

# MODEL SESSION, PART II

A lecture given on  
1 March 1962

Thank you.

Okay. And this is still the 1st of March, second lecture, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, on the subject of Model Session, AD 12.

I was talking to you about Havingness. And the uses of Havingness are intelligent uses, and that's why it belongs where it belongs in the Model Session. And Havingness is the easiest to run and the easiest to audit of any process. So, therefore, it belongs right there. So if your pc is out of session, you can start immediately into Havingness and get them into session.

But if your pc is not in-session, you mustn't depend on the remaining rudiments to do a thing for you. If by this time you have not managed to get your pc into session, you've practically had it.

In the first place, you've got your first test, "Is it all right with you if I begin this session now?" A little two-way comm should have settled – "Well, at least let's begin the session, so that we'll just have this inside the session. Start of session" – that kind of a – of a response to a pc's recalcitrance.

You can go on down the line and get the pc to set goals. And by getting the pc to set goals, you should be able to get a pc into session. Just like that, with goals. Bang! You can't get the pc into session with goals, you've got Havingness and you should be able to get the pc into session with Havingness.

And if you can't get the pc into session with Havingness and so forth, the probabilities of your getting the pc into session with auditor section, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" are quite remote. Because that confronts directly the reason they won't go into session. And it's almost too steep an incline.

So if you depend on "auditor" to finally get the pc into session, you will occasionally lay a nice, great big ostrich egg. Do you see that? Although it apparently could be accepted by you as, "Well, then naturally, you'll go into session, you know? Well, well work this out. We'll knock out the ARC break." See?

If you haven't got it handled by that time, you're not going to get a chance to run anything that will knock out the ARC break because the pc will just claw at you.

Now, O/W has a terrible liability. O/W was the oldest and at one time looked upon as the best method of getting the pc into session. And it has a hell of a liability. It can miss a withhold and throw the pc *wildly* out of session. Do you see that?

Now, you want to know why the pc occasionally – you probably have all felt this: “I wish to God that I could handle an ARC break with the pc,” see? “If I could just handle an ARC break . . . “

Now, some – you've run into pcs that you possibly had difficulty handling the ARC break with. you understand? And that's because you depended on this section of the rudiments or the processes under it to put the pc into session. And that's almost a misuse of the rudiment.

The pc's got an ARC break, you don't use an ARC break process to throw him back in. See, don't use a process to throw a pc back in. Don't use an ARC break process to handle an ARC break if they're that incipient.

Your – there's a difference here – the pc won't be audited and the pc being made more auditable. You see, these two states of the pc. *Ah*, he's talking to you, but he really isn't paying much attention to you. Your command value's not great.

Well, if your command value is not great over the pc or there's a little thing went yickle-yackle, you know and the pc is still in-session but a little bit cooled off. They're just a little cool, you know and something or other on this and so forth. That's your ARC break. That's the old ARC break level auditor. That's the time you use that, see, anything you're auditing there.

You're improving, so that rudiment – the auditor, “Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?” is to improve the in-sessionness of the pc, not to create the in-sessionness of the pc if it's totally nonexistent.

Now, it's quite remarkable the liabilities of healing the ARC break, they are numerous. And if your pc wouldn't talk to you to tell you if it was all right to start the session and if your pc wouldn't set any goals for the session and you think to yourself, “Well, we'll catch this pc.” And the pc – you're not going to run any Havingness and you're going to catch all this under “auditor” – “Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?” You've already set up a hurdle that is almost unhurdable.

See, by that time, you should have handled the situation. How should you have handled it?

There are numerous ways of handling this situation. I've just been going over them and they all had to do with Havingness or a little bit earlier than that is setting some goals – getting the pc interested in getting someplace and so forth.

The ARC break, “Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?” is enough if the pc's in-sessioning is poor, you know. That's good enough if the pc isn't well in-session, and so forth, to put them better in-session, but not good enough to put them in-session. See, straight in-session. Requires a gradient, why? Because it is a process. And you have to have him in-session enough to run the process and if they're not in-session enough to run that process, oh, they'll point at the ceiling and they'll point at the floor. They won't point at you.

And if you've ever noticed, the last thing the pc is pointing at, if you're running Havingness to cure an ARC break, is the auditor. Have you ever noticed this?

*Audience: Yeah.*

Well, add that up. So don't use that type of a rudiment approach to heal an ARC break except *in extremis*. So let us say there's nothing else. Or if it's not very light at all – I mean it's not heavy enough not to – it's just a little bit, the pc's cooled off, they're kind of looking at you with a walleye. You could ask them, you'd say, “Well, do you have an ARC break?”

“No.” And so on.

“Well, what weren't you able to tell me?” Excellent question. “What didn't I do?”

But now remember, you're in a Prepcheck area. If you use that, you're in a Prepcheck area. So that is feasible only in using it with 3D Criss Cross or some type of process like that. Not in a Prepcheck session.

So that is why you find your first level of action in Prepchecking is with this as the Zero Question. This is always your Zero Question, no matter how many Zero A or Zero B or Zero C you add after it. That is always your Zero Question for Prepchecking. Because it's an open invitation to Prepcheck, “Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?” It's a beautiful Zero. That forms the body of the session. So it must assume to some degree that the pc is in-session if you're going to use that as a departure point.

Now, this'll improve your pc's in-sessioning. Improve it and improve it and improve it and improve it. And pretty soon, why, they don't have ARC breaks with you, if you handle this thing well.

But to use “auditor,” just to sit there and argue with the pc as to whether or not you should – you have to be somebody to audit them or something like this, you're not going to get anyplace. Not if the pc's got an ARC break. Don't you see that?

If the last thing the pc points at in, “Point out something” is the auditor, in healing an ARC break – so the last thing that you would run, if he had an ARC break, would be the auditor. Do you follow that? Hmm?

Now, you can carry that out to too great an extreme. Auditing, remember, is what you can get away with. I'm giving you just a basic, general rule. All right, pc has an ARC break.

The pc has a bit of an ARC break, still talking to you. Well, you can use the rudiments process to go along with that.

But, I don't think that process would ever heal an ARC break down to a point where the pc will not talk to you at all. you see how far south it goes? Not *very far*. And that is why you have had difficulties in handling ARC breaks. Okay?

Remember, confronting is a companion to havingness. You did something so the pc – or the pc thought you did something, so the pc is left without an auditor. Now, what are you going to do? You going to say to the pc, “Now, that you can't confront me, confront me.”

Is that what you're going to do? Because any process that you run that immediately addresses the auditor is also going to run that process. Do you follow that easily? So the only way I know of to get a pc in-session and hold it in-session easily if the pc is totally out of session – you know, just won't at all – consists of the upper parts of the rudiments. Never this one.

All right. How far out of session can a pc go and you can still handle “auditor” rudiment? Well, you can go this far out. The pc is saying, “Oh, you're the lousiest auditor in the world – I have never seen the like of you,” and so forth and, “My God, the number of mistakes which you make are absolutely colossal and catastrophic.”

He's still in-session. You miss that left and right, you see?

The person is – why is he cussing you? He's cussing you for only one reason and he *wants* auditing. All ARC breaks stem from no auditing. The only reason the pc ever has an ARC break. No auditing.

Let's take the ARC break of the fellow on the street. He must be in an awful ARC break if you say, “I'm interested in Scientology and Scientology makes you better. Wouldn't you like to know some more about it?”

And he says, “I never pay any attention to – what are you talking about – *grrrrr - grrrrrr - bowwww*. “

*What's that? That's an absence of auditing, isn't it? Scientology didn't exist early enough to put him in good shape, so that when you approach him with Scientology, he despises it. Perfect. No auditing. It's weird how fast you can put them in-session when they do that. They'll still talk to you.*

*But the fellow who just turns his back on you, he won't argue with you. You know, I've never had anybody argue with me about Scientology that wouldn't go at once into session? Do you know I've had psychologists and government lobbyists and oh, I don't know. I think I could even put a pig in-session. As long as they'll argue about it. See? They're in-session.*

*The best thing for you to do is to adjust your definition of “in-session.” You see, what is “in-session,” don't you see? Well, he's willing to talk to the auditor and he's telling you he is not interested in his own case, he's in-session.*

But oddly enough, won't even speak to the auditor and totally absorbed in own case: not in-session. See that? Or, not interested in own case, not talking to the auditor: not in-session.

But a pc who will sit there and say, *“I've never seen such terrible auditing in my life. Grrrrrrr-grrrrrr-grrrrrr. Why do you keep making these blunders? Grrrrr.”* He's in-session. And the auditor that thinks at that point that he has an ARC break to handle is making a technical error. He has no ARC break to handle. There isn't any ARC break. There's just an absence of auditing.

And it turns up very recently – which is why I'm giving you this pair of lectures on the subject – it turns up very recently that a missed withhold is an absence of auditing. You didn't audit it. you should have known about it. And you missed it. And all the pc's doing is accusing you of an absence of auditing. That's all. you weren't careful and you didn't pick it up and you should have known about it and he sits back and he festers.

And if you – if you think to yourself that it's because the pc is afraid you'll find out about it, you're actually making a bit of a mistake. Because if you notice, the most active tone arm responses is to the most fruitful question on the “Who” and if you play that “Who” up and down and watch that needle very close while you're running the Who section of the withhold system, you will see that that question which gets you the most frequent release of charge is, “Who should have known about it?” Not “Who didn't know about it?” “Who could have known about it and failed to find out?” And all of a sudden you'll get a resurgence of charge. And the thing tends to blow at that point.

Well, isn't that interesting? That's an absence of auditing then, isn't it. *Hmm?*

Well, if you're knuckleheaded enough to miss a withhold on the pc and wait and let the pc find it out by blowing up, you, of course, are – should have somebody blowing up in your face because it's damn bad technology, that's all.

When you're monkeying around with Prepchecking, when you're fooling around with rudiments, I don't care how many times you ask the question “Have I missed a withhold on you in this session?” See? I don't care how many times you ask that question in between . . . I don't think you should go so far as to ask it in a 3D Criss Cross session between null items. “Weasel, weasel, weasel, thank you, it's in. Have I missed a withhold on you?” I don't think you should run like that. “Cat, cat, cat, it's out. Have I missed a withhold on you?” I don't think that frequency is called for. But in Prepchecking, it's pretty confounded often.

You're sailing down the line... Because it's the only guarantee when you leave a What question down to a further-lettered What question – you know, you leave a What question because it isn't clear yet because you got to get something earlier on the chain, well, it's only sense that after you've done this once or twice or three times that you possibly missed a withhold. Because you're jumping off uncleared What questions hoping to get a lower What question that will unravel the whole chain.

Well, sure, you've missed a withhold, but has the pc at any time gotten the idea that you've missed a withhold? Has he confused your going earlier to clear the thing, with missing a withhold? Has he confused these points? He knows it's not clear. He knows it's not clean yet. He can still feel it kind of biting. Well, is he still holding onto something? Well, so every, every – every What question would be about as frequently as you would ask it. Once every What question. That is to say, you got the What and you got four or five withholds off on the same What question and you maybe twenty or thirty times – well, actually, five or six times have run through the “When? All? Who?” routine on each withhold, you see, if you've gone even that thoroughly at it. That's being very, very thorough. Yeah, after one of these What questions, why, it just very well might have established the idea on the part of the pc that a withhold had been missed.

Of course, you're setting up the ARC break. You're going to go on about three more What questions and all of a sudden the pc's going to get nattery and the pc's going to do this and the pc's going to ARC break on you and so forth, because you've missed a withhold.

The only reason you ever get an ARC break of that magnitude where the pc is climbing all over you . . . Let's say you had the pc in-session and then all of a sudden half an hour later you find the pc shouting at you and screaming at you. The pc *was* in-session and has *ceased* to be in-session – please hear me this time because I've only said this about 500 times, but please hear me this time – is because you have missed a withhold on him. It's the only reason that situation arises.

So the best remedy for that sort of a situation is “Have I *missed a withhold* on you?” And that is the best ARC break process there is because it's the only reason there is an ARC break. That is the only reason there is an ARC break occurring after an in-sessionness.

Of course, the man on the street who screams at you even before you audit him, why, the world's been missing withholds on him left and right. You could do the same thing with him. After a fellow's ranted on about you, about he didn't want to know anything more about Scientology and it was just a fake and it was terrible and he wasn't going to – thought everybody in Scientology ought to be killed and he said something like this – well, you should just look at him very interestedly and you should say to him, “Well, what should Scientologists have found out about you and failed to? What – what should they have found out?”

I don't care if you've got him on the meter or not. Man, I tell you, the least that'll happen is he'll shut up.

Oddly enough, he probably very often would simply tell you.

“Oh, well, if you put it that way, that's something else again.”

Of course, it's a bad thing, I suppose, to put men in-session on the street, but I'd put them in-session before I would sit there and let them scream and rail and rant and rave. The guy's already said he's in-session because he's ranting and raving. You see? So you lower your sights on the subject of what in-sessionness is and you stop flubbing just because somebody blows up in your face and start running an ARC break process or something of the sort *late* in the session.

*Ah, nah, you aren't going to get anyplace with it. why not? Because it's all based on a missed withhold. But of course, if your pc won't have anything to do with you and won't audit and so forth; and is just totally ARC broke and won't talk to you or anything like that, and now you ask him what withhold has been missed on him, you're not going to get any further either, because the pc isn't talking to you. But you can get a pc into session with those earlier steps, but not at that point, “auditor.”*

So at that point – from that point on, you are trying to *improve* the session. From “auditor” level *on*, including “auditor” level, is simply session *improvement* and nothing else.

Now, the question, “Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?” perfectly all right. It's the perfect Zero question, but it sometimes is not the perfect “auditor's” process because it doesn't indicate any process.

So you say, “Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?” and you get an awful fall, well, it's the E-Meter that's telling you and you didn't possibly detect the pc was or wasn't in-session or something like that. I would advise you if you were prepchecking to totally avoid any withholds or missed withholds or anything of that sort. Just avoid that because the pc's going to throw the session on you.

You know, all of a sudden you'll be prepchecking something else and you – that you don't want to prepcheck. You've already got him on another line and so you run some of the old, moldy processes. “Who would I have to be to audit you?” Anything like that, see? The old, moldy process. Don't run any one of them that had anything about an O/W process in it. “What have you done to me?” and “What have you withheld from me?” and so on. You're liable to throw him out of session.

There is – there's some wheezy ones. That's one of them. That's one of them. A much later one is ARC '61. It will run to a high stuck tone arm but is nevertheless a pretty darn good process, and so on. A lot of interesting results have occurred to it.

Another thing that you could use at this particular level, “Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?” to get yourself in sideways is a very interesting process, but I don't advise you to use it on a member of the opposite sex when you're auditing them. Now, seriously, I don't. Because they get sexually restimulated, and that is, “Touch my knee, touch my other knee, touch my shoulder, touch my other shoulder, touch the top of my head, touch my chin.” It violates to some extent the auditor using his body in the session, but it works. It works. ARC comes way up.

And one of the reasons I advise you not to use it is not that it doesn't work on a crisscross like that, but sometimes, you frail creatures, you get into the middle of this thing, you know, and you skip it. you don't flatten the process. And it's a rather lengthy process and it is a process. It is a process. It apparently runs up – when it's done by a girl auditor on a man or a man auditor on a woman, it runs up the second dynamic channel. You got to clear it all the way.

And you've set yourself up then not to run a hunt and punch process. You've set yourself up to run the next two hours on it, but if you consistently had difficulty with this pc staying in-session with you, it's well worth doing. If you remember to flatten it and not fall in any second dynamic nonsense. Girl's a third of the way through this confounded thing, you know, saying – realize that she loves you desperately. Or the man, he realizes he's loved you all of his life and that he's known you in 18 past lives, and so on. Man, flatten the thing. Flatten it. Flatten it. Don't leave it at that level.

Now, it oddly enough is the cure for auditor falling in love with pc, pc falling in love with auditor. You run it on the auditor on some other auditor. It does a nice transference.

We have had problems with this. HGC – you get a pretty girl, a staff auditor in an HGC, she always has problems with this sort of thing. Get a male pc and my goodness, he's phoning his wife and getting a divorce and he's got the whole structure all planned up and going to town in all directions and so forth. And she has – the girl staff auditor hasn't even found out about it yet, you see. What's this, you know?

Well, you can pick it up at that point and you can run it on up and out because it's basically simply reactive. Something has gone into restimulation and it's gone into restimulation because of the proximity, that's all. So let's close the proximity; only let's flatten it. That's all I say about that one. Let's flatten it. And it is flat when there's no longer any misemotion, love, anguish, unrequited swearing coming off with it.

I give you that one with reservation. If you use it, why, for God's sakes, remember I give you the limitations of the thing is it has to be flattened, so it's hardly a rudiments process. But it could be used at that stage. And it is a specific. It's pretty much a cure of the pc falling in love desperately with the auditor.



You shouldn't feel too complimented on that particular line, by the way, because I never have had a psycho woman spinning someplace or another that wasn't also desperately in love with me. And it ceased to be complimentary to me. I finally figured out that this wasn't so much due to my charm, but leaving something unflat.

The difficulties that you run into are – contain that as an occupational hazard. And it's a good one to run. It's a good one to run. you don't go into the private parts of the body or anything like that. you just use the knee, the ankle, the head, the shoulder, the hand. you know, just ordinary, routine, casually. Go on and on and on with the confounded thing. Misemotion and emotion and love and then dying, God knows what, and the 18 times they didn't know you on the past track, all these things blow off.

In the first place, I don't know what your body has to do with the auditor anyhow. But evidently this is all associated one way or another.

All right. Now, we get down to this interesting question of the rudiments, “Are you withholding anything?” And if you're running a Prepcheck session, you have to modify this particular Model Session question.

“Since the last time I audited you . . .” sometimes you have to say this two or three times, even give its date – “have you done anything that you are now withholding?” And if you get a fall, you ask it again, stressing its date very *hard*: “*Five o'clock yesterday afternoon, 28 Feb. 62.* Since that date, have you done anything that you are withholding *from me?*” And the pc's various withholds from you sort of fall out and scatter around and then they finally say, “Well, no, no, no, as a matter of fact.” And the needle goes clear.

One of the best ways to clear the needle is to clear it from the end of the last session until *now*. you just clear it for that period. And you don't get into any hot water at all. Do you understand? That's cleared rather arduously. Sometimes you have to be *awfully* ironclad and thump about that particular rudiment because your pc is withholding something for their grandma and they've got you vaguely associated with grandma for reasons we couldn't have a clue of, you know.

And you're a male auditor, so they've got you associated with grandma, you know? And they're withholding from grandma in the Prepcheck and they don't see who you are. And they don't see where the auditor is and so on. you just have to start emphasizing the *time* and the *date*, you know, of the last session *end* and *now* and, *me*. *Me, me, me*. And they finally say, “Oh, *ha-ha-haha*. Withholding something from the Instructor. Wasn't withholding anything from you.”

And then, so you won't miss a withhold, you say, “Well, what was that during the period?”

And they say, “Well, ah, so-and-so and so-and-so.”

“Well, all right. That's fine.” And then *repeat* the question in that lengthened form and make sure that it's clear and go on.

You only want the interim period from the last auditing.

Now, that would vary if you restarted a session after a break. You note the time of the break and so you add from the moment, you notice that the tone arm is up. “*So have you done anything since 2:22 today that you are now withholding from me?*” It is now 2:32. Quite interesting. Quite interesting.

Don't pay too much attention to the tone arm going up on a break. We scouted it down here two or three months ago and actually did a little searchout on what this was all about and we found out that tone arms went up on very interesting things like pc who was just getting assessed on the terminal “woman,” had actually talked civilly to a woman which, of course, was a total violation of his mores. A lot of that stuff. So it isn't too important.

All right. That's your withhold question. Now, on a Prepcheck, you don't want that going anyplace but there because if you're going to ask this thing very broadly, of course, the pc now launches the session. He fires the cannon without you standing to and nobody at the flagpole and so on. And it doesn't turn out to be a shot to start the war, it turned out to be the sunset gun on the session. That's the end of that session. You might as well skip it and go home and go to bed because the pc is now going to give you a whole new chain that you haven't anything to do with and didn't want anything to do with and you have lost control of the session.

So, if there's any doubt in your mind, if the pc on former experience does not seem able to respond to what you're asking the pc, just omit it for Prepchecking, see? It's a little bit dangerous to do that. Just a little bit dangerous, but if you've gotten into trouble doing it, even with this positive way, I just wouldn't attempt it again. You got it? I mean on the next session, I just wouldn't attempt it on the same pc. say – as we go across it, why, we say, “Well, all right. This session is mostly concerned with withholds anyway. So we're going on to the next rudiment.” Don't even mention the rudiment beyond that point, see? You've heard me pulling this gag.

Now, it's a good thing to do that with new pcs if you're just sogging right straight into Prepchecking. If the pc's brand-new, they haven't had any time to have any missed withholds. See, first few sessions and you've not missed any withholds on her. You've been checking during the session for missed withholds? Fruitless question to ask.

Now, you can ask this, you can ask this at a time you were doing 3D Criss Cross. And your use of the rudiment in 3D Criss Cross definitely calls for just this rudiment exactly as it is. “Are you withholding anything?” By that time, we assume the pc has had a lot of Prepchecking and is pretty well in-session, and so on, and won't make a bunch of mistakes about the whole thing, so it's now safe to ask the question. You see the logic that follows that?

So you can just ask the question. It goes bang! And you say, “What's that?”

And, “Well, I was out with Joe last night and I didn't want to tell you about it – and . . .” Withhold. Run a – run a When, All, Who on it. you know, just a little withhold system on it and *bzzzzt*. Because it'll clear up fast if the pc is in that advanced state of case.

Early on, during a Prepcheck period, a pc is *not* in any advanced state of case and they *can't* handle it and they *can't* tell one withhold from another withhold. It's all just sort of solid *thooooo*. So you ask her, “Are you withholding anything?” and they try to lay their whole case in your lap or try to keep from laying the whole case in your lap and you get a whole bunch of missed withholds and at that point, because you can't clear it up, you've set the session up for an ARC break.

All you have to do is ask that question and miss it and you've set the session up for an ARC break, so it's too dangerous to come near on a Prepcheck session early on, see? It's a dangerous question.

And now we get to *PTP* and pcs don't like a *PTP*. They don't like to find them. They don't like to run them. They like to avoid them. And if you audit a pc with one, you've had it. you make no session progress. It'll jump back up in your face, so it's vital that you handle it whether in a Prepcheck session or a 3D session. That's a *PTP*. Present time problem.

The way to handle a present time problem is not with withholds. Now, you could handle it and I gave you some advice earlier that you could handle, but experience has not borne it out that it could be handled this way in a Prepcheck session. You can't ask for missed withholds or anything like that. “Oh, I had a terrible fight with my husband last night,” and so forth.

Well, you – in a Prepcheck session, you just don't *dare* say, “Well, what should your husband have found out about and failed to?” Early on and in a Prepcheck session, you wouldn't dare ask it because the pc will now throw the whole session into that channel and you've now got new Zeros and you won't be able to clear it up. You'll find yourself on new chains and here you go. So you avoid, again, O/W. Just avoid using any version of O/W or O/Ws or any version of withholds, in clearing a present time problem for a Prepcheck session.

Later on the pc's rudiments have been put in well, the pc's had quite a bit of auditing and that sort of thing, yes, you can ask the question if you're running 3D Criss Cross.

“Oh, I had a terrible fight with my husband last night,” and so forth.

“Well,” you say, “what withhold did your husband miss on you? What should he have found out about and didn't?”

“Oh, well, that's different. *Ha-ha-ha-ha*. Just so-and-so and so-and-so.”

“Okay. All right. Thank you very much. Now, do you have a present time problem? Thank you very much. Well, have I missed a withhold on you? Thank you very much. Good.”

That would be exactly how you would handle that. That's a rather advanced case that is auditing very, very well, don't you see?

Early on, “Do you have a present time problem? Do you have a present time problem?” *Clank!*

And you say, “Well, Ron said you didn't have to pay too much attention to rudiments, so I'll just let that be” and then the session doesn't get anyplace and the pc doesn't make any goals and gains and God almighty and it comes up in the middle of the session, you have to handle it while your attention's on something else and the pc's down the channel. Oh, God. You can get in an awful lot of trouble auditing a pc with a PTP.

But we had some old processes that were lovely. The best of them, which was most generally runnable, even though it wasn't necessarily the shortest one, is “What part of that problem have you been responsible for?” Get him to state the problem. “All right. What part of that problem have you been responsible for?”

And you'll find out it'll fall out.

Now, as you're running it, you're not trying to flatten the whole process of responsibility. You're just taking the problem, so you ask occasionally for the present time problem again. “Do you have a present time problem?” And as soon as you get *no* reaction on the question, “Do you have a present time problem?” you come off of it. you just stop running the process. You say, “I'll give you two more commands and end this process if that's all right with you. What part of that problem could you be responsible for? What part of that problem could you be responsible for?”

Now, you better define the problem in that auditing command, so it better be, “What part of that problem with Archibald have you been responsible for?” Something like that.

Or you could be much more definite about this present time problem. “What part of that problem about Archibald wanting the car and you wanting the car at the same time have you been responsible for?” I don't care how specific you get, but it's just so finally, the only reason you're running it is “Do you have a present time problem?” must go null on the meter.

All right. Now, I'll give you the reverse of this. Somebody did this the other day. I almost shot him right here. The present time problem didn't register and the pc said it still was there and the auditor ran it. Running a present time problem that doesn't register. That's amongst the high crimes of auditing. Because it's just a rudiment.

A session is *not* designed to make the pc anything but auditable. It is *not* to make the pc happy with life. The rudiments are not designed to give an auditing gain of any kind. They're just to make the pc auditable.

And you talk about a major Q and A, that's a major Q and A. Pc says, "Well, I've decided that we're going to clear up my grandfather in today's session and this auditor isn't going to have a word to say about it," so he says, "I have a present time problem with my grandfather."

And the auditor says, "All right. It didn't fall," and audits it. Not only is he auditing a rudiment into the session and God help us how, but he's auditing a dead line. It doesn't react. God help us.

He's auditing something on which the pc either has no reality or can't be audited or doesn't need to be audited or it's unassessed and he is probably auditing something that isn't even part of the 3D Goals Problem Mass. It may beef up the whole Prehav Scale. There are many wild things can occur on taking an uncharged PTP and auditing it. So you run it by the meter when a session has rudiments to make the pc auditable and it doesn't have rudiments to get any auditing done of any kind whatsoever. See, that's not the purpose of rudiments, to get a big gain on the pc.

If you get a gain accidentally by running rudiments, oh, fine. Nobody's going to argue with gains. We're not going to hit the pc because he's had a gain on the rudiments. But we're sure not going to bother to expect one.

All right. Now, we take the body of the session and let's slide down and inspect *end rudiments*. The *end rudiments* begin with the truth rudiment. "Have you told me any half-truth, untruth or said something only to impress me or try to damage anyone in this session?" Awful mouthful, isn't it?

So when you say this, you don't say, "Have you told me any half-truth, untruth, said something only to impress me or try to damage anyone in this session?" That is not the way you say that rudiment.

You say four rudiments with one suck-in of breath. And you halt at each fall and clean it. So you say, you – I'll give each one a split second to answer. So it's properly said, "Have you told any half-truth? Untruth? Or said something only to impress me? Or tried to damage anyone in this session?" I gave you enough space to see if there was a fall.

All right. Let's supposing there was going to be a fall after "untruth."

"Have you told me any half-truth? Untruth? Well, what untruth have you told me in this session?" See? You didn't even bother to finish the sentence.

"Well," the pc said, "well, I just – it wasn't very much – ah – very much. I said I inherited eight million dollars and ah – as a matter of fact, I owed twenty cents and *ha-ha-ha-ha-ha*," so forth.

Say, "All right. Good."

Don't bother now to go back to the beginning of this thing because it was “untruth,” see.

So you say, “Have you told me any untruth in this session?” And it goes *clank*.

And you say, “What was that?” And you finally get this thing all sorted out. There is no process goes with it. Except, “What was that lie you told, you dog?” And you get all that off.

Now, you cleared up “untruth,” didn't you, see? So you finally got a null on “Have you told me any untruth in this session?” see? That's null now. So you say, “Have you said something only to impress me? Or tried to damage anyone in this session? Thank you.”

And go on to your next one. you got it? That's the way you test that one out. See, if it's null, it's null. That's it. Don't go back and invite disaster again. See? A rudiment is just to make the pc feel better and get him out of the session zone area and straighten it up, get the little additional charge off what he was telling you. That sort of thing. And verify you. And actually, these rudiments are just basically that, these end rudiments. To make the pc feel okay by session end. They're to clean up additional and residual charge left by reason of the session. And they're to put the pc in a frame of mind to end the session. Those are the basic reasons you have those rudiments.

Now, let's take a subordinate reason to correct the most common auditor errors made in sessioning. And although that's secondary, these things are there to hold these auditor musts in front of auditors' faces. Because these are a list of the most common auditor misses. The things which auditors most commonly miss on pos.

And let me tell you, you can turn out bulletins and you can give lectures and you can scream and you can hand out infraction sheets and you can talk to Herbie until he gets mad at you, and these things will still go out if they aren't right in the frame of a Model Session.

These things will happen and they cause – most randomness caused in sessions is caused by these various items. This is all secondary, you see, once we've given these first reasons. They keep these things corrected. And they keep them held to view because, you know, pcs can make absolutely no gain at all and their case can be all loused up if any one of these end rudiments, except goals and gains, is out consistently.

Now, “Have you told me any half-truth?” My golly, if you're auditing a child someday, you will actually spend three minutes in the auditing session, including beginning rudiments and the next half hour cleaning up the half-truths. Just little prevarications that aren't really prevarications. They didn't tell you all or they're trying to safeguard or help somebody. They're wild, you know.

And if you let that pile up, the child, all of a sudden, would get an auditing time track that was just total black muck. And they just wouldn't want to be audited anymore. Same way

with any pc, of course, but you'll find this most flagrant with a child. Their level of responsibility is poor on the exactness of the world and that sort of thing.

And they very often give you quite delusory activities just to entertain you and so forth. Their motives are not very bad.

“Oh, yes, I was walking down the hall and this old lady jumped out and frightened me, you see.”

Well, you could spot that at once. But you don't spot “Well, ah, actually I slapped my little brother.” See?

You can say, “Well, that's all right. He shouldn't be doing that, so that's a laudable withhold,” and so forth.

You get down to “half-truth, untruth,” you know, “Well, I didn't – I didn't really slap my little brother, as a matter of fact, I haven't seen him all day.” It'll be as illogical as that.

And this goes on with adults and children equally well. But if you let them pile this stuff up, it can get quite serious.

Now, “Said something only to impress me” is not really very important, but sometimes it operates as a missed withhold and the pc gets a little bit mad at you, or feels rough about you because he said something only to impress you, not because it was true, don't you see?

And if you miss the thing, he sort of operates to some slight extent as though he had a missed withhold. You see? It's a cousin and it can bring about a downscale attitude by next session.

And now we take, “to damage anyone in this session.” And now let's catch the whole basket-load of pcs who use auditing to spread enttheta and to downgrade and to – so forth and in short, dramatize. And it – it's getting – it's less these days around here. It's occasional. But brother it really roars in HGCs and far areas of the world. Oh, wow! And every time they do it, it's an overt. So their auditing sessions take on the complexion of a long concatenation of overts. They will give you all kinds of other people's withholds and data and weird, oddball things that don't give them any case improvement. They're just overts, that's all. Trying to damage someone. And if you let them get away with that continuously, they've stacked up their auditing track and the next thing you know, they become unauditible. Less for the pc than for the auditor.

The auditor very often develops a fantastic idea of the pc. The pc sits there and lies about himself. Tries to damage himself. But do you know that's the last person the pc knows about?

And listen to this one now. you quite routinely, if you don't clear it at once and it's still falling, you routinely have to point this fact out to the pc. It's not evaluation. Just say, "Well, did you try to damage yourself?"

"Oh *ho-ho-ho-ho*, well, *ha-ha-ha-ha*. Yes."

"In what way?"

"Well, so-and-so and the actual truth of it was such-and-such, you see?"

All right. Any time this whole thing is violated you get an alter-is, not an as-is. So that's why you get the session mucked up. And this is the prevention of alter-is, is what you could really call that particular clause. Okay?

Now, the next one, I don't know, I had the percentage once. What was it? Oh, somewhere between 10 and 20 percent. I've forgotten, but I had the exact percentage once. It's an impressive percentage of people will throw or sell items or sell charge or try not to sell charge and they get fixated on the E-Meter and they get in a games condition with the auditor on the subject of the E-Meter. I've known a pc, actually, the second you started to give them any withhold question or anything like that, skilledly, with great practice, be able to raise the fingers one after the other so as to get a needle rise just as that question is about to be asked. Interesting.

And an eight-year-old child has actually thrown or sold an item because she liked it and thrown a whole assessment just absolutely haywire and could have just been knocked in the head if that item had ever run. Fortunately the item was never run.

But it wound up, because she'd done it and this thing has not been cleaned up. Actually, the whole thing went out and everything went null, you see? And this could have all been mysterious if we didn't have this question. But influence of the E-Meter, influence of the E-Meter is a very, very important part of this thing because the E-Meter hasn't anything to do with a pc. It's an auditor's tool. It isn't anything the pc should be interested in.

If the pc is interested in the E-Meter, we automatically assume one of two things. That the pc is afraid of revealing something or the pc has in the past had some type of incident where the meter was proven wrong according to the pc's viewpoint.

And the pc has no confidence in the E-Meter and therefore has lowered the command value of the auditor because the pc knows the E-Meter's a fake and so the command value of the auditor's poor, but that's because somebody's devaluated the E-Meter. And the most flagrant way the E-Meter is devaluated I already gave you earlier. I gave you that. It's just, auditor says, "Well, there's no fall here on an ARC break and you say you have one." That is the most fruitful source of evaluation of the E-Meter.

But the E-Meter has become invalidated in some fashion. Now, if that thing continues to knock, you had better take that up in the body of the session and clean the whole subject of



meters, metering and E-Meters on a Prepcheck basis because there's something been missed on this pc and there's something wrong with this pc and there's something wrong on it.

Now, actually it'll fall, tick or a fall or react in some way. Well, "Did you try to influence the E-Meter?"

"Well, I really didn't want it to read when you said . . ." certain 3D Criss Cross item and so on. And it blows. Just standard lines. See? Those things, they clean up as you go through the rudiments.

But if this thing is always out, session after session, you roll up your sleeves and you take it and make a whole session devoted to nothing but it, prepchecking that one as a Zero Question. And then just clean this up and find out when this E-Meter was invalidated and when it was wrong and what they have done to the meter and all that sort of thing.

And you'll find out there's plenty on it and once it's cleaned up, why, bang, all of a sudden, they'll operate just fine on an E-Meter. And the question will go clean.

All right. "Have you failed to answer any question or command I've given you in this session?" This is one of the earliest admonitions of auditing. There's one auditing command or question for one response. And it is the one which is the oldest and is the one which is most frequently forgotten. And pcs have not answered auditing commands and so forth and it's a great case foul-up, and for lack of attention on this one point, I had a pc who had been given, actually had had in hundreds of hours of auditing, had thousands of auditing commands on the subject of havingness and had *never yet answered one question on Havingness*. Therefore, no Havingness Process ever worked. Interesting.

You could run Havingness Processes by the hour and test them all and of course they never would have worked because the pc had actually had alter-ised every Havingness command, had tried to tell auditors, "But Havingness doesn't work on me," and that sort of thing. And nobody had listened. It'd become just a perpetual withhold so the pc just sat there and alter-ised every Havingness command and did something else. Whenever any Havingness command was given, the pc did something else. Interesting, huh? So that's why that one is there. That's a safeguard. That's to hold in the oldest admonition concerning auditing – that the pc must answer the auditing command. And when it doesn't, you'll get a fall. When the pc hasn't, you'll get a fall, so you clean that up.

Now, "Have you withheld anything from me?" is all right for 3D Criss Cross but is not all right for a Prepcheck end rudiment. So a Prepcheck end rudiment you would say, "Have I missed a withhold on you in this session?" And you'd finally clean that up.

Your "auditor" question, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" actually it isn't read this way, but it possibly is understood this way, "Are you still willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" And that is a second check on this withhold question.

By the way, I could give you a variation on that withhold question that is a very clever one that somebody had originated out in Seattle. “Is there any withhold that you would hate to have me write down in full on this auditor's report?” or any such question. “Is there any withhold you would feel uncomfortable about having me mention to anyone?” That is a good parallel view, a second test of the thing because the one they mentioned was not cleaned up and you've missed a withhold on it. There's always more on that withhold. Follow that? That's a trick. That's a trick end rudiment Prepcheck question. And you can use that and you'll find out there's more to clean up. you just go ahead and clean it up then.

All right. “Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?” is just an effort to make sure that we don't have an ARC break involved in it and as far as “Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?” and the pc said “Well, not so much,” and so forth.

Just say, “Well, what did you find yourself unable to tell me?” or “What didn't I receive?” or something of this sort.

You ordinarily clear it up just that easily. Just a two-way comm situation. If this is wildly out at end of session in Prepchecking, remember, you are probably still cleaning up “Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?” in the beginning. So you would tell the pc it is not flat and you will now leave it, however, because we are working on it in the session.

Now, in 3D Criss Cross, you clean it up. Regardless of what you have to use, clean it up. Because you find the pc coming into session next time, it's not going to null well or something of the sort, so clean it up right then. Usually cleans up very easily. Follow that?

All right. Now, goals and gains. Now, well, “Look around here and tell me if you can have anything.” Naturally, you have a Havingness Process ending the session as the last process out, the easiest one. If you haven't gotten something else, you've certainly got the Havingness Process.

One of the ways to do this, the safest way to run that particular end rudiment is have the pc give a – turn your sensitivity down and have the pc give a can squeeze. And then run five commands of the pc's Havingness Process and ask the pc to give another can squeeze. And between those two, if you see a broadening of the situation, probably the pc needs some more Havingness. Because remember, in the body of the session, you might totally have changed the characteristics of the E-Meter on the pc. Well you can't count on the fact that this. . . But if five commands loosen the needle, you're pretty well off to give him twenty more. Okay? Because his havingness must have been either down or improvable.

All right. And that lets him out and takes him off with anything you've missed in the rudiments – will usually come off in that little smidgen of Havingness.

And then your “goals and gains,” and your “goals and gains” are basically for the auditor because an auditor wants to know if he has made any progress in the session. But secondarily, they are for the pc to point out to the pc that he did or didn't get someplace in the session.

Now, “goals” we have always had, but we add “gains.” See, we've always said “Have you made any part of your goals for the session?” but “Have you made any other gains in this session that you would care to mention?” has been added in exclusively for the auditor because pcs very often want to tell the auditor they have made some other gains.

They might not have made all the specific goals such as “to have three children” or something like that as their session goal, they haven't made that one. But they have made some gains. They don't feel quite so pregnant or something of the sort. Something weird or impossible is liable to come up like that where they have not actually set very real session goals. You never argue with these session goals, of course.

But they have made gains for the session and it gives them an opportunity to tell the auditor. In other words, that is the auditor's pay period. That's where the pay line starts. Starts right at the beginning of that rudiment. And you'll find out that since we've had that, an auditor feels better paid. That's right. And, because you'll find out it's amazing. Pc at the end of the session – say, “Well, did you make any of your goals?” It's all right, by the way, to read the pc's goals back to the pc if he can't remember them offhand. “Did you make this one, did you make this one, did you make this one? And what do you – what do you think about that?”

And then, of course, put it on the freewheeling and say, “Have you made any other gains in this session you'd care to mention?” And the pc will tell you they did or they didn't or something of the sort and you make your notation on your auditor's report and then comes end of session.

And of course, you end the session to end the session. And when you end the session, make sure that you end the session. Don't leave it in question. If the pc's still sitting there going kind of like you – like this and makes no

motion or doesn't yawn or relax or you don't feel attention break on the subject of the auditing session, bust it. Go right in on it again and you say, “Has this session ended for you?” And I don't care what you do particularly, but say, “All right. Now, look at me. Look at me. Look straight at me now. Now, feel your feet on the floor. Look at me now. Feel your feet on the floor. Now, touch the table in front of you. *pat it. pat it.* Feel your feet on the floor. Look at me. All right. *End of session.*”

“Oh, well, yeah. *Ha-ha.*”

They're very often hung up in some fashion and you just *mustn't* end sessions with pcs in-session. You want to know how often you do it? You want to know how often you end a

session with the pc still in-session? Is the pc talks to you about the auditing session right after you've said, "End of session." You want to know how often you have ended the session with the pc still in-session? Pc goes right on talking to you in the same way. Walks down the hall with you in your same role as an auditor. Goes right on treating you as the auditor. The session has not ended.

That actually – no disaster involved with it because he shakes out of it after a while – but that actually is the most common auditing error is not to end a session. Because it goes unpassed. It's not a very serious error. Therefore, it becomes extremely common.

You expect time is going to end the session. Well, the old man with a scythe – I haven't met him for years, you know? I just haven't met him for years. And I don't think he comes around and says, "End of session" to your pc.

I know the pc's still suffering from what happened 200 trillion years ago and so I don't think anybody ended that either. I don't think time is very efficient this way.

I don't say there's anything wrong with time. I just say that the auditor should not rely on the old man with the scythe to come up and look fixedly at the pc and says, "Hey!"

And we have this other one which is terribly optional. It's terribly optional. Is "Tell me I am no longer auditing you." And that tends to end the thing. Okay?

All right. Tell me I'm no longer lecturing to you.

Good night.