

# QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD: TR 4, MODEL SESSION

A lecture given on  
21 June 1962

Okay. This is the second hour of the Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, 21 June 62.

What question would you like to ask me about Model Session? Meryl?

*Female voice: I wonder about something on one of those questions – what was it? What question have you failed to answer?*

Yeah?

*Female voice: I thought that you should never ask a pc a question that didn't give him the possibility of just saying "no." Like, "Have you failed to answer a question?" Remember, like in old Sec Checking, you know, you never just say, "Well, what did you steal?" You say, "Have you ever stolen anything?" So he always has gotten "no" for an answer – a choice. Do you see what I mean? Rather than the question simply implying that he must have done it.*

Well, that's your second question.

*Female voice: Well, then, how exactly does the first one go? Unlike this "failed to answer a question or a command."*

"In this session . . .," what is it?

*Female voice: "In this session, have you failed to answer any question or command I have given you?"*

*Female voice: That is the . . .*

"In this session, have you failed to answer any question or command?" is the way it goes.

*Female voice: Well, that is still just the way it is then?*

Yes. So . . .

*Second female voice: Yes and then if you get a read, then use the second one.*

Yeah. Your second question is not asked unless the answer is “Yes.”

*Female voice: I see. Yeah, I get that.*

Now, the trick is here is your pc – I should comment on this – is your – the auditor always thinks that the – he builds up a facade here that the meter answers for the pc on the yes and no. And you'll find out in normal auditing that your pc will – after they've been audited on a meter for a while, they begin to wait for the meter to answer anyhow. So – they do, to find out whether it's clean or not clean, which is perfectly reasonable. And that question which you just asked me is not answered unless the question was “Yes.”

*Female voice: I see. Mm-hm.*

Okay?

*Female voice: All right, fine. Thank you.*

You bet. Yes, Ian?

*Male voice: on “Failed to suggest,” Ron, if you left out the middle rudiment, is there an optional one you can use?*

That's a prep.

*Male voice: You can't use it in the middle ruds?*

That's a Prepcheck. If your pc is busy and consistently and continually desiring to suggest something, you've got a point now which is an interesting point of decision. See? It was one of these optional questions. If this is always hot on a pc, your pc is always about two-thirds out of session, this could be used, don't mistake this. If it were to be used it would be the first one. You'd say, “In this session is there anything you have failed to suggest, suppressed?” See? “Invalidated, failed to reveal or been careful of?” But you'd find out that this rudiment would tend to drop out even in one or two sessions. Because it is so symptomatic of somebody being way out of session, it is not something that puts a person well into session, it's simply a symptom. The rest of the rudiments are not symptoms. They're ill in their own right.

*Male voice: I have that but I was thinking . . .*

You always use it on a prepcheck.

*Male voice: I was thinking chiefly in terms of auditing people like the mob we have here, professional auditors.*

Yeah. Yes, yes. It is a bit trickier to put a professional auditor into session than it is raw meat off the street, see. It is trickier. There is no doubt about this. But I wouldn't Q-and-A with this fact. I'd just go ahead and put them into session. For instance, Kay Minor, last night – where is Kay? Oh, there she is. She'd evidently been run lately with the rudiments out. See?

So she was sitting there a little bit – about half out of session, see, and toward the end of it she started to go into session. See? I think she would agree to this. And I don't know if she felt like that or not. But if I audit her again, she would be taking it much easier. See, audit her again with all the rudiments in. And then if I'd audit her again with all of the rudiments in, the test would have been made, is: Yes, I dare go into session with this auditor. Get the idea?

Now a professional auditor is to that degree harder to put into session because he knows what is being done right or wrong. It isn't that he is a tougher person. He is not. Don't ever make that mistake. He's just tougher to get into session.

Why is he tougher to get into session?

Because he has a higher criteria. His critical sense on the idea of auditing – not critical as a derogatory thing – but he has more information to be critical about.

The funny part of it is, is the raw meat is just as critical, but never says so. You make mistakes and because Model Session is geared exactly the way it's geared, you'll get the mind reacting reversewise.

So you can expect that a professional auditor is harder for an auditor to put into session, perhaps in the first one or two or three sessions.

Now, if a professional auditor is almost impossible to get into session, then he's being handled with all the rudiments out. In other words, nobody is actually getting the rudiments in.

So, you've got some student now in HPA. He's the third week and he thinks, actually, that you read the thing off the tone arm. If you don't get a tone arm shift when you ask a rudiment, why, then it's clean. Well of course, a professional auditor can be audited out of session to session with, out-of-sessionness, you see, much more rapidly than anybody else. Because he knows this is so dead wrong and he knows he's liable to be gotten into trouble. So his wariness goes up. See?

Does that answer any part of your question?

*Male voice: It answers all of it.*

All right. Thank you. Okay. Any other question? Yes, Peter?

*Male voice: Ron, I had a question that really was last night's question . . .*

All right.

*Male voice: . . . on the cognition . . .*

Comm lag permitted.

*Male voice: Thank you.*

All right.

*Male voice: On the cognition that you picked up. you said to Kay, "You cognited on something then," and I didn't know how you picked that up. you were running a Havingness Process and you said, "How is it going?" or something. "But you had a cognition on that, didn't you?" And I didn't know how you realized that.*

Just tone of voice. Put it down to an irrelevant remark. Frankly, not good auditing. Irrelevant remark. But it's not bad, merely because it was absolutely germane to an acknowledgment. But it's skirting along the thin edge, man. See? It's – if you can't handle those things with a clash-bang – it's just an effort to get the pc acknowledged – an appreciation of something

Once in a while you'll hear me say, "That was very interesting," or "That was amusing." The pc's laughing about something, I'll say, "That's very funny." Understand? That's just part and parcel of the skill of *thorough* acknowledgment. See? Unnecessary – unnecessary. It isn't vital. Probably shouldn't even do it. Pc's laughing like hell so you sit there like old stone face. See? Actually you could sit there like old stone face and get away with it and sometimes get away with it more often than by laughing like hell. you all of a sudden find they were really crying. So, frankly, Peter, it's a tightrope walk. But any remark of that character is simply in the interest of further acknowledgment of the pc – has no other value. That particular case the pc said, "Well, I'm not in that, you know, thank God!" and so forth. And I just say, "That was a cognition, wasn't it?" See?

These things have a tendency to boomerang on you. Well, let's ask the pc. Did the pc mind that?

*Female voice: No, I enjoyed it.*

Yeah. See? But you're walking on a thin edge.

I'll tell you what the irrel--- what irrelevant remark really is, is the pc is sailing along on an even keel, no particular action is going on and you all of a sudden say, "Wow, that needle just fell half a dial."

And the pc says, "What needle?" you know, "What – what – what – what happened? Why? Well, why did it fall half a dial? What happened to me?" See? All right, that's an irrelevant remark. It's a sudden remark and that should be eschewed madly.

But if you can appreciate what the pc is doing sometimes, so the pc feels quite well acknowledged – and it's just a trick under the heading of TR 2 – little TR 2 trick. That's all. You're commenting on something – it takes me by surprise to that degree because every once in a while somebody finds a trick I do and calls it to my attention. I've been doing it for years and never recognized it as a trick, but that is one of them.

The pc starts crying and they keep on crying for a while and so forth, you go on with a hard-boiled tone of voice and they are not acknowledged and of it. But you called to mind something I do that I myself had never analyzed. Thank you.

Any other question? Yes, Ian?

*Male voice: Ron, if the preclear comes in and sits down you – and there he is in session – you've got to prize this case off your lap – whereabouts would you take up Model Session to start? You're not going to throw him out of session by saying, "Is it all right if I start this session?" He thinks it's started.*

All right. You start the session in a quiet tone of voice. That's the only – that's the only surrender you make on Model Session.

*Male voice: All right.*

Don't Tone 40 it.

*Male voice: No. Otherwise you go through the beginning . . .*

You go through everything just straight on because there isn't anything now . . . Pc comes in and he's got to do an awful lot of goals and he's got all this goals and he's talking about his goals and he's going into this and that and so forth. All right.

Experience demonstrates that he wakes up somewhere along the line later and goes much slower if you haven't properly started the session. So what you – the only compromise you make is just to look at the pc, and he's saying, "And these goals so-and-so and so-and-so and I've got this list and I was up half the night writing this list and here it is," you see, and so forth. And you say, "All right, okay. Start of session." So on.

You might add this reality to it. This would be a trick I might use in the R-factor, "All right. Good enough. We're going to take – we're taking it up. Well, let's get into it. Let's get going right now, now then. All right, you've got it; let's get going right now. All right. Start of session." And rip off the beginning rudiments and go right on into it and you won't blow the pc out of session.

Your question is well put. It's never actually been asked. You would handle that factor in the R-factor and by softening up the way you started the session. All right.

Yes, Jim?

*Male voice: I found it necessary a couple of times to handle the withhold prior to the appropriate moment for asking the question about withholds . . .*

Mm-hm.

*Male voice: . . . in beginning rudiments.*

Mm-hm.

*Male voice: Otherwise the pc is kind of sitting on something waiting for the appropriate question to come up. Is it all right to do that?*

Frankly, the pc will give you a withhold under “difficulties.” Havingness won't function too well under it. But in actual fact, by experience, if you take them in that order, you'll find out that you'll have a gain by doing so.

*Male voice: Mm-mm.*

Now, grabbing the withhold out of order of the Model Session, see – grabbing the withhold out of order was something we were doing. However, there's very little advantage in doing so; very little advantage in doing so. Particularly on a pc that's been audited two or three times at least, you see? He knows this is going to come up. Now he's liable to originate the withhold.

*Male voice: Mm-hm.*

That's right. Then you merely handle it with TR 4.

*Male voice: Mm-hm.*

But you don't give it any credence with the meter. You got it?

pc, see? So on top of that, of course, you can be human. Pc then tends to overlook the fact that you're a dedicated monster down underneath the surface, you know? Get off of that process? God, no, man.

Pc says, “Oh, boo-hoo-hoo, this process is driving me mad and my head is just splitting You ask me just one more command . . .” This sort of thing never happens to me, by the way. “But you ask me just one more command,” you know, “and I'm just going to go up in smoke!” You know? Something like that.

I just ask one more command, you know? The probability is, is I wouldn't even acknowledge it at all. I'm a past master at just letting enttheta fall on the floor with a dull plop. Pc says, “What the hell is the matter with you? Why are you going into this? Good God, how many mistakes can an auditor make!”

I'd just give them the next auditing command. I don't even – don't even give it the TR 4, see? It would just pass through the wall two feet to the right of my head, see. And they let up a new scream and – about something or other – and do the command.

But if a pc is in there working, I acknowledge him well. And if he's not, I just throw away TR 4.

There probably is some more to know about TR 4. But I rather tend to think it would be when you were absolutely expert in handling a session, knew completely that your control

of the session would never be moved, knew implicitly that – exactly where you were going and your control of the pc was perfect. If all of these things happen I think you'd tend to relax in session and enter into that type of response. But if you relax to the point of entering chitchat into the session, you destroy the thing completely. So it is actually relegated only to TR 2. It's just a little more on TR 2.

Hey now, that's quite a commi--- that's a cognition, you know. Pc says, “Good God!” you know, and “You know catfish are very often twenty feet long. I got et by one once and that means that catfish are never necessarily small!” And, hey, you know?

You say, “Well that's – guess you're finding it out, huh? Good-oh.” No further than that.

“I'd like to catch one of those someday. Heh-heh.” Irrelevant remark, see?

Tiny borderline between these two things, a tiny borderline. You keep all such remarks in the line of ack and now and then you'll be sorry you opened your cotton-picking mouth. But most of the time the pc will feel he is talking to somebody, providing you know your business well enough so that that is never contrived. You see, you feel like saying, “Ah, well, heck,” you know? “All right,” you know? Puddle has just accumulated, you know, beneath the E-Meter so you have to turn on the bilge pumps, you know. “Ah, come off it,” you know? “All right. All right, you'll be okay,” you know? That sort of thing.

The funny part of it is the pc's grief charge is acknowledged. See, you've acknowledged a doingness on the part of the pc. And if you said just, “Yes, okay, thank you,” oddly enough, most of the time you would be all right too, you see? But if you say, “Yes. Thank you. Mm-hm. All right,” the pc tends to go out of session.

So the pc does something, you don't remark on the fact the pc has had a cognition because you are interested in the pc cognition. You're interested in the pc's attitude and you acknowledge the fact. Get the trick? TR 2 only. Okay?

*Male voice: Mm.*

You bet. Didn't make to – mean to make such a long and drawn drag-out of it. But you called to mind something I do that I myself had never analyzed. Thank you.

Any other question? Yes, Ian?

*Male voice: Ron, if the preclear comes in and sits down you – and there he is in session – you've got to prize this case off your lap – whereabouts would you take up Model Session to start? You're not going to throw him out of session by saying, “Is it all right if I start this session?” He thinks it's started.*

All right. You start the session in a quiet tone of voice. That's the only – that's the only surrender you make on Model Session.

*Male voice: All right.*

Don't Tone 40 it.

*Male voice: No. Otherwise you go through the beginning . . .*

You go through everything just straight on because there isn't anything now . . . Pc comes in and he's got to do an awful lot of goals and he's got all this goals and he's talking about his goals and he's going into this and that and so forth. All right.

Experience demonstrates that he wakes up somewhere along the line later and goes much slower if you haven't properly started the session. So what you – the only compromise you make is just to look at the pc, and he's saying, “And these goals so-and-so and so-and-so and I've got this list and I was up half the night writing this list and here it is,” you see, and so forth. And you say, “All right, okay. Start of session.” So on.

You might add this reality to it. This would be a trick I might use in the R-factor, “All right. Good enough. We're going to take – we're taking it up. Well, let's get into it. Let's get going right now, now then. All right, you've got it; let's get going right now. All right. Start of session.” And rip off the beginning rudiments and go right on into it and you won't blow the pc out of session.

Your question is well put. It's never actually been asked. You would handle that factor in the R-factor and by softening up the way you started the session. All right.

Yes, Jim?

*Male voice: I found it necessary a couple of times to handle the withhold prior to the appropriate moment for asking the question about withholds . . .*

Mm-hm.

*Male voice: . . . in beginning rudiments.*

Mm-hm.

*Male voice: Otherwise the pc is kind of sitting on something waiting for the appropriate question to come up. Is it all right to do that?*

Frankly, the pc will give you a withhold under “difficulties.” Havingness won't function too well under it. But in actual fact, by experience, if you take them in that order, you'll find out that you'll have a gain by doing so.

*Male voice: Mm-mm.*

Now, grabbing the withhold out of order of the Model Session, see – grabbing the withhold out of order was something we were doing However, there's very little advantage in doing so; very little advantage in doing so. Particularly on a pc that's been audited two or



three times at least, you see? He knows this is going to come up. Now he's liable to originate the withhold.

*Male voice:* Mm-hm. That's right. Then you merely handle it with TR 4.

*Male voice:* Mm-hm. But you don't give it any credence with the meter. You got it?

*Male voice:* Yes.

So any time a pc interjects and tells you something, for God's sakes give it the treatment, see?

*Male voice:* Right, but not necessarily check the rudiment question.

But don't now, because he gave it to you, check it.

*Male voice:* Quite. Okay.

See, always be perfectly happy about the thing. Also, you realize, to the degree that you don't use two-way comm in a Model Session you will tend to succeed better. Two-way comm during Model Session tends to slow down the progress of the session. Two-way comm in the body of the session, for sure. But two-way comm in the beginning rudiments, middle rudiments, end rudiments areas tends, more than anything else, to slow things down. But it's not forbidden.

*Male voice:* Mmm.

Now, you could handle it something on this order: Your R-factor at the beginning – the pc is all jumped-up. Now, instead of saying, “Well, the session is going to handle this,” you say, “Well, what's gotten into you?” See? No meter.

*Male voice:* Mm-hm.

See? Get him talking to you at least. And he says, “Oh, well, hell, I've got so many withholds you wouldn't be able to count the things,” and that sort of thing, and so forth. “And I've had an awful rough time of it and I haven't had any breakfast, dinner, lunch or supper and it's terrible and, the weather is bad and besides, I've got a headache,” and that sort of thing.

You let him run on, very short. And then let him have the business, you know, with a terrific ack. See? Acknowledge it. Acknowledge it. Now start the session. Now get these points together in order. And some order will establish itself in his confusion.

So there is an area where this could come about. It could come about before session, just in an ordinary friendly discussion. But there must be no meter connected with it. If the pc volunteers a withhold or tries to straighten out something with you – he says, “Now wait a minute before we get on with this, I was out with your girl last night, you know, and I – really this is weighing on my mind so that I know I couldn't go into session.” And so on.

You say, well, give him a cheery aye-aye or give him anything you want to say. you see? But no meter treatment.

*Male voice: Right.*

See, you don't ever dignify an out-of-orderness, see, by checking it or anything of this sort. That's actually Q and A with the pc.

Now what he's done, actually, is get the session started in his direction.

*Male voice: Mm.*

Now any of you, sooner or later, are going to run into a pc who is going to prevent the session and can keep control of the session with conversation. Therefore, you must actually learn to turn the spigot off with a good ack. you know, there's an awful lot of auditing time wasted under that heading. Pc's talking and talking and talking and talking and you never can get your session in edgewise. Well, blow him out of the water with a Tone 40 and get the session turned on and the orderliness of the session, the inevitability of where you're going, all of a sudden puts the pc under control.

Now, if the pc is able to introduce on you, Jim, an irrelevant step, he to that degree has taken the session out from underneath your control. Okay?

*Male voice: Right.*

*And they will try to do it.*

*Male voice: Mm.*

Okay. Anything else on that?

*Male voice: Yes. Not on that exactly . . .*

All right.

*Male voice: . . . on Model Session.*

Right.

*Male voice: It seems to me now we've eliminated any necessity to vary a question when the meter reads and the preclear says "no," . . .*

That's right.

*Male voice: . . . by getting in first. I wanted you to confirm this.*

You do not ever vary any of these questions. Forget varying the question – it came from old Sec Checking – you don't have to do it anymore anyhow. The only question that is varied is a What question – and that sometimes has to be tested in its variation till you get it to read. But on a rudiments question, no, you do not vary it.

And what's the rest of that you said?

You've eliminated any possibility or any need of varying the question . . .

*Male voice: By getting in, "That reads, there is a reaction on this in this session."*

Oh, well, when you get a read and the pc says, "No," and the meter says "Yes," you acknowledge the meter and to hell with the pc. See? At that particular time, don't ever worry about this making the pc wrong Because hell, he's wrong anyhow. See? The pc [auditor] said, "Do you have a present time problem?" *Clang!* You see? And the pc says, "No." And you say, "What is the problem?" You see? But you say, "That reads. What is the problem?" And the pc says, "Well, you're – you're right, I do have a problem." See?

Now, your rightness, all of a sudden, shows up and his wrongness doesn't necessarily show up, and he gets rid of it and he hands the thing to you. But never have any qualms whatsoever about crossing the pc's "No." Pc says "No" – you say, "Yes." Not snidely. He says, "Do you have a – do you have a present time problem?" And the pc says, "No." And you say, "*Ha-ha-ha-ha-ha, ha-ha-he-he-he-heh.*" I wouldn't advise that particular approach. But you just tell him, bang, right now. Just tell him, bang, right now, "That reads."

As a matter of fact, I don't contradict – I know that there's a trick in this. Thank you for asking this question. There's a trick in this. Your "That reads," doesn't contradict his "No." And the best way to handle this is never pay any attention whatsoever to the pc's "Yes" or "No" in rudiments. Don't ever answer it. Don't ever pay any attention to it. Only answer the meter. And you'll never make a feeling in the pc of countering what he has just said. That's a little bit of a – magic involved in it. He sees – he says – "Do you have a present time problem?" He says, "No," and you say, "That reads." He often will interpret it, if you've said to him in contradistinction to what he said, "That reads," he will argue this as a disputation. If you weren't paying any attention to it at all, whether he said yes or no – "Do you have a present time problem?" He says, "No," and you say, "That reads," you're just saying it reads here. You're not saying he was right, he was wrong

*Male voice: Mmmm.*

In other words that statement he made fell on the floor. You can't depend on that, as you learned in Sec Checking and that sort of thing and in Prepchecking, you could never depend on the pc's yes or no anyhow. The meter's always right. The pc is not necessarily always wrong See? You don't run on that basis. But where there is a difference between the pc and the meter, you pay attention to the meter. So on the yes or no point of Model Session, never even listen to the pc.

The pc also will very often louse you up on your second question, by the way. you say, "Do you have a present time problem?"

He said, "I beat my wife last night and she won't speak to me today."

You say, "Thank you. I will check that on the meter." Omit your second question. See? Just skip it. you will find out that this looks a little bit ragged at first but you'll eventually get into it. The pc who is really comfortable in the session will eventually settle down and wait for you to ask him the question. He'll let you run it. It's the eager pc that is jumping that one all the time. But nevertheless, just drop it out of the lineup.

Well, thank you for asking that question, Jim.

It's just answer always – talk to the meter after that first question. "That reads." "That's clean." That – just say that to the meter. You never even heard his "Yes" or "No." Don't pay any attention to it at all. Then you'll never be in a dispute on the thing

"Oh, did you say no? I'm sorry. I didn't hear you. I just – looking at the meter here which read. What was the problem? What is the problem, rather – What is the problem?"

But he says, "But I said no. I said no!"

"When did you say no? Oh, yeah? You said no. All right, thank you. Thank you. Very good. What was the problem?"

"Well, you're making the problem."

"All right. Very good. Very good. Thank you. We will check that on the meter. Do you have a present time problem? That reads."

"All right." And he'll tell you, you see, whatever it was.

He – you're just making him confront to that degree.

Thanks for asking that question, Jim.

*Male voice: Thank you.*

All right. Anything else? Yes?

*Male voice: Ron, how do you handle it when a pc, in the middle of a session, asks you a question?*

Asks you a question? All depends on what's the question about. I usually answer a pc's questions.

*Male voice: Uh-huh. Well, say it's about some auditing acknowledging*

What?

*Male voice: Say it's about some auditing.*

Well, give me an example.

*Male voice: Well, such as, "How do you run CCHs on an unconscious person?"*

Man, if a pc asked me that, I would say, "Thank you very much." I would say, "Thank you, very good. Thank you very much. Thank you for asking me. We're now going into end rudiments." Get end rudiments in and I'd give him a tenth of a second break and get beginning rudiments in and get him in session, man. It's – it'd be a terrible symptom of out-of-sessionness because he's not interested in his own case, you see.

*Male voice: Well, you – you – you don't think this would suddenly come up as a result of him uh . . .*

It would only come up if he was out of session.

*Male voice: Would it?*

See, he's not interested in his own case.

You got – you got what in-sessionness is? It's interested in own case and willing to talk to the auditor. Well, when a pc has totally lost track of what you're trying to do – I'm not making fun of your question, see – when he's totally lost track of what he's trying to do, when he hasn't a clue where you're going anyhow, his rudiments are wildly out, he'll start asking you irrelevant questions and chitchat and things of this particular character. First chitchat that a pc ever gives me, I start sliding the rudiments in with a coal shovel. I want to know what the hell happened. By the way, it doesn't happen to me. I don't get this trouble. Why?

Well, I don't get this trouble because I pick up an out-of-sessionness long before the pc does. Long time before the pc does. He didn't find out about it for an hour. He wouldn't. And get it corrected. And therefore, you never get an irrelevance to the session.

An irrelevance to the session – You say, how to handle this thing? Well how to handle it as a question? Well, by all means, acknowledgment, acknowledge it. It's an origin on the part of the pc. He has said something He's made some noises in the air. Yeah, yeah, handle it by all means.

But so as not to ARC break him up, and then realize that a question that from any basis of anything you are doing, my God, at least your middle rudiments are out. Something is out here, man. The banana peels have been scattered all over this walk. That would be it. And so what you would *do* about it is *get the pc in-session*. *Male voice: Mm-hm.*

As far as answering a pc's questions are concerned, I thought you were going to ask me some question of the type that pcs do ask when they are in session. Pc's sitting there steaming away and the steam's coming out of both ears and he feels this mass coming in on him and so forth. And he's saying, *Whoooow!* you know, he's very interested in all this and he's – "What's the tone arm saying?" You know? "What's the tone arm reading?"

And I say, "4.25. Thank you."

And the pc says, “4.25 – God, it sure feels like it in here!”

He says – he says, “What are we going to do now?” He says, “What are we going to do now?” You know? He says, “I’d like to find my goal today. What – what are we going to do now?”

And you're going to say, “Well, it's twenty minutes from session end. We're going to have to run end rudiments. We'll try to find your goal next session.” Whatever it is. “But I'm not going to make a botch of it. Anything you'd care to say?” You know?

The pc says, “Oh, well. All right.” The pc says, “My God,” he says, “What are you doing?”

And it suddenly dawns on you that you put in no R-factor on this whatsoever. You were supposed to be running 3GA today and you're prepchecking. And you just say what you're doing. You say, “I'm prepchecking I'm sorry I didn't tell you.” Cover it up that way.

Never be – never think that by admitting you were wrong, you lose control of a session. That's another trick. You don't. Do you know you only lose control of sessions by demanding to be right? When you didn't understand – the pc said – you say, “Point out something” And the pc does this, you know, and you say, “Well, I didn't see what you pointed at.” See? You don't say, “What did you point at?” like, “What's all this clumsy motion you're making with your hand?” That knocks him out of session.

And you say, “I.” Get the Chinese into it, see, the Japanese, “Blind, insignificant me, failed to perceive what wonderful, radiant you did.” The pc relaxes himself straight into session. There are many methods of control, as women could tell you.

But pc asks you a question – basically answer it if it has anything to do with his case or this session. Answer it. If it doesn't, why, give him a cheery aye-aye and then try to size up whether or not this pc is in-session or out of session or what's going on here, see? At least get your middle rudiments in. Do something Size it up. use it as a word of warning.

*Male voice: Mmm.*

See, that is a word of warning. He isn't in-session if he asks you something like that. Okay?

*Male voice: Yes. Well, a question that follows on, somewhat, is that the havingness is up at the beginning of middle rudiments and the beginning of end rudiments but goes down when the rudiments are finished. In other words, you don't get the swing of the needle. What does this mean?*

How would you know?

*Male voice: How would I know?*

Yeah.

*Male voice: Uh, finishing Havingness, running end rudiments, having time at the end of the session and run some more Havingness. And when you start, the swing is down.*

What are you doing Finishing off the body of the session with Havingness?

*Male voice: Well, you might get through your end rudiments . . .*

*Another male voice: It's a Havingness session.*

*Male voice: . . . so fast you've got another five minutes up your sleeve.*

*Another male voice: It's a Havingness session.*

*Male voice: It's a Havingness session.*

Oh, it's a Havingness session.

*Male voice: Yes.*

And you think you have observed here that the havingness was well up and went down?

*Male voice: Yes.*

By the time you hit the havingness at the end?

*Male voice: That's right.*

Nothing peculiar about this.

*Male voice: Mmmm.*

Havingness slides all over the place. I don't think you've noticed this consistently. You have noticed it on one pc and that pc is being inquired into. And actually – oh, I really shouldn't answer this question – it'll make you gun shy of asking them. I don't want to do that. The answer to the question, unfortunately, is a symptom of very rough auditing. It's a symptom of unconfidence.

I already made this test years ago. ARC break and havingness are interchangeable. In the presence of an ARC break, havingness goes down. When an ARC break is cleared up, havingness goes up. Those two things operate hand-in-glove. When havingness goes up, ARC breaks disappear. When havingness goes down, ARC breaks appear. You sometimes get an ARC break just because havingness is down.

Now, if there's anything rough at all about auditing, you'll get a dwindlingness of havingness. You see? If you're failing to get a rudiment in expertly, if you're not old smoothie himself, you see, in snapping these things off the line, you can expect the havingness to drop.

I'll give you an example. You say, "Did you – in – in – in – did – in – yeah. Did – did – did – this – this session – is there anything – any que – is there any – que – in this session, a question or command – uh, let's see, now – no, no, I got this – I got that wrong now. Wait a minute. Is there a question or command I haven't a . . . no, no, that's not – right."

You could pull something like that on a pc, give him a can squeeze test, see – here's your test, see; you've been auditing him smoothly, see – give him a can squeeze test and he gets a full dial drop at sensitivity O here. Then say your next rudiment in that garbled fashion. Quite sincerely garbled, you see – no gag about it. And – or do this, "In this session is there any question or command you have failed to answer – answer with me?"

And the pc says, "I don't think so – I don't – don't think so."

And you say, "Question, man, question, what question, what question – question. I said question, question, what – what question? What question didn't you answer in this session? That's what I want to know."

And the pc said, "Well, I don't know of any. I don't – I don't know – I don't think of any – right at the moment."

And you say, "Good. Thank you very much. Squeeze the cans."

Now, it doesn't have to be this flagrant. It just has to be that the pc's confidence in the auditor – actually, confidence in the auditor is proportional to the smoothness of the auditing from the pc's point of view, you see? And little bits, almost microscopic to somebody else, are rough spots on the road and you'll get a havingness drop.

Now, you find this out that if you smooth up on a pc the end rudiments – smooth up your approach with this pc on the end rudiments, see. Smooth it up so – oh man, is it glassy. You come down to the body – into the body of the session, you open up with your end rudiments, you go through to the end, you test it again. Your havingness, if anything, will have increased. See? That's what – confident, flawless handling See?

I've also been interested in this. Don't think it's necessarily you, you understand. Because a pc, early on in his auditing, tends to be more critical of the auditor than later. And if you take a pc who is having any kind of a rough time, casewise, and if you ask that pc every five minutes if you have made a mistake, the pc will have – find one that you have made. You're doing a flawless job of auditing, if we could theoretically put it that way, and ask the pc what mistake you have made in the last five minutes, and the pc will find one that you have made. It'll be a mistake such as, "You turned your head on your side when you asked – on its side, slightly, when you asked me the question." See, there'll be these little, microscopic things.



But these are all symptomatic of a very nervous pc who is not well grooved in, who is having a hard time anyhow and who has been roughly handled in life and has possibly not been too easily handled in earlier auditing

So, as your pc is well audited, this factor drops out. Let's keep your auditor constant, see; your auditor is always the same. And the pc havingness after the fifth session with that auditor will stay up, whereas in the first session would have gone down. Auditor's equal factor, see. you got your pc's change.

Now, similarly, your auditor is auditing better and better and handling things more and more expertly as the session goes along, you're going to get the reverse – you're going to get the same effect happening As your auditor gets better, your havingness stays up. See? If you can give – if you give a rough session, if your handling of the sessionness is rough, you can always expect havingness to drop.

I'm sorry to have to give you that answer.

*Male voice: No, that's all right. I like to hear it.*

All right. Okay. That's the answer to it. All right. Yes, Esta?

*Female voice: I'd like to know more about the importance of the tone of voice of an auditor when noticing something about the E-Meter like, let's say, all of a sudden you get a free needle – the auditor never saw a free needle, “My! Free needle!” Or, let's say, “Well, in this session have you tried to damage anyone?” The needle is null. “Fine! It's null!” Well, what effect can that have on . . .*

All right. You're asking me if tone of voice . . .

*Female voice: How important is it?*

. . . how important is tone of voice? It actually isn't tone of voice, honey. It is irrelevant remark, which is already at the end of the bulletin there in Model Session. It's irrelevant remarks. Now, you can make a remark without saying anything.

*Female voice: Yes.*

And it's still a remark.

*Female voice: Just by the expression.*

Yeah. All right. You say, “Do you have a present time problem?” You say – you say to the pc, “Do you have a present time problem?” The auditor wouldn't do this, but he said, “Do you have a present time problem?”

*Female voice: Yeah.*

“It's clean!”

*Female voice: I had that experience quite a few years ago. I had a free needle for a day and a half and the auditor was saying, "God, I never saw anything like it!"*

Yeah. He did? All right. Now, that is a remark.

*Female voice: Yes!*

And it's a whole series of remarks. They are understood. They express themselves in the tone of voice . . .

*Female voice: . . . startled.*

. . . and so on, and they are all bad. That's – that's very sour. That's a very sour thing to do. It is making a remark with a vocal expression.

“Have you ever been raped?”

And the pc says, “No.”

And the auditor says, “It's clean,” you know. And well, he's made a remark, hasn't he? All right. And then anything like that is a remark – an irrelevant remarks.

Now, this is as bad. You're running – you're running the pc and you say, “Look around here and find something – Hey, that – that – that needle just dropped a whole dial!”

And the guy says, “Huh? What? Who? Where? What does this have to do with anything? Which way did they go? Who – who was – who was that?”

See? And it enters a whole chain of stuff. This all comes under the head of the auditor putting the pc's attention on the auditor. And of course, the pc goes out of session because the attention comes off the pc's bank onto the auditor.

*Female voice: And the E-Meter.*

Therefore goes out – and similarly, E-Meter. And therefore the pc goes out of session with a crash. And you can knock a pc out of session with any of these irrelevant remarks.

Oddly enough, if you're too different even in voice tone you can do the -same thing You can say, “Well, I'm not going to make any irrelevant remark.” All right. “Do you have a present time problem? That is clean.”

And the pc says, “What's this?” see.

And once more you've achieved yanking the pc's attention out of session.

Now, there's something more serious about this. A sudden yankingness of attention off of a bank and onto the auditor – the auditing environment or the meter – a sudden yank in this particular line – causes those things which the pc has sort of been holding out from him with a thin, frail straw – see, he's got a straw punched into this mass out here and you all of a sudden scream behind his back, and he goes, “*Beeeeeyaaaah*, what the hell!” You know? And this –

he lets go of this straw and the mass will hit him right square in the puss. And after – you'll find it's an awful hard time digging the pc out underneath all of this mess now.

And you say, “Well, how did he get so caved in?” Well, it's something like being mystified. You're in the mines, you see. And the mine domes are all held up with pillars, you know. And you go down there with a bazooka or a sledge hammer or something of this sort and you knock all these pillars down. you see? And you say, “What are all those miners doing buried under all of that coal?”

See, it's just as idiotic to be amazed about that as it is to say, “*Good God! What the w – well, look at this meter! Wha – oh dear! Huh?*” You know?

And the pc says, “Where am I?” you know?

And you say, “Well, what's my pc doing buried under all that coal? You know, the needle stick now and – and I – what am I going to do?” And it's a hell of a thing to dig a pc out from underneath. It's one of the most serious things an auditor can do is a sudden shift of a pc's attention.

One of the ways you can do this is get him awfully absorbed in question one and then before he gets a chance to answer it ask him question two. you say, “Well, did you ever have a mother?”

*“Mother, wonder if I ever had a mother. Mother – mmmothermmmothermmmother-  
mmmmmm . . .”*

And you suddenly say, “Well, any parents at all?”

And what he's put his attention on down here is “Mother” all of a sudden goes on him, *snap!* Because he's holding it out with his attention, you might say, and his attention goes off of it suddenly and it's got spring to it and it'll – it'll give him the sensation of being hit.

Okay. Well, thank you for mentioning that, Esta. It's all under the heading of irrelevant question. It's irrelevant question, irrelevant remark, irrelevant action. It has nothing to do with anything, and it's all very damaging. The only place it's allowable at all is when you're trying to acknowledge the pc. Then you can make a little bit of a remark. And you can answer the pc's question when they appertain to the session. Always answer him, don't leave him in mystery.

I neither inform him when he doesn't want to be informed or withhold information from him when he wants it – about a meter. I never obtrude a meter on a pc. Never obtrude a meter on a pc unless the pc has already got the meter in the middle of the field. Pc says, “Is my needle dirty?”

And I say, “Yeah.”

He'd say, "Oh," and go on back into session, see.

He says, "Have you been auditing an awful lot of pcs lately?"

And I say, "Mm-hm. Thank you. Yes." And just let that one go by, see? It didn't have anything to do with the session. It's none of his business.

Pc says, "Are you doing this because you hate me?"

I pick up the missed withhold. Get in the mid ruds – something.

Question will come up, sooner or later . . . That answered your question, didn't it, Esta?

*Female voice: Yes.*

Yes. Question will come up, sooner or later, do you ever use the middle rudiments while using the beginning or end rudiments? The question will come up sooner or later.

I can imagine a situation where this should be – where this could happen. I could imagine. But I couldn't imagine an auditor who had a pc well under control having to do it.

Using a consistent, skillful auditing approach, getting the pc day after day, session after session, well into session – carrying it along and so forth – you'll find out, gets away from having to take any unusual steps at all. Actually getting all of the rudiments in, getting something done in the body of the session and getting the pc, you know, out of session at the end with the rudiments, you'll find out that that, skillfully done, answers in very short order – just a very few sessions and any need for anything tricky – it'll smooth out the pc's needle, give the pc better confidence. It'll cut back the pc's incidence to tantrums and so on. Actually not because you've done anything but be consistent. Not because you've only done that which is necessary to do. Only because you've been predictable. Just those factors alone will keep the pc from blowing up.

With what a relief some pc who's had a very Q-and-Aing auditor, all of a sudden finds out that the pc will go on in spite of being blasted out of the chair – I mean, the auditor will still go on.

Let me give you this. This pc has on many occasions gotten ARC broken and had an auditor quit – had the auditor just quit, see. Wow! Then the fel – auditor left him and he's stuck in it and so forth. Well, that's all what it would be. But it has an additional effect beside from a bank effect – he's kind of afraid the next auditor will do it, see?

So you're now – now he's got an auditor and, he goes, *blaaooooow!* you know, and he splatters all over the ceiling and he knocks everything off the table and he screams and so forth. And the auditor asks the next auditing question. So he screams a little bit and the auditor says, "I'll repeat it. I'll repeat the auditing question," and does so. So he answers it.

And all of a sudden sits back with a tremendous sigh of relief and goes right on, just walking along beautifully.

What's happened there? His confidence has come up. His reality's come up. And he finds out he can trust the auditor to audit him. That's all that's really happened. He realizes he's going to get some auditing.

And the funny part of it is, you can sometimes be quite rough. You can say, "Sit down there! Sit down in the chair! Now pick up these cans! I'll repeat the auditing question."

And the guy says, "Wow, you know! That's terrific. That's real good. you know? You – that's great."

And if you did the reverse and did the kind thing, why, he'd just be – he'd just go all to pieces. See? He'd get worse and worse. The more you tried to do something about it, the worse he'd get.

I'm not saying be tough with such a person. I'm just talking about predictability and predictability alone will hold somebody in-session regardless of whether you're doing anything with the mind or not. It's a factor which you mustn't neglect.

And therefore, the more irrelevant actions you take or the more unusual things you do, such as getting in the middle ruds while you're doing the beginning ruds, the more unusual things that you're doing, such as getting in the end ruds while you're getting in the middle ruds, see, anything that you're doing that's the least bit off-base runs you at the risk of seeming unpredictable. And it actually works up to more of a curse than it does a cure.

What you should concentrate on is predictability of saying the exact auditing question, doing the exact textbook response, see. Going on that way just absolutely exactly and give that a chance to work. And you'll find out in two or three sessions one of the roughest pcs you ever had is sit – sit in the pc's chair, you know, and he just begins to smile like the Cheshire cat, you know? Needle gets smooth. Case starts to move. He starts to blow things that he never blew before. And the only thing, perhaps, that you introduced into the whole thing – you understand getting rudiments in outside of this doesn't really introduce anything at all except getting the pc into session, the auditor real, the session predictable, things smooth, taking off anything that happened in the session.

But it's all predictability. And get it under the heading of predictability. And as soon as you understand it from a standpoint of predictability, then you'll see that it itself has a virtue and it itself does something. Now the person has confidence in you so then he dares go into session, so he dares blow something. Otherwise they're sitting, you know, like a gopher on top of his mound, you know? Watch, watch, watch, watch, watch, watch, watch, watch, watch, you know? And they don't go into session so they don't blow anything.

Predictability alone permits them to go into session.

Now, when you add to that the tremendous strength and power of the buttons you are using in beginning, middle and end rudiments, how can you miss? But the first factor you must strive for is predictability of use – that you must strive for. When you've got that, then you'll find out the better you can make that, the less unusual you have to be and the more you will do for the pc.

A very skittery pc and a very nervous pc is best handled with a simple predictability. The more nervous they are, the more predictable you should be. The more dispersed they are, the more steady you should be. And you'll find out that'll work just like absolute magic. That has nothing whatsoever to do with the buttons you are using.

By the time you have audited a pc three or four sessions, no matter what you are running, if this person isn't swearing by you and if this person isn't deeply in-session every time they go into session and so forth, then your handling of this must be unpredictable to that pc. And you are actually not doing anything odd. What you're doing will be unpredictable. You'll be doing something off the rails here and there.

One thing I wish to apologize to you about is those who just learned the first Model Session, I wish to apologize for having to give them another Model Session to learn instantly. But there is this one point, there is this one point I would like to make. I wouldn't do it for worlds, see, I just wouldn't do it for worlds unless it made it that much better.

Now, we're winding up to go for broke here on clearing and there's the course and direction that we're steering. I don't want to get well into this and then have to change horses. You see? So I'm trying to change horses here so we can hold it stable from here on.

Everything I'm trying to do is in the direction of a greater stability and we're just now achieving the results, broadly, by auditors who are well trained. And I don't think there's a person that we can't clear. If we can get our hands on him, we can clear him.

All right. But it all depends on the consistency of application of what we are doing. We know all the rules. It depends on whether or not all those rules will be applied.

And along with this goes predictability. And you'll find out that I am less and less violating this particular factor. I've only violated it up to the point where I find out we have a very nice workability and there you'll see it stopped.

You haven't heard a thing about Prepchecking for a long time. I did find we had a hole the other day. We find – didn't have our Havingness Processes, all of them, on one sheet of paper. I was quite amazed that we didn't have them all down and so I've got to fill that in, and here and there you'll find one that is filled in or needs filling in. But basically I'm trying to – trying to create and hold a standard here.

And don't be too dismayed when you find something isn't quite as standard as you thought it was, because I'm always willing to learn, I'm always willing to improve something. But I'm also very careful of improving things that are working. It's only where we need improvement that we keep putting them in.

So I hope you'll be very successful with this new Model Session. I hope it will answer everything up the way you think it ought to go. Use it though, just as it's written to make a predictability come along with it.

If you have tremendous difficulty, consistently and broadly, with any one of its lines or any one of its wordings, I guarantee you, I will change that. But that would be the only reason I would. Okay?

Thank you very much.

Good night.