an escape mechanism of pulling the pc's attention out of the bank, pulling the pc's attention out of the bank, pulling the pc's attention out of the bank, you actually yourself will never ask a stupid question in trying to find out what the pc's doing. Because your question never has the hidden fact from you that you're trying to get the pc to escape. Of course, it's damn dangerous to be in a temple which is falling down and where one has committed a murder with fifteen dozen soldiers around brandishing copper swords. Very dangerous to be in such a locale.

Well, the "kind" auditor says, "Come outside! Oh, you're fifteen thousand feet up above the temple. Whew! Boy! Is there any other zone of life later than that where things were calm?" You get the idea?

As long as an auditor experiences impulses, no matter how obscure, to rescue the pc from danger at every side, and pull the pc off the bank, of course, it isn't safe to have an

auditor asking very many questions, don't you see? Well, that's the whole bug back of this. So that's why I today tell you about this other.

I've told you about the other from time to time. Well, I'm saying you better do it. you better do it. Pc says, "Well, here I am, ten thousand feet above this temple and everything is fine now, and good we can go on with the session."

"All right, is there anything you skipped there, just before you went up?"

"No, no, nothing, nothing."

"All right, and I'll ask another auditing command."

You've inferred that he go back and take a look, you see. And you ask him the next auditing command, "What is the most unknown thing you can think of about Astarte?" or something.

And the pc says, "You did it to me. Here I am right back in this temple. I've been trying to get out of this temple for fifty thousand years, and you – you're trying to get me right back in this temple again, and here I am."

You know, it's a little – little accusative feeling. Well, you, if feeling defensive and not knowing whether you're right or wrong, are liable to take this slight accusative thing as making you actually think you *have* done something wrong. Well, I'll tell you what's wrong is: Let him out of the temple and let him stick in an exteriorized bounce. And then run for the next fifteen sessions ten thousand feet in the air, not confronting anything. "Yes, I'm running the auditing command. Everything is fine. There's nothing but peace."

Well, the clue is that the bank is as it is because it has so much action and randomity in it. And if you can't keep the pc in areas of randomity, the pc won't clear up, that's all. And that's your five-to-one auditing factor which Julia here who's been talking about for years. That's the bulk of that auditing factor.

I – I was never very allergic to action. I haven't got to have action. I used to drive somebody I knew very well completely stark staring mad because I used to go up and . . . They say, "What are you going to *do?" you* know. Their whole idea of life you see was to be *doing, you* know, be busy, be working or something, you know.

And I'd say, "Well, I'm going up and sit down for a while."

"What are you going to do?"

"I'm going to sit down for a while."

"Yeah, well, what are you going to read?"

"Nothing. I don't happen to have a book right now I'm interested in."

"What are you going to do?"

"I'm going to sit down for a while."

"Well, what are you going to think about?"

"Nothing."

And the person would go absolutely, *"Woogo!* God, I could never do that. I just think of that. Awful, you know, terrible!"

And it's unthinkable, you know, just to do nothing. But at the same time it's also unthinkable in auditing if you don't get the pc to confront the action which has got him stuck, stuck, stuck. You do not audit the quiet points of the track. Just skip them! Although a scarcity of action is what is wrong with a pc, we have to ask how did this scarcity of action *occur?* Scarcity of action occurred because of the unpalatability of action.

Ask this horrible question: "Why is this pc sitting there on the plain, farming?" He goes out and he plants these beets, see. And then they come up very quietly, because it's a very nice climate. And the beets come up, and then he has the beets thrown into a wagon and they are dragged off to the beet store, see. And next season he plants the beets, and every Sunday he goes to the same church, and he hears the same sermon, and he listens to the same confounded hymns. And he goes back and forth, and he walks on the same paths. And if you talk to him very – very much you would find out that it was dangerous to do anything else. That's the keynote. The great payoff of being quiet. Of being still. Of never being in motion. The enormous bonus this pays is always: "You won't get hurt."

That's the superbooster of conservatism and such things, you know. "We won't go into any motion because if we do, we'll get hurt." What taught him this? So you find this pc sitting there, complaining about the fact that there is no action. There is, "nothing happens in life." He is bored. He is bored in life. Nothing is ever happening.

And you say, "Well, all right. Let's go join the Marines."

"Eh, well, no."

"Well, what are you going to do?"

"Well, next Sunday I'm going to go to church."

"What are you going to do Monday?"

"Well, I'm going to go out and hoe the beets."

"What are you going to do Tuesday?"

"Oh, Tuesday. That's my day to clean up the smokehouse."

And you say, "Well," you say, "life's pretty boring, huh?"

"Oh, yeah, life's awful boring. It just runs the same routes, the same routes, same routes."

"Well, fine, let's join the Air Force."

"Oh, well, no."

"Well, why not join the Air Force?"

"Well, you might get hurt," or "Things would run wrong," you know?

Action has been given a bad name. It's discreditable. Action is now discreditable. You'll find the whole literature of the society at this particular time is devoted to the discreditability of action. People go into action, they get in trouble. This is obvious. Read any novel if you don't believe this. Heroes no longer dash over the top and emerge unscathed with medals pinned to their bare skin. No, they're sort of sick in the trench, you see, and they crawl over the top because they're so tired, you know. And just the moment they stand up they are severely wounded, you see. And then they're carted off to a very brutal hospital, you see, where it's all pain and then they get a letter that Emily has left them. She's run off with the iceman.

Now, action has been given a bad name. Why? Why? If the pc is so starved for action, if he's so bored with the do-lessness, you would think offhand then, that there was just a scarcity of action – you see, you might think it worked out this way: that there was a scarcity of action because he wasn't in action. You know, there's a scarcity of action, because he's in a situation in life where he can't have any action. This is quite obvious, isn't it? I mean that's the first thing that you might adjudicate on the subject.

Of course, he has a scarcity of action because he's a clerk. And he sits in this office all day long, you see, and he doesn't even have any excitement on the lines. He doesn't have anything to judge or say or do or anything else. There's nothing really going on. He has figures he knows nothing about which he enters in a ledger that he knows nothing about which goes to a destination he knows nothing about. And you say well that man is suffering from a scarcity of action because he's not in action.

Now, what is he *doing,* doing that? That is the proper question to ask. Action must have gotten a bad name. How did action get a bad name? Well, he'd been working at it for a couple of hundred thousand years; therefore, it must be pretty desirable if it has that much of a bad name. And it is very desirable.

So, the faster you get a pc over the idea of the discreditable nature of action, the more the pc is going to move out of those quiet areas on the track, too. Because he's keeping those to make sure that he doesn't go into action. He'll keep those very closely. He'll have this whole long life, you see, as a beet farmer. He's got this beautiful life as a beet farmer and you ask him, "Well now, how many angels can stand on the head of a pin?" and you think you're getting someplace, you know. you just think you're just roaring around like mad because you're getting a little tone arm motion and everything's going along all right.

And you, however, along about this time should be asking, "What sort of a picture does he have? Where is he? What is he doing? What is he doing there?"

Well, he hasn't noticed what he's doing either. But he's asked – answered the question, "Well, eighteen."

"What sort of picture do you have there with that?"

"Well, I got a picture of this old country church, and the organ is playing rather badly and out of tune," and so on.

And you say "All right, how many angels can stand on the head of a pin?"

And he says, "Well, seventeen."

And you say, "What kind of a picture you got there?"

"Well, I've got this long country lane, and the quiet, white clouds drifting by."

Well, if you kept check on it, you'd find out he'd had these things for the last eight sessions. And he's going to have them for the next eighteen sessions. Why not? He's running all the safe spots on the track, of course.

You say, "Well, what does this picture look like?"

"Well, this picture looks like it's just a – just a picture."

"Well, how big is this picture?"

"Well, this picture is about uh – oh, it's about two feet by two feet."

"Well, does the picture have breadth in any way?"

"No, no, it's just, small little picture."

"Well, does it have any dimension?"

"No, it doesn't have any dimension."

"Well, is that the size your pictures always are?"

"Oh, yes, yes."

"Well, what color is it?"

"Well, there's no color in it."

"Is there any picture above or below it?"

Haaaarup! Blow the whole thing, huh?

Liable to have very quietly kept all of these very quiet lives there, and they're actually running through blood and guts, man, the whole way. Only he doesn't put any attention on those at all. If you start asking him to look around he'll find out some things. He'll find out how pictures ought to look.

You'd be amazed what the ideas people have as to what their pictures should look like. Though it's not up to you to correct them. But it's sure up to you to find out. You'd just be *fascinated* what some people think a picture is.

Had a pc had a cognition the other day just on this basis: "I always thought every picture I had should be 3-D in all directions, 360 degrees. And therefore, I didn't think I had any pictures because my pictures weren't like that. If I were looking at a book it was just a picture of a book." Well, what else was their attention on? How could they have anything but a picture of a book if all they were looking at was a book? What did they think? They had some kind of a machine that did a 360 degree CinemaScope that somehow or another put it in? No, they – they of course, they've got the pictures they got. They have the pictures of what they saw. Naturally. And only the pictures of what they saw. But they have some weird ideas about pictures, believe me. And every one of those weird ideas about pictures is backed up with the discreditability of action.

I'll give you a little sequence that you might be interested in on that basis. I think I've mentioned this to you before, but it's rather startling. It took me by storm. All right.

Auditing question.

Cognition: "The Greeks had books, printed books."

"How did the Greeks print the printed books?"

"Well, they printed the printed books this way," and so forth.

Auditing question.

"Well, what do you know, the Egyptians printed books too."

"All right, how'd they print books?"

"Well, so-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so."

And the auditing question, and so forth. And the auditing question, the auditing question.

"What kind of a picture have you got there?"

"Well, I've got a picture – it's a picture, it's . . ."

Auditing question.

"What picture you got there?"

"Same picture."

Well, auditing question.

"What picture you got there?"

"Same picture."

"Has anything changed in that picture?"

"No, not for the last five, six auditing questions."

All right, what's the exact mechanic present here? *Books. Is* there anything more quiet than books? You're going down the middle of a roaring action chain, man. Except, of course, you're going down it on the basis of the stable datum. The quietude. The quietness is a core in the middle of some hurricane. You're going down books; where's the hurricane?

And this interesting idea was injected into the session, "Why don't you look on the other side of the picture?" And at that moment *Boom!* What was on the other side of the picture? Some of the goddamnedest fights that anybody ever saw. But it was an awfully quiet picture about Egyptian books. You get the idea?

Well now, a pc will just stay there on that nice quiet chain, bouncing from one quiet Sunday to the next quiet Sunday, bouncing from "Old Hundred" straight into "Lead Kindly Light," until you tell him to look. And how do you tell him to look? By asking him what the hell is going on. Auditing question. "What's going on?" Auditing question. Auditing question. Auditing question. "What's going on now?" Auditing question. Auditing question. "You got a picture? All right, what is it of? All right, what's going on?" Auditing question. Auditing question. Auditing question. "Got a picture? Got a picture now? Has it changed any? What – what's it look like now? What's happened here?" See?

"Well, there's some more of these books."

"Oh, I see."

"There's this stack of books now."

Yeah, auditing question. Auditing question. "What's going on now?"

"Well, there's this small number of books. They're pretty books, you know, they're awfully pretty books."

Now, the danger point is asking the pc a question he can't answer, such as, "What are the books about?" He doesn't know it, you know. It's just books, see. Asking him for particularity that he wouldn't possibly have the answer to is the kind of question that will get you into trouble if any question of this character would get you into trouble. But even a question of that character gets you into less trouble than a total neglect of the whole situation. So you could very easily say, "All right, is there anything else around there?"

"No, just books."

"Well, where are all these books?"

"Well, they're just here in this bookstore."

"Okay." Auditing question. Auditing question. "What kind of picture now?"

"Oh, just this bookstore. I'm very grateful to you. you know, I hadn't realized it was a bookstore. It's very beautiful books. They're all down the shelves and everything."

Auditing question. Auditing question. "What you got a picture of now?"

"Oh, just this bookstore."

"What's outside the bookstore?" *Boom!* He ran a bookstore on the Alaskan frontier. Three killed every morning before breakfast on the front steps. Got the idea?

You can do a certain amount of direction of the pc's attention by asking him questions. And as long as these questions do not yank their attention off the subject on which it is operating, he will get into no trouble whatsoever. As long as you don't say "Oh, look at something else. I'm tired of you looking at books." Or as long as you don't say some other auditing command; change the process.

And he says "Why?"

"Well, you aren't getting along well enough, you see, with that particular process, and – ."

This is all invalidative of what the pc's doing. But just finding out what he is doing and what he is looking at, and ask him to look around a little bit more – this type of interrogation and questioning and so forth – can become more illuminative than anything you ever saw. And then, on top of it, any time you see a violent escape of some kind or another, scent that he must have escaped from discreditable action of some kind or another. And ask him if there was ever – did he tell you everything there was to know in that sequence which he just left?

"Is there anything that you left unknown about that sequence?" you know. "Is there anything in there that you didn't quite look over?"

"Well, I'm safely out of that now, and I don't think we need to talk about that anymore because – . we got out of that all right."

And you say "Good, what did you get out of, exactly?"

"Well, there you've done it, you see. I mean, here I am right back in here, I've been trying for eighteen thousand years to get out of this temple and here you've got me back in this temple again."

"Well, what's going on in there, anyway?"

"Oh, this is where we tortured the victims."

"What victims?"

"Oh, these victims."

"Who tortured them?"

"Those high priests. I didn't have anything to do with it, you know. What am I doing with all these gowns on, you know? Yeah! Well, there's something I – I just realized: I – I was the high priest. Oh well, yes, yeah. I – I see what you mean. Yeah, this isn't so good here, is it?" and so forth.

"All right, I'll give you the next auditing question."

Of course it's the auditing question that got him into this mess. And it's the pc that's jumping out of a mess. And it's the auditor that gets him to apply the auditing question to the mess, you see, but he does it rather delicately. By just asking him: "What's going on? What are you looking at? What does it consist of? Is there anything else? Is there something you haven't mentioned?"

"In that sequence about the fur trade industry, now, that we just – you don't seem to be in now, is that gone?"

"Oh, yes. Oh, that's gone."

"Well, just a moment ago you had pictures of all these canoes. What you got a picture of now?"

"Sky. Got a picture of the sky."

"What sky is it?"

"Oh, it's the beautiful sky of Normandy. I don't have any more to do with this . . . this fur trade industry, you see. I – I'm out of that, you see, I'm all out of that. All out of the fur trade industry."

Now, the wrong question, and the question the auditor would ask who thought it would be a good thing to get the pc out of all that dangerous area, would be, "Well, what does the Normandy sky look like?" You say, "Well, what happened to those canoes?" You know, aside from the fact that you are interested and you're curious, they – there were these eighteen canoes going down the river, one after the other, and they were all full of painted savages. And that was the last you ever heard of it. Well, I don't let people run continued stories on me. I'm not expecting him to run into these canoes somewhere up the track in another fifty-seven hours of auditing I want to know about those canoes *now.*

"What happened to them? The last auditing command I gave you had canoes. Now you don't have canoes. What is this all about?"

"Well, I was an Indian. Hey, what do you know! I was in the canoes! Oh, this was just before they went over the rapids! Ha-ha! Yes!" *Glug.*

And you say, "All right."

Next auditing question. Next auditing question.

"Yeah, we went over the rapids, and that was it, and we're all drowned, and now I'm back here in this beautiful Normandy sky."

And you say "All right, good enough, good enough. All right. Now, how many – how many people – did you see anybody else in the water there, in the rapids at all?"

"Uh, no no, no, no, no, no no."

Next auditing question.

"Well, as a matter of fact there were about twenty!"

And you say, "Well, that's good, that's good, that's fine." Next auditing question, next auditing question, next auditing question, that's fine. "Now, what've you got a picture of?"

"Well, this beautiful Normandy sky."

And you say, "That's good. Now, what happened to the canoes? Did they just drift away after they went over the . . . oh . . ." Auditing question, auditing question.

"Oh, God almighty!"

"What's the matter now?"

"Ugluh-ug-lu-gluh! I got terrible somatics in my throat."

"Well, what's the matter? What's happening? What's happening?"

"Well, after we got all dumped in the water, the fur trappers on the shore started firing volleys into us. Oh! Oh! Yeah, and they killed everybody. You see, this was a big lose for me. I was a big chief, you see. I had been over in England, and I picked up one of these Indians so I decided to . . . I – I that's right. That's the way that went. Yeah, that's right, and then all of a sudden the English attacked me and that was, so on. And I was Indian, that's right. And – yeah, here's the picture! Here's the picture you've been looking for."

You know, and all of a sudden the whole sequence – the unknowns vanish out of the thing, and the thing is all clear, and he can look at it and not look at it and he skips it and so forth, and he's not running away from it anymore. Do you follow that?

But it's very adroit auditing that does that. Because you can be totally knuckleheaded and ask all the wrong questions, but it is better to ask some questions than none at all. The way to err is being too yappy. And the way to make mistakes is never to say anything. Because the pc will just bounce, bounce, bounce, bounce, bounce, bounce, bounce, bounce, never confront. And it's just like the present time problem I started in to tell you about at the beginning of the lecture. And that present time problem is simply there, and the pc knows he's got it. But 1A won't let him run it. So in that particular case you *overtly* direct the pc's attention, you see, with the auditing command. You say, "What is unknown about that problem about teacups?" He's worried about his teacups, you see, and you run that flat. He's interested the whole way. He knows he's getting auditing.

Well, now, if you keep directing his attention back into where his attention is really fixed and those points from which he's trying to escape, boy, does he know he's getting auditing. See, by definition, he knows he's getting auditing to the degree that his attention is being directed where it is already stuck. His attention is already stuck there, even though he's escaped out of there. So he knows he's getting auditing if his attention is freed from the spot and not permitted to escape from the spot. you see? And by asking no questions at all, your pc has no illusion of being audited at all, and wouldn't even really believe that a session is in progress.

So how do you get a person in-session? Well, you direct their attention, find out where their attention is, so forth. And they know they're getting audited. You find out where their attention is stuck – you *guess* where the attention is stuck. Put it back there. You say it must be still stuck there. You don't get Normandy skies – you don't get Normandy skies in the middle of a rapids in the North American wilderness full of savages. The Normandy skies are awfully quiet so the guy must have moved into a stable datum and must have escaped from action. Now, what on Earth was the action? And of course you yourself are interested. And if you yourself really want to know what the action is, you will find out. And of course that is what his attention is stuck on. And the pc winds up with action not being discreditable. He takes care of all this. Up to this time, he's got it all justified. Your pc is normally leading a quiet life and he is walking to church every Sunday and he is listening to "Lead Kindly Light" and the highest randomity that he runs into carefully is that some Sundays they play "Old Hundred."

You find that sort of a sequence – here in present time he's leading that kind of a life – you have to suspect at once that action has become discreditable and that he can't have it, and that he's very carefully not having any action. Well, of course, the healing from that, of course, makes you direct his attention over *into* the zones of action and the zones of action then – becoming inspected, he becomes more familiar with it, he recognizes that he could have action. That action isn't quite that bad. He becomes more familiar with it and there he is.

Okay?

It's very simple. All you have to do is do it. Okay?

Thank you.