

HOW TO AUDIT

A lecture given on
10 January 1963

Thank you.

All right. This is the second lecture, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, 10 January AD 13. And I've told you all you have to know now, so there isn't anything here to lecture about in this particular lecture. And you have become wise beyond measure, here, in the last hour.

I'll talk to you about the implications of processing. We have had a problem for all these years of auditing somebody and everything was fine and then auditing another guy and everything was fine and then auditing a third guy and he starts tearing up the neighborhood. Well, this comes under the general heading – and only this heading, only this heading – of missed withholds. And the biggest missed withhold you can have, of course, is the missing answer to the auditing question. He didn't give you the answer. He didn't put the item on the list. That is the biggest one.

This is so gigantic, that if you did that right all the time, you practically could omit pulling missed withholds. But you can't omit pulling missed withholds and I'll tell you why.

On your May third bulletin, I think it is, a great many manifestations of missed withholds are given. And amongst those are dope-off, boil-off, ARC break and that sort of thing. Now, in Routine 2, you're pulling missed withholds by the carload lot. How many missed withholds do you think are in one Routine 2 track item? See, that's ... Well, when you miss that whole package, this of course makes a terrific, crashing missed withhold, see, because it's a conglomerate mess, as well as a mass.

Now, you however, have to pull and continue to pull the little icky-dicky ones, you know, about "I bit my fingernails last night," you know? Because you're liable to make this mistake: You say, there is so much unconsciousness in the bank that of course a pc will go anaten – to use one of the old-time words – will go unconscious, under the impact of this list. And brother, that isn't true.

A pc won't go unconscious under the impact of an item, even when you fire it straight to them and shift their attention. They won't go unconscious by simply reading lists. They won't get dopey or groggy simply by reason of reading lists. None of these things are going to happen.

It sounds so reasonable to you that under this much impact – and reading down one of these very vital rock slamming lists back to them again – because of the anaten contained in the list itself, natively and naturally, that they're going to dope off a little bit, that you tend to

miss the fact that that's the little "bite the fingernails" missed withhold that you didn't get in the session.

Any time – now, mark this – any time that you see a pc go dopey, boil off, anything like that – or even go groggy and start shutting their eyes and slumping down on nulling, you pull up right there and get those nearly-found-outs.

Now, of course, this is aided and abetted if you have just got through missing an item on a list. But the missing item on the list doesn't cause that anaten. It merely gives it body. They've got to have a PT type nearly-found-out before they will go under on a list or as a result of an item. In other words, an item won't do it all by itself and a list of items won't do it all by themselves. Now, just mark my words, here: It's just not *possible!* I can't say this too strongly, I know this phenomena of boil-off and that sort of thing. It is just not possible for a pc to go anaten, groggy, boil off, without a near present-time missed withhold.

You give them an item, pc thinks of an item, goes anaten; you give them an item, they go anaten; you read a list to them, they go anaten; they groggy and, you know, *thuuuh*. That's not items! Now listen to me: that's not items! They've been biting their fingernails last night, that's what that is! They haven't told you, that they've actually been haunting the door of the theory room, getting the questions being asked currently on bulletin so-and-so, you see. They've been doing something. They've been carefully contemplating busting rule 28, see? Something is awry, here. It takes that present time booster to knock them out.

And the ordinary behavior of a missed-withhold-free pc during listing and nulling and receiving of items and thinking of items, is bright awake! That is the expected behavior. Not grogged-out at all. Bright awake. Oh, they can close their eyes so that they don't watch your pencil wiggle, or something. But they're bright awake. That is your expected attitude on the part of the pc.

Now, during nulling this is terribly, terribly important, because you are depending on reading an item once to get it to R/S. And although, on test after test, Prehav Some ticks would register, even though the pc is out, a meter will not rock slam while the pc is anaten. Now, that's pretty dangerous, isn't it?

You're counting on that meter rock slamming just by reading the item once. And you won't see the rock slam if the pc is boiled off. Pc can't tell you the last six items, five items, three items, four items, didn't hear them, because he was boiled off. Hm! He wouldn't have rock slammed on them, either. So that is enough for you to have some cold chills about ...

And you see that pc sitting there and he goes *zzwhaawel youuummgo* mummm khh. Somewhere – anywhere on that gradient scale you cannot count on the meter rock slamming. You can count on it doing a tick; you can count on it doing a tiny reaction, if you hit something significant, which is all we were counting on, on doing Prehavs-assessments. But you can't count on it rock slamming. There's just insufficient attention present to charge up the package so it'll slam. So that is a marvelous opportunity you have there of missing a slamming item. That's enough to give you cold chills, unless you know it. Now that you know it, that's easy.

Now, that will work the same way on rocket reads, and so forth, on goals checkouts, and this is still data for 3-21. An anaten pc won't rocket read. Anaten pc won't rock slam. Ticks, yes. But not – not a good healthy, crashing manifestation like a rocket read or a rock slam, see. They're not that active, because they're not there.

Now, you get yourself an accustomation of keeping pcs bright awake. Not using the Dianetic method – Dianetic methods are frowned on these days. The FBI thinks that they're very bad, so that ... Used, to kick them in the soles of the feet. That was the method of bringing a pc awake. That's right! That's right. You didn't audit them when they were boiling off – you kicked them on the soles of the feet and woke them up.

There were two schools of thought on this. One, you went on auditing them, even though they were boiling off and wait until they woke up, and the other school of thought was that you kicked them on the soles of the feet and woke them up and went on auditing them. And finally I remember during Suzie's day, in the Wichita Foundation, I think the accepted method was if they began to snore, was the borderline. And you kicked them on the feet if they began to snore, but otherwise you left them alone.

Had a Director of Training there in those days – he used to blow bubbles; his method of boiling off – how to keep from getting audited.

The point here is that, that was way back when. Now midway along the line, I found out why people boiled off, what boil-off actually was. It actually is a flow which is run too long in one direction. That's what boil-off, anaten, and so forth – a flow, running too long in one direction. That is to say, this person audits – gives an auditing command too long in one stuck flow, he can eventually walk into a situation where he is groggy. Now, that's essentially what it is.

Now, where does this fit in with the missed withhold? A missed withhold is a restrained flow. And because it is a restrained flow, any effort to outflow by the pc while he is busy inflowing causes him to inflow harder, and when the pc has a missed withhold, he's inflowed as far as he can go and he's very, very prone to boil-off. In other words, he's holding back a flow, see. So he gets a stuck flow real quick. Anything sticks! You get that?

The withhold that has been excited, that is restimulated, see, the restimulated withhold there, causes this flow to lock up. Right now! And it's a very @y thing. You might get a subjective reality on this someday. Somebody is very, very industriously pulling these things and you all of a sudden find yourself bright awake. You give him the one which was knocking you out. You go *thuu!* Bright awake. Room gets bright, everything gets bright, see?

And you're sitting there holding on to a withhold and things start to get dim, and very often a trained auditor being audited ... A trained auditor being audited actually doesn't do the same things that raw meat does. You know, I've noticed that they keep their own rudiments in and do various things and they always have – no matter how deeply interested they are on this and that – and there's always a small section of one eye cocked on the professional skill and aptitude of the auditor auditing. Always is, he can't escape it! Anyway, not even an ARC break involved – he's just keeping an eye on it.

Found Suzie out of session here. A few weeks ago I was auditing Suzie and I found her out of session, I just knew it wasn't quite right, so I pulled a missed withhold on the thing and she'd been sitting there very brightly and alertly, finding out how I was getting that many items called. Tricky. So even shell do it.

Now, any pro will do this kind of thing and it doesn't constitute very much. But it's probably a bigger trick to keep a pro in session than it is raw meat. Raw meat is attitudinized and they don't know how you're supposed to do it right, and auditing is ... Even rather crude auditing looks flawless to them and you give them some real smooth auditing, my God, they don't know what hit them! There's no thought of any criticism in this department, don't you see.

But there it is. The fellow's sitting there, he gets this little withhold and – now mark this – the session withhold quite commonly keys in a pre-session withhold. You almost never get the session withhold as the sole source of the anaten. So that's very interesting. See? In other words, session withholds tend to key in missed withholds.

In other words, we didn't have any missed withhold at the beginning of session. See, we had – it wasn't keyed in so you hadn't been missed. And then something happens in session, and ... You see, we've cleaned it up beautifully, "Since the last time I audited you is there anything you have failed to reveal?" You see, that's fine. So we obviously got the last twenty-four hours clean as a wolf's tooth. Nothing showed. This will explain a mystery to you, maybe, if you've ever wondered about this.

And then halfway through the session, the fellow starts to say something, doesn't say something, forgets what it is, then remembers and then thinks he'd better not say it and starts to look a little groggy and then you try to pull this missed withhold: "*In this session*, is there anything you've failed to reveal?" And it doesn't pull.

And you say, what's coming off around here? Pc just gets edgy. Well, of course, the withhold you're looking for is not in the session. Got that?

Audience: Mm-hm.

The key-in is in the session. But the withhold isn't. Well, nearly found out, "In this session, is there anything I have nearly found out?" is quite fortuitous and usually takes care of the situation. But an auditor should know this as part of his bag of tricks.

PTPs don't necessarily key in. Willingness to talk to the auditor remains the same. Actual overts and that sort of thing, they tend to come off at the beginning of session. But a session, something happens in a session can key in a missed withhold that happened before the session. So that's why that has to be kept as a random rudiment. And fully expect, in a session, that something the pc did and was missed day before yesterday will key in. See, it doesn't happen every time. But it happens often enough to get in your road trying to make this person wake up. You got that?

You – you'll see that every once in a while, you'll see that every once in a while, it isn't every time. But, pc holds something back, doesn't give you an item. You're listing, doesn't give you an item. "Is there anything you failed to reveal?" Gives you the item and gets

groggy. Says, “Yeah, I didn’t reveal this item, so-and-so,” you expect him to brighten up, see. You say, “Whoa, wait, wait. Why doesn’t he suddenly come up here, you know, and start in here batting’?” Instead of that he gets groggier.

Somehow or another this item keyed in. Every once in a while, enough to make it part of the auditor’s bag of tricks, see, something keyed in that he did last week or yesterday. So, never fail to – never be completely unwilling to uncork a whole track sort of withhold question. Oh, dangerous, it’ll keep you busy! But listen, it’ll get you out of more trouble than it’ll get you into.

Like, “Has anybody missed a withhold on you?” you see, or, “Is there anything anybody nearly found out?” Horrifying! Here we expect this guy to sit there and give you now two hundred trillion years’ worth, and make it a terrific missed withhold all over the doggone place. Well, in actual practice, in actual practice, it will get you out of more trouble than it gets you into. Doesn’t say that it won’t get you into trouble! But it’ll get you out of more.

Sometimes I’ll date it on this, you know, on the basis, of “In the past week”, even though I’ve got between-session rudiments in, you see. Now, that’s used that way only when you *can’t* wake up the pc. You got that? You start uncorking this kind of a trick – you understand this – and you uncork this trick of just broaden that missed withhold question, if you can’t wake the pc up, ordinarily and generally. Like “In this session, is there anything I nearly found out? In this session, is there anything I nearly found out? In this session, is there nearly found out? You got that? Fine.” The pc’s bright. Oh, well, don’t break anybody’s back, see. That’s fine. So that did it. So you’re all set.

But, let’s supposing the reverse happens. “In this session, is there anything I nearly found out?”

“Glug. Uh, so-and-so.”

“In this session, is there anything-.”

“aonnowsmmsdunn...”

“In this session, is there anything I nearly found out?”

“Uyuhyuyu ...”

Or worse than that, you put it in at ten minutes past the hour and you find him boiling off at twenty minutes past the hour again! Now, you just got to wrap that thing up, and fire it, man, because you’ve got a keyed-in nearly-found-out. It didn’t exist, to amount to anything, during the session, up to this point. But the session for some reason or other, which we needn’t even bother to inquire into, is keying in this missed one. And it’s now keyed in. And it wasn’t keyed in at the beginning of session. And that causes and causes and causes.

Now, something else you should know about a missed withhold that I hate to have to tell you, but you’re old enough to know the facts of life. One of them is that not all missed withholds are on the second dynamic. I thought that might ... People have been known to let air out of other people’s tires. And you start steering missed withholds, by dynamics, or

something weird like this, you're going to get yourself into more trouble, you're going to start more unfinished lists ... So you just keep this question pretty broad and pretty general.

Now, you do have to know this about the nearly-found-out question: It is a left-hand button. In other words, a suppressor-type button and does not necessarily read on the meter.

So, you run into a situation where your pc looked a little bit groggy early in the session and you said, "In this session, is there anything I nearly found out about you?" and he gives you an answer and that's good enough, he brightened up, and fifteen minutes later he's twice as groggy as before, you know exactly what's happened: He's got a pre-session, earlier-than-the-session nearly-found-out, of some kind or another, that your question is not capable of eliciting an answer to. And the thing for you to do is to precheck the nearly-found-out question.

I don't care whether you give a time limit or not. It's going to do you a lot of good to straighten this pc up to that degree. Doesn't come under the head of no auditing. Auditing a pc who is boiling off, while you're reading lists to him or trying to get lists from him, amounts to no auditing. See, this is the point where no auditing is not no auditing, definitely. Well, you can't do anything with a boiling off pc, his needle won't slam. So, what have you got to do with him? You've got to ... Because it's a left-hand button, you know, Suppressed, Careful of, Nearly found out – Failed to reveal comes under that heading too. Those are all left-hand, suppressive, buttons. They do not cause a thing to read, they *prevent* things from reading. All the other buttons cause things to read unnecessarily. So that's fine, you can see all those. These are visible to the naked eye.

We've added one button recently, to big mid ruds, that I ought to make some reservation about, and that is Anxious about tends also to be a left-hand button. But now we're getting into the very big mid ruds, when we add that. But Mistake, Suggest, Decide, Protest, these all make things read. They don't keep things from reading. Your suppressor buttons over here, they prevent a read from occurring.

Actually you realize that you can check out a rock slamming item with Suggest, Invalidate and Mistake just about as alive as they can get. You realize that? The ones you've got to worry about are Suppress, Careful of, and Nearly found out or Failed to reveal and, to a less extent, Anxious about. Now, of course, a Protest follows on the heels of a Nearly found out, or something of that sort, or a Failed to reveal and so it tends to be the point where these two tie together – the left and right-hand side. You actually, you know, can use Protest as a random rudiment. Did you know that?

All right. Now, as we inspect the pc during nulling ... Of course a pc who is boiling off can't list, because he won't talk. That's very obvious. But it is less obvious – a pc slumped back in the chair, particularly if he's not snoring – it's less obvious that this pc is suffering from lots of unconsciousness, see? That's less obvious. You got to keep an eye on that. Got to keep an eye on that. And the only cure you have today is not kicking them in the soles of the feet – they've been known to ARC break when this occurs and it doesn't do much good because it'd just ARC break and close your meter out – the thing to do is to get off the nearly-

found-outs. And if the session nearly-found-outs don't cure it, why, expect a lot of the time, if it goes down to severe a thing as boil-off, to have to cure it with a much broader time base.

Now, there is – there's fairly important data in running Routine 2s. And the way you prevent this thing from happening in a co-audit – you go down the line of a co-audit well, HPA student, something like that, or public co-audit of some kind – one of the things you must watch as an Auditing Supervisor is that somebody hasn't grogged out, particularly during a nulling session. That you must watch. And the way – the best way to cure this – the best way to cure this, is to sit in on it. Don't try to teach the auditor how to get the missed withholds off the case, for God's sakes. And take it for granted, if it's happening, that it's out of the session. Don't even bother to put in the session mid ruds, don't you see?

Just swing the random rudiment right in against the guy. "Is there anything we nearly found out about you?" When you say "we," you also give it a time limit, because he's probably only been around for a week or a month or six months or something like that. And see if you get a response on the part of the guy. Worm it out of him. Or get his auditor to run it totally repetitive. Say, "Just sit there and run this for the next twenty minutes," see. Then when you finally see the pc is starting to ARC break on it, decide it's flat and tell him he can go on listing.

I mean, there's crude ways of adjudicating and handling these things as rather – as well as neat ones, you know? See, the pc's starting to look desperate. You know? You look down the line and see this pc, kept your eye on him, he's looking desperate by this time! "Is there anything we nearly found out about you?" The auditor's been going on.

Go over, peer over the shoulder and grab hold of the guy's meter, "Is there anything we nearly found out about you? Yeah, that's good and flat, go on and list. That's it." Something like that. Doesn't take any more than that.

Because, let me tell you, it's pretty gross – you get it on the public like that, it's a fairly gross manifestation. But it's a very fine thing, what really put him to sleep. That's what's amusing about it: the slightness of the thing that actually kicked him off, the slightness of the key-in. Maybe it keyed in something important behind that. Maybe you got that, maybe you didn't, maybe it won't key in and maybe it will. That's beside the point.

You sometimes ask – you get this down searchingly and the pc has just got through saying, "Well I-I uh – I nearly found out – I-I nearly found out something! I-I nearly found out what the item was!" Or something, you see? "Then I realized I hadn't," and so forth. This'll be the type of answer you'll see him suddenly brighten up a little bit, you know? I nearly found out. You know? The thing is reverse end to. But that's perfectly acceptable as an answer, on a broad, generally, "Was anything nearly found out?" And then you – he still – you could see that if you went on doing whatever you're doing he's going to go off again. So you press this question, just another time or two, and all of a sudden he says, "Well, actually, this morning, Herbie offered me a ride and he nearly found out that I thought that it was too dangerous." You know, a little thing like this. It wasn't any vast deeds or anything of the sort, you know.

And all of a sudden the pcs bright, as awake as a gopher, see? “Where’s the list?” You know? “Well, fine! Where’s the list?” You read sometimes too much significance into these things. It’s how it locks into the bank, don’t you see?

Maybe the guy is about to give you an item that you won’t get for another session or something, or maybe he’s about to give you an item, “a coachman,” you see, and anybody refusing a ride in a coach, this is a terrible moral break, or something, you know, or something like that.

You don’t care much how it adds up, you actually don’t care about the significance of it. It’s just that is what knocks the pc out. And you just mustn’t audit a knocked-out pc. That’s all. You got all the cures for it, why not use these cures?

Something else – you’re probably all at sixes and sevens: We’ve been knocking auditing around and giving it a bad name lately. Doesn’t mean you shouldn’t be able to do it well. You’re probably wondering these days what is a Model Session? What is a goal finder’s Model Session? What are all these things, you know? Well, I’ll tell you. I use as much auditing as I have to. And that’s what I use as a Model Session these days. And it certainly has these elements. You can’t really reduce a session now, for safety’s sake, knowing what we know about goals. You can’t reduce a session below this and still be fairly safe.

Before session, ordinary, usual routine is, of course, you get the room all right and adjust the pc’s chair, get his can squeeze and put in the reality factor. You certainly do those things, because this thing could go very awry if you didn’t do at least those things. Look around and see if the room’s all right. Adjust the pc’s chair, get a can squeeze and put in an R-factor for the session. Now, that’s certainly minimal action. You’d get into trouble if you took any less action than that.

And then you have to give him a start of session. And you give a pc a start of session, of course, with a Tone 40 and you have him there and then you find out if the session started for him. This is – also you could get into trouble a little bit if you didn’t find out. And then, “What goals would you like to set for this session?” You certainly can’t avoid that, now. But, in actual fact, that could stand a trifle of an overhaul. It’s distractive to have goals for life or livingness come after the session goals. They probably should be in reverse. I wouldn’t say that we’re putting them in reverse, I’m just pointing out that that improvement would be an improvement, but we are not at this time using it. Got it? Be released in due course, if it’s ever released. I’m just pointing out to you there’s a possible improvement there.

Goals for the session, goals for life and livingness. All right, you’re fine so far. Now, it depends utterly on whether or not you are going to do a listing or a nulling session. Depends utterly what you do now. But let me tell you, that if you had a good complete list yesterday and the needle was very free and flowing and you thought you were all set to null in this session today and the pc’s needle is free and flowing today, and you do more than take down the goals and say, “All right we’re now going to null this list: *pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa*.” You’re taking a risk if you do more than that because it becomes no-auditing. You see that?

Audience: Mm-hm.

You thought the list was complete yesterday and the needle's clean as a wolf's tooth today, and the pc is all eager-eyed and bushy-tailed, and we're all set to fire here and so forth, just – well, you got the goals down, all right, you say, “Now, I'm going to – going to null this list.”

There you go, start nulling! Take your chances on whether or not he has any between-session mid ruds out. Because generally he's so interested in the list that these are more or less pushed aside.

Now, only get worried if he starts to boil off. Now, he's going to boil off – why, there you are. You better get in your – not mid ruds – you just better get in your random rudiment on a nearly-found-out basis. “Since – ” we don't care how you word it, just as long as you pull those missed withholds and get them quick and get back there to doing what you're doing. If your missed withholds didn't do it, the list isn't complete and that's all there is to that. Simple – add to the list. Now, that's what's known as really short-handing sessions, right down to nothing.

All right, pc – now, let's take a listing session. We do exactly those things, in other words, we give them the basic form of an auditing session, listing session. *Pocketa-pocketa-pocketa*. What are you doing on a listing session ever getting in a missed withhold or any other damn thing? What you doing? What – what are you doing? Why? “Start of session. What goals would you like to set for this session? Any goals you'd like to set for life or livingness?”

“All right, we've got this list, ‘Who or what would oppose a catfish?’ All right. What item would you like to put on this list now? All right, here we go. Who or what would oppose a catfish? *pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa*.” I don't care whether the needle's dirty, tying itself in knots, rock slamming; to hell with it, who cares what it's doing. You understand?

Audience: Um-hm.

Because that action is far more therapeutic in cleaning up the needle, than anything else you could do and it's probably dirty because of the pc's thoughts about doing it! You got that? So, listing session – list! Don't do anything else. If you can't hold the pc in-session or something like that – or something like that – the pc won't sit there and list, why that's another thing. Now, if the pc stops listing... And I say it's another thing, that's a missed withhold situation ... But if the pc stops listing, what are you doing getting in a dozen mid ruds? You know there's only two mid ruds that stops a pc from listing – Suppress and Invalidate. And those are the primary mid ruds.

They're the primary rudiments, as far as mid ruds are concerned – Suppress and Invalidate. Very often, if a pc is on a fairly hot list, you never have time to get in more than Suppress and Invalidate and he's off to listing again. Well, why try to get in anything else? Why try to get in anything else? Just call those two the primary rudiments and if your listing interrupts and the pc stops listing, get in the Suppress, get in the Invalidate and there we go. Suppress is by a Prepcheck, by the way. And fire on down that list. And! And-and-and-and you get in the Suppress and he gives you a suppress and a suppress and then you ask Suppress

and he gives you an item. You want to get the case tied in an absolute knot? Don't take the item. Just abandon Suppress and Invalidate right there. You're not going to do anything more with them. Just going to go on listing. Got that? You're not going to Bay another word about it!

“Anything you suppressed?”

“Well, actually, I was suppressing here – I got an item. I got an item. A waterbuck. Yeah. There's a waterbuck and a caterwump and...”

You just – to hell with it, see. Skip any of that other stuff, see? Go right on listing, see. Because why did you put them in? You put them in to get the pc to start listing! Now, you're not going to sit there and try to get your auditing question cleaned up. He hit something and there was something he failed to reveal there, or something of the sort, in actual fact. But it'll all come out on Suppress and Invalidate.

Now, if you can't get him to list again, get in the rest of them. But I've never seen it happen. I've yet to see this happen, where you had to get in more rudiments than Suppress and Invalidate to get the pc back to listing. See? So, what I know is – I'm talking now about just cutting short corners around auditing, see?

All right, we get down to the end of the day's session and we discuss what we're doing here and where we have gotten to and we put in a bit of a reality factor on where we are going and what we – don't necessarily put it in for the session tomorrow, but just say where we got and that's it. And then say that's the end of the body of the session, you see. And that closes off the body of the session.

And now, what I've been doing, is cock the meter up here to 64 on a Mark V and say, “In this session was the room all right?” And pull any stuck reactions on the thing and get the needle back to flowing again. In other words, get him out of the auditing environment as the most important thing that you could do for the pc to keep him from being stuck in the session.

Just that one. “In this session was the room all right?” Clean it. Sometimes you find a pc starts protesting this question and that sort of thing. Well, take it easy and do it next session too. You know, say, all right, he's protesting the thing and he's probably nervy and there's probably a missed withhold, something like that. Don't beat his brains out because of the thing. But you can also assume there's probably something wrong with the room. Get your auditing question answered, but don't necessarily clean this thing up, you know – grind him to death.

Here's what I'm trying to do. I'm trying to give you the answer to the pc who is inventing answers, so he can answer the question, you understand.

One of the best ways to clear that up, “Is this question being protested?”

“Oh, yes.”

“Have you invented any answers?”

“Oh, so-and-so and so-and-so.”

“Oh, well, thank you very much.”

And then just don't touch it. Don't ask the question again. Just come off of it, see. You understand? Because it's more important to pull the protest and the invented answer, than it is to try to get the auditing question driven home between his ears, because it's just a courtesy. You're trying to get him out of the auditing environment.

I refer to you – to a book which is not liked at all by the *phew* the – the department of the government, *phew – Scientology 8-8008*. Now, that talks about a thetan in the physical universe, see. And actually all the thetan is doing is stacking himself up against the physical universe and batting around like the blue bottle in the cage. And if you want to do something to free him up out of his session, well, you just ask him if the auditing room was all right. You get the modus operandi? Then you've got the thetan and the physical universe, and you've got the sixth and seventh dynamics – these straighten up and the pc feels better, you understand?

Sometimes they become very, very gratuitous and start inventing answers for it. Why, then, you're in trouble and you don't bother to clean the thing up, you assume there's probably a missed withhold or something of the sort, or he feels nerved up because of the session. You're not going to do anything about it anyhow with the room. You got it? See, you're not going to do anything about the room. So get the invent – invented answers, the protest off – get off of it. Go ahead and do it next session again. Don't be scared off just because the pc has objected to it, because he probably was objecting to it because his mind was on something else, see? In other words, you don't have to kill that one with shotguns, axes ...

Now, we move over into the next action, which is the can squeeze. And normally, you ask this other question, "In this session was the room all right?" to cut down the number of times you have to run Havingness. Because very often, if the pc has answered this question and cleaned it – "Is the room all right?" – his havingness will snap back, quite often, and you'll save auditing time by answering the question. This is all in the direction of saving auditing time.

And then you get the can squeeze and you ask him to squeeze them up. Make sure that you've got the same thing. And if your pc has actually been beat up in this session, about the best thing you can do for that pc toward the end of session is not beat him to death with a lot of rudiments. You know, you normally are getting short-timed, toward the end of session. You could very easily – because of the time nature of your sessions, you see – you could very easily leave him with only part of the mid ruds squared away or something like that. Or in an HGC, and so on ...

So your – actually your best trick is to run some Havingness. If you don't know the pc's Havingness Process – what are you doing auditing a pc whose Havingness Process you don't know? "Feel that," "Touch that," and "Notice that," are the best Havingness Processes there are. And normally any pc will respond to one or another of those. It's a very funny thing, though, they very often don't respond to "Touch that," when "Feel that," is their Havingness Process, and vice versa. You tell me why, but it's true! It's true. I figured out the other evening it might be – I was auditing – it might be that "Feel that" requires more confront than "Touch that." There might be something in that. It's only a few commands of this thing.

I was watching a TV Demonstration you were given the other day, and so on, and some – whoever it was who was running that Havingness on that pc was going far, far too long, man. It only takes a few commands. You just want to get that can squeeze restored. How long does it take to get a can squeeze restored? Well, let me tell you something. You can start running the bank with Havingness with the greatest of ease. We're talking now in the direction of about a dozen commands or slightly less. See? And if we're not sure of the pc's Havingness Process, we're certainly not going to run more than five commands of a strange process.

All we're trying to do is just run this pc's havingness can-squeeze test back up, that's all we're trying to do. And that takes very little time. So, you snap him back to battery with Havingness and that's your – and then take up goals – never take up life or livingness – never, never go over your life or livingness goals with a pc. Just go over the goals: session goals.

Now, you take up gains and you take down whatever gains the pc says and you make your own comments over on the side of the thing and the pc can sit there and hold onto the cans while you scribble down whatever comments you make, too. And don't take the cans out of the pc's hands until the session is ended. Don't fall for a practice like that. Because it gives him a double change. It ends the session materially before it ends the session mentally. And it tends to kind of throw him out of balance a little bit.

All right, you got your goals, you got your gains, you say, "Is there anything you @e to say?" and the pc says, "Oh, yes, yes, so-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so." Something like that. Usually it's a question. "Did my tone arm go down?" or something like that. Answer it! Be crisp.

Now, because you're started – you've started the cycle of ending the session, don't err ... I myself make this mistake occasionally, I all of a sudden get interested, you know, again in the session. Confounded thing rock slams, you know. You say, "What – what was that?" You know? That's bad practice. You're ending a session. Sometimes it's so vital that you have to know what that is, though, and you still ask him. But end the session, and "Anything you care to ask or say before I end this session?" and so forth, and he says it. Well, don't prompt him to say anything else, is the point I'm making here! Cut that off, man! Usually it's a, "Thank you," or something like that. And you say, "All right, here it is," and give him a good Tone 40 end of session that leaves no doubt in his mind whatsoever! Tell him, "Tell me I'm no longer auditing you," so as he shakes out of that, and that is through.

Pc who continues to talk about his case to you, it's almost inevitable the PC will make some kind of remark about his case. Give him an entirely altered aspect – is the best trick of ending the session, now, visually too.

I never put it – doubt – much doubt in the pc's mind, but if the pc looks – is shaking his head when I've said, "End of session," going like this – I'll end session again for him, see? I'll ask, "Has session ended all right?" You know, I take a little care, if it's kind of obvious he didn't get out of session. I'm not going to spend any time on it. I'm not going to put him back on the meter and do various things of this particular care.

If I've given him an item and said, "That's your item, and now we're going to end the session," and I see the pc isn't coming out of session, I say, "Well, what's the matter? You – you having doubts about that item?" He'll say, "Kind of." "Well, all right, you don't have to have that for your item, well go on listing on it next session." Pc brightens right up. And you say, "Good. All right. Got that now? End of session!" POW! And he's out of session. See, that missing item can hold him from coming out of session.

And then you're through. Now, when I say an altered aspect ... You've been an auditor and so forth, and you've been willing to listen to him, you're still willing to listen to him, you're not going to ARC break him, you're not necessarily going to give him a wisecrack or invalidate their case or something like that, but look more cheerful and natural than usual. Ask him something like, "Hey, you got a cigarette?" you know, something. It's an altered aspect, an altered tone of voice, and it helps them come a little further out of session. You got it?

Audience: Yeah.

Well, now, you say, "What's Model Session today?" Well, Model Session is still Model Session. And it's got all those rudiments and it's got everything else in it – that's Model Session. Now, we're talking about a very shortened Routine 2 session, see. This is a Routine 2. It isn't goal finder's Model Session. That was itself, too. This is Routine 2 session. It just fits for Routine 2. Honestly, if you use much more session than this, you'll get into trouble.

Now, you're trying to null, you're trying to null, the list is obviously complete and so forth, use this other trick – just to get back to it a little bit – of handing the pc the sheet, and saying, "What – what cooks on this sheet here? What – any – any big thoughts on this sheet, here?" or something like that.

Pc says, "Oh, well, yes, and I invalidated that and I did this and I did that, and so on. And kind of suppressed that and I didn't think that was it."

And you say, "All right. Thank you very, very much. Thank you."

Don't ask him any rudiment on it, just give him the sheet. You understand?

Oh, you don't know about this trick? Maybe it's not worked well for you.

Audience: Yeah. Yeah, it has.

Yeah, all right. It's a nice trick. It gets all the rudiments in, *Brrrr! Bow!*

Bring it back over, and go on going.

Now, but aside from that, I would assume, if a pc became agitated in a Routine 2 session – I would assume immediately that there was something wrong with the Routine 2, not something wrong with the auditing. That's the first thing I'd assume. I'd assume he was getting no auditing or something or he thought he wasn't and so forth.

A pc who starts to act very self-audit-ish in a session, I wouldn't pay any attention to it. You know, he's starting to get his own rudiments in and starting to fill everything in, I just give him a cheery "Yes. Okay. Fine. Thank you." And so the pc starts interrupting me while

I'm nulling, and so forth, to getting his own rudiments in. I'd just stop and give him a cheery "Aye, aye," and go on again. See, I don't start snarling at him, and frowning, and ...

I sometimes have been known to frown at a pc who scratches their head with the back of the can when they're listing! – while giving me four items, you know? I very often say, "Well, that's four we don't know whether they rock slammed or not." "Oh, oh!" says the pc.

Well, that's the extent of the importances of session. I guess you could have called this lecture, "What you do in an auditing session these days and relative importance thereof." And of course, as you see, the manifestation of boil-off, and therefore pulling missed withholds, is paramount to everything else. Because you – of course he can't list while he's asleep. And you can't null, because he won't rock slam while he's asleep. So, there you are. That makes Routine 2 impossible. But within those limits, why, that's about as much sessioning as I would use these days.

Now, something very funny-I've got to tell you one little other piece of data and we'll end this lecture. You start on a list that is incomplete, or wrong way to, and you start nulling it – if you use the 2-10 type nulling, of just call, call, call, looking only for rock slams, you see, *bark-bark-bark-bark-bark-bark-bark-bark-bark-bark* and you get about halfway down the front page of that list and that needle starts getting dirty, you would normally assume that the pc's rudiments have gone out. I lately have begun to assume the correct answer: It's either wrong way to or the item isn't on the list.

You never saw anything as – quite as agitated as a needle goes on nulling on a list that's got something sour about it. Now, the faster you call off items, the more briskly you enunciate them, the less the pc thinks. So at the speed I've been nulling lately, the pc didn't have – no pc's had a chance to do any thinking. So I've managed to sort out this other datum. And that is, that I've taken some lists that are wrong way to and so forth and tested them. And your needle will dirty up. And it's an indicator – it's just an indicator – it isn't a rule, but you should always be leery that if you're calling down a list fairly rapidly, and you straighten out the list, give him the page, let him straighten it out, and you're calling this off again, and it goes dirty almost at once, you should be – get very alert, man. There is something wrong here. It isn't just the rudiments going out. The Routine 2 is wrong. Wrong source, wrong way to or item isn't on the list, and usually, all else being equal, it's the item isn't on the list! That's the only place that an auditor can foul up.

Now, you can also – somebody has done it here, in this unit – list endlessly, way beyond the point where the thing could be listed. Way, way, way, way beyond – thirty pages or so beyond the point where it ought to be nulled. That's a very extreme look, but it's a fact! And if it ha(Wt been for the vacation and the snow and so forth and another auditor taking aver the case, we never would have found it out. The auditor – the pc to this day won't still be listing. Because, of course, a needle starts going dirty on the protest. You overlist and overlist and overlist and overlist, the needle goes dirty on a protest.

But you know that an incomplete list, the needle doesn't go dirty on the protest. You know the person really never protests it. They snarl, they sound ARC broke, they sound this

way and that. You can't find any protest! They go on listing, one way or the other, even though you've had to say, "If you don't list any further on this list ... You get the message?"

"Oh, well, you put it that way!" and so on.

No rudiments in see, just list! Not recommended. But sometime when you know damn well the list is not complete, and the pc won't add any more to it, you know, and the pc's getting all ARC broke, and all this way and that, why, your rudiments fail to get him to list again, why, "list!" you know? The only crime you can actually pull is not completing the list. You realize that?

All other crimes fall short of that crime.

And in essence, there's minimal sessioning. Oddly enough, it's going to take you more mid ruds on 3-21 than it does on Routine 2. You're going to use mid ruds a lot more on 3-21.

Now, as soon as you've got the PT problems out of the road – as soon as you got the PT problems out of the road – a case actually is ready for 3-21. You recognize that? You could overuse Routine 2 if you're a clearing auditor. You realize this? You can overuse it. It won't do the case any harm. He goes on, he gets Clear and so forth. But there's a point where you get the present time problems out of the road as far as this pc's concerned and so on, he's ready for 3-21. Hell 90 right down, find his goal, as nice as you please. All you'd actually have to do on him is a brief Prepcheck and he'd practically present you with his goal. You see where that borderline comes?

It is safer for an expert auditor to do goals on a case, than it is to do Routine 2. He will actually make less mistakes doing goals on a case, if he is an expert. But it is more catastrophic for an inexperienced auditor to do 3-21 on a case, than it is Routine 2. Do you see how those two points add up?

Audience: Yes.

Now, in actual fact, an expert does 3-21 more smoothly than he does Routine 2, because Routine 2, after all, is not running on the pc's goal. What you want to do is get the pc's goal and run it against PT, if you want to get the rest of the problems out of the road – and you do all kinds of things. You can do more with his goal any day in the week than you can do with Routine 2, but you – of course, you can't get most people's goals without getting some packages out of the road.

I want to give you one change in Routine 2, just as one final remark here. That List 1A, "In present time, who or what are you upset about?" would probably run more easily on a pc, just as any version of, "In present time – or – who or what does present time consist of?" Let me give you that as the basic model. "Who or what does present time consist of?" You see? "Who are you in contact with in present time? Who or what are you in contact with in present time?" You understand? Any such version.

Now, one more remark, about missed withholds and this changed line. You realize that you can list the wrong universe. Remember there's the wrong universe ... There's the universe of the pc's life and livingness, his auditing universe and the parts of existence. And do you know that it'll constitute on some pcs a missed withhold if you don't list that one first which

is ready to be listed. You got that? There's another way that you can miss an item: is choose the wrong sphere of interest for your first list. That's not a very fruitful one, but it can happen, so you should be advised of it. And that is pertinent to what I've been telling you tonight.

You insist on running auditing-type universe, see? And actually his present time universe has got him caved in. You know, his life and livingness universe got him caved in. You try to do parts of existence on him and his auditing universe is kicking his head in. And the pc will act like he has an ARC break. He'll act like a missed item, by choosing the wrong one of these three universes to do first. So that has to be sorted out with the pc on a real expert action.

It's not common, but it can – it could actually louse up a case. Somebody screams like mad, running about auditing. Ah, he's about to be divorced or shot or President of the United States has heard his name and is therefore in a rage. See, something of that sort has happened. Then his attention is so stuck on that type of a universe that he can't even think about being audited, don't you see? And you can't get that one out of the road – if you don't get that one out of the road, he won't be able to get any of the auditing things out of the road. So there's another source of a missed item. Okay' .?

All right and that is it and I hope it does you some good.

Thank you very much and good night.