STYLES OF AUDITING

A lecture given on
17 November 1964

Thank you.

What's the date?

Audience: November the 17th.

November the 17th, AD 14, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, and we have a lecture here today on the styles of auditing. And this is something new that will make, actually, the training and doing of auditing enormously easier. And although it would appear at first glance to be an unnecessary separation, and something that is more precise than is needful, you will find that any old—time auditor at one time or another has passed through one of these phases.

Because what—this is one of those things that have been going on for many, many years. Auditing styles have changed and shifted around. And it must be very confusing for somebody to say, "Well, what is an auditing style?" So they think it's some individualistic activity. And they try to find out if they hold their little finger in the air, you see, as they present the E-Meter cans to the pc – or something like this, don't you see. And they think it must be some individualized action.

Well, over the years there have been many auditing styles, and the reason there have been auditing styles is because processes have changed. There have been different processes and they require different styles. And therefore, at one period of two or three years you'll see one auditing style was very much in vogue, you know. And at another period you'll see another one.

For instance, 1955-56, you saw repetitive command type auditing. That was when the TRs first came out. And everybody was going by the TRs at a crash, you see, and so on. And then in an ACC up in London I found out that these TRs were being broken down by auditor interruptions and evaluations and that sort of thing. And there were about a dozen students on that course that – the biggest one taught up in London—that were just not getting any result from the pc at all. And I made a study of this situation; I found out the auditor was getting in the road to the result.

So we invented something called muzzled auditing, and we muzzled them. And in actual fact the—I've forgotten which way it was—I think the auditor who had a—who had the right to not be muzzled and talk to the pc had a red ribbon around his neck so the Instructor wouldn't bawl him out.

But the others had to audit muzzled. And we found out that that style brought about progress. And their pcs would progress. In other words, the repetitive command, and so forth, all by itself, not taking any care of origin and so on, would in actual fact bring a pc on up the line. And this was quite remarkable, don't you see? So in those particular ease the auditor was preventing the case advance. So we got an auditing style called muzzled auditing.

More recently we had a – I did quite a bit of work on the auditing comm cycle and looked it over, and found out that what auditors weren't doing at the lower—level processes was listening. And we got what has been loosely called, amongst auditors, "itsa," an auditing of itsa. It's perfectly all right to go on calling it that, but just recognize it's a slight misnomer. That is just Listen-style.

And then we have another style that came up in Sec Checking and Prepchecking, whereby you steered the pc around. And then you did something about what the pc landed in. And we worked with this and we would—had a great deal of trouble, by the way, because it hadn't been dignified as a style.

So, I hadn't actively planned to simply take these various styles and assign them, but it couldn't have been done in any event until we had all of the processes and gains, and we knew where these things were going.

Well, we're at that point now, so I formulated these auditing styles. You'll find out that you're repeating, to some degree, the various types of auditing which were in vogue at one time or another and they're now fitted to the various levels. Only they're fitted to the expected progress of an auditor's skill. It's what can an auditor do at a certain level and what new thing does he now have to learn how to do, to go up to the next level. And then you'll find that this is fairly easy to do.

Now for instance, one of your confusions about auditing style is that I am sure, somewhere or another, some Instructor has insisted that when you did Listen—style that you were—really did Guiding—style. "But you aren't listening—you aren't doing itsa. Your itsa is bad because the pc isn't talking interestedly."

At that time—I see I'm hitting a blank spot with all of you, see. Yes, it—you got caught in that one. You'd say, "Well now, can this auditor pass itsa?" And this is probably true through every organization in the world as well as here, you see.

"Can you pass itsa?" All right, well check this person out on itsa. "Well, he flunked itsa." Well, how did he flunk itsa? "Well, he flunked itsa because the pc was not talking interestedly."

So right away this put the poor student—and it's probably one of the biggest bugs that auditors have right at this moment—puts the student in this terrible thing: If you're supposed to sit there and listen, well then, how in the name of common sense can you do anything, you see, about the pc being interested or disinterested? But yet you couldn't pass itsa, you see, unless the pc was getting gains and tone arm action.

So what was this thing, you see? And whereas putting on the auditor the complete clamps of, you see, "He must listen," we then demand tone arm action. We then demand an

interested pc. We then demand case advance. We demand, now, no ARC breaks. We demand the auditing comm cycle be perfect, you see. You even get repetitive auditing in there.

Well, what happened actually is you of course, being instructed—however, not you particularly—but students out through organizations were being instructed very carefully by—and with great sincerity—by auditors who of course were quite experienced. And what looked like auditing to them, you see, was far above the immediate ability of the student to execute.

So that, you see, they would start to pass somebody on itsa, as they called it, which is just whether or not the auditor was listening to the pc. But in actual fact what they would collide with as an Instructor is the fact that it didn't look like good auditing, see? So they start out on one thing, you see, start out on this low—level auditing which they all understood to be a very low—level action, don't you see, and promptly check the fellow out for Class IV.

And then, of course, wouldn't let the person pass at the low level until the person had moved into a Class IV classification. But the person couldn't get to a Class IV style of auditing or address, of course, because the person could never get out of itsa.

Do you see the conundrum which was posed here? How is anybody going to find out how to do all these other things if he hasn't first learned to listen? And nobody was letting him learn to listen. Everybody was insisting that he immediately get in this jet, you see—not even the training version, but the fighting version jet, you see—and they were just sending him off down the runway and they were saying, "Now, all you're supposed to learn is to hold the wings in balance. That's all you're supposed to learn." And they'd fire him off down the runway, you see, and he'd go through the sound barrier, and ... Then he'd hear over his intercom, "I think your aerobatics are very poor." And he'd say, "But I . . ." "They don't show any polish. Now let's repeat that Immelmann," you see.

And then they get back and then they turn in their report on the—on the student, and they'd say, "Well, he didn't pass."

"Well, why didn't he pass?"

"Well, he couldn't keep his wings level."

See, nobody could get through that sound barrier on the auditing progress. So I've seen this and been working with it for some time and finally formulated this to a gradient scale of auditing approaches that nobody could really skip very badly, because, of course, at once—at once an Instructor, having Guiding—style Auditing up the line, you see, at II, knowing it's there, would not then try to pass the student on Guiding—style Auditing, when he was in actual fact trying to do something at Level 0, you see? So this would—is not something now that we'd get involved.

So it was a point that was very necessary to straighten out and it has that instructional value of a gradient scale. After you've learned how to do one thing you certainly can do the next thing, you see. And after you've learned how to do that, then you can do the next thing.

Well, one of the things that's difficult—let's go all the way to the top now, from the bottom—one of the things that's very difficult in teaching anybody R6 is something that's

rather hidden there. And that is: The person has to be able to do many different auditing styles *flickety—flickety—flickety, bingity—bingity—bing,* one right after the other, shifts from one to the other and back and forth again. It's the wildest thing you ever saw in your life.

Because the session is going so rapidly that there is no time to handle these things with base, way—back—to—the—beginning—type auditing. Well, I'll give you an idea, I'll give you an idea: We're running this pc down the bank, you see, and the pc is in a GPM and we've got an item all ready to go, and we end the session. And the next session the pc pops up with a PTP. Well now, if we don't handle that PTP, that pc's going to make no progress in that session at all. So now what are we going to do?

In the first place, the case is getting much better and is really flying, and what are we going to do? Now are we going to handle his PTP with an hour and a half of "What part of that problem could you be responsible for?" on a repetitive command? See? Well, we're not going to do that.

Well, how do we explain to the auditor that we're not going to do that? He knows how to handle a PTP. He's been very carefully taught. He's been very carefully taught that when the pc has a PTP, you locate and isolate what the PTP is and then you say, "What part of that problem can you be responsible for?" or something like that, for half an hour or something like this and the problem tends to evaporate.

Well, the only trouble with this at R6 is the problem is undoubtedly closely associated with the item the pc is right now in. It is the tiniest lock imaginable. It has the same order of magnitude of a gnat standing alongside of the Alps. And how are we going to handle this?

So we have to admit that the pc has a PTP. So we bring this up—the pc has a PTP. We isolate what the PTP is—we guide, you see—and then we simply use itsa or something like this, you see. And the pc says, "Well, it's a so and so on, and a so and so on, and a so—and—so and so—and—so." And you say, "Well, that's very good. Do you have a PTP?"—glance at the meter, you see—"That's fine. You haven't got one. All right. Now let's get on with the next item," you see—bang, bang! You know?

Well, you see, that violates—if somebody has never been trained to handle a PTP that way—that violates it and it makes him think that he now audits sloppily. That's the immediate result.

He now gets the idea that the higher you go, the sloppier you audit. No, no, that's not true. The higher you go, the more precise you audit. But the sloppier it may look.

See, it may look awfully sloppy to an observer but it's actually far more precise—rat—a—tat—tat. You're choosing up the process and the auditing style to fit the process right there—bing! Don't you see?

Well, what do you think—in R6 you suddenly start in and you find out that some item won't read. Well, what are you going to do at that particular point? Well, we're not going to now do a tremendous case analysis or something like this. We're going to take this thing as we can, don't you see?

And what does it indicate? It indicates a Prepcheck. Well, very good. The auditor's been taught how to do a Prepcheck. He knows how to do a Prepcheck. You assess the problem or item necessary to prepcheck and then you have eighteen buttons. And you run each one of these flat.

Wow, if you did that to somebody while he was running down through a GPM, he'd half kill you, because some of those Prepcheck buttons are very hot locks right on top of items and right on top of end words and they would ball that bank up like mad if you're running down the bank. It wouldn't necessarily be true if you weren't running down the bank, you see, at the lower levels. But it's now very true.

So we condense a Prepcheck into this sort of a thing. Ah well, we know what's been suppressed: the item, see. So we say, "Well, on that item has anything been suppressed?" And the pc says, "Oh, yes, so—and—so and so and so on and suppressed."

"All right. Repeat the item again ... All right, that reads. Fine. We go on down to..."

That's a Prepcheck. You follow? Well, that's actually Abridged—style Auditing. It's just abridged. You just cut out all of the nonessentials out of the actual action that you're doing. And re—of course, that has to be terribly precise, because the auditor has to know what's essential about the action he's doing. You see, it's actually more precise than complete full—dress parade type of auditing.

So at R6 we have All—style. And all a fellow has to do at R6 is simply be able to do all the styles which are below Level VI and he does them all consecutively and at various—in various orders. He's liable to be shifting from one style to another style. And you very often find yourself, oddly enough, doing Level 0 auditing with R6.

This pc's gone off on a wild tear of itsa. "Oh! you know"—this sort of thing—"Gee! You know, that was why I hated my grandmother," and so forth. "And you know I got some kind of an idea that I had other grandmothers at one time or another. Yes, I'm sure I had grandmothers and so forth and so on. And I've had—always have seemed to have had trouble with grandmothers, you know. Grandmothers, grandmothers, grandmothers." He's running some GPM that has to do with "kill the old," or something.

And tone arm's going at some mad rate, you see, and he's itsa, itsa, itsa, itsa, itsa, itsa, itsa, itsa, itsa, itsa, itsa. And—well, let me assure you—you as the auditor—as long as that tone arm is moving, you'd just be a fool to open your face.

And you've been going down the bank, you *see—brrrt—bow!* Put in the *steps—brrrow—bow,* see. Bang—bang—bang, you know. Thud, thud; crash, crash. "All right, now we'll check out the next GPM"—boom, *bang, thud.* You see, we're going right just at a terrific rate of speed, and then all of a sudden, "Hey! You know, I think this is why I hated my grandmother." And of course, you're right there, ready to commence again, but no, that isn't the end of that cognition.

Now, if the auditor is unskilled in recognizing pc origins and unskilled in handling itsa, he can lay a terrible egg right at that point. See, he can try to force the pc on down the bank, or force the pc into actions or shut him off or herd him up one way or the other or do

something with him when that's—actually what he ought to do is just sit back and smile, as his total auditing action.

Ah, but that requires judgment too, because supposing the pc was cogniting on other end words in the bank. And supposing he was traveling all over the bank with his itsa. Oh, no, we don't want him traveling all over the bank with itsa. He isn't cogniting, you see, he's just sitting there speculating, "Well, I wonder if this is so on, an end word, and I wonder if that's an end word, and so on." The next thing you know, you're going to have the most frozen tone arm that you could find south of Nome. There it'll be.

Well, so at this point you've got to know Guiding—style. You got to be able to herd that pc. You got to be able to shut him up without ARC breaking him. And of course, that's—you—the auditor that's learned that, he's learned it, see? "Well good. I'm glad you got a lot of end words there. Well, that's fine, I'm glad you're cogniting on that. Fine, fine. Well, thank you very much. Now, I got all that. Now, what do you suppose this next item is?"

And the pc says, "Well, the next item is ... Well, the next item is so—and—so and so—and—so," and we go on down the bank, don't you see?

But let's take an auditor who has been carefully trained to do repetitive command auditing and can assess if he holds his tongue between his teeth like that while he looks at the meter. And now let's turn him loose in this lion's cage, you see, called R6, where he himself is under heavy restimulation usually too, and his last session hasn't gone and a bunch of other things are terrific liabilities about his auditing. And now, without any basic training, let's expect him to get some kind of a result. He's still trying to find out various things: Does R6 work? Are GPMs there? Can anybody possibly ever get cleared?

Well, he's trying to get cleared on R6. He hasn't cognited yet that you don't get cleared on R6, that you get cleared back at IV, you see. And he hasn't—he hasn't meshed all of this. He's still got all these searching answers. And then he has no pattern of training on styles of auditing. And of course he's just going to have an awful time.

Because, you see, he'll have a hard enough time if he *has* the training on all the styles of auditing and he can do each one of these styles. He will have a hard enough time just grappling with the new strangeness and complexities of the whole reactive mind. Because you're just asking him nonchalantly, "All right, go ahead and run the pc through his reactive mind." Because that's all there is to the pc's active mind—reactive mind, you see. "Well, all right, just run him through his reactive mind." And the guy says, "Reactive mind! *Whhooo!* You know, well..." and so forth. "And let's see, now, what did it say? What was the patter?" You know, he's trying to remember the patter and he isn't skilled at this point and that. And then we also hit him in the head with what style does he use, see. He won't make it.

Because even given all of his information and so forth, he actually should be at least twenty hours on solo audit, after he goes into there, so he gets a reality on the bank. And all of a sudden he'll coordinate the bank against the reads, he'll coordinate his auditing against how to handle this. All of a sudden it all falls together beautifully and it's very smooth and he goes on from there.

If he doesn't go on from there, somebody can get him by the scruff of the neck and take some of the charge and overburden off of the thing, don't you see, straighten him out and do a bit of case analysis, something like that; but not run a bank. And put him back on running the bank. And he eventually will find that he can grapple with his own bank, which is a tremendous piece of confidence. Then he's got a good subjective reality on it.

But for him to do that without any background of auditing styles and so forth would again be almost incredible. See, it's one thing to be a pc and it's one thing to be an auditor. But to be an auditor and a pc with all auditing styles demanded while running on through the reactive bank is quite a trick. And therefore, I have some feeling that somebody should be prepared to do this.

So the auditing, the auditing which you're doing at lower levels is of course very much gauged at these lower levels. Now, somebody the other day was going to go back home and audit a couple of pcs on GPMs—they're not even Releases, you see. He's going to audit them on this.

Well, you'll find everybody is tugging away at the idea of going to the top. Our society is gauged that in order to be successful you have to be at the top. And there are very few ladders around, and if you'll notice, why, there are very few at the top. And the reason there are very few at the top is that there are no ladders provided. There are a great deal of booby traps provided. There are a lot of ropes that are half cut through provided. But there are very few ladders provided.

Now, a pc has to climb the same ladder and these are gauged against what auditing a pc will respond to at what level—which isn't covered in the bulletin, but is quite pertinent. Now look, a pc would have to be up to withstanding All—style.

Well, do you realize that it's the constancy of lower—level auditing—short sessions and constancy. It's the fact that the auditor is predictable. The pc now knows and becomes certain, because the pc can predict what the auditor is going to do.

Well, a pc isn't going to predict anything in All—style. So he already has to have a high level of confidence in auditors. Right?

Well, how's he going to gain that? Well, he's going to gain that by going up through the levels.

Also, you could describe the reactive bank.

He becomes familiar, in other words, in—to reacting to these various styles of auditing and he finds none of them bite, and he's now familiar and reacting to all these styles. Well, so when they're all thrown at him one after the other, out of sequence, and so forth—as is necessary at R6—why, it all seems very usual to him. Whereas he'd do his nut—to use a Britishism—if he possibly were subjected to this kind and type of auditing as his first debut into Scientology. "What the hell is going on?" You see, he had no certainty on it at all and he'd quickly foul up.

There's a case fact that prevents you from grabbing somebody off of the street out here. Everybody wants to get to the top and they want their R6 auditing and they're very

important people. And you'll find out the lower they are, the more important they are, you see. And the more exaggerated their ideas of their ability is. And you get somebody up here and you just drag him off the street at random and you start to run him on R6.

Funny part of it is, you might get away with it. You might get away with it for several GPMs or you might get away with it with this or that. But remember that you're just playing your luck. It's something like running a race with the saddle cinch of the horse cut three—quarters of the way through, don't you see, and with only one nail holding the shoe on each hoof.

Now, the conditions there are so strained that I doubt you would be able to progress fifty hours of auditing into R6 without coming a terrible cropper—a really terrible cropper. And you haven't got any background or backlog in the pc with which to salvage the pc. The pc has no confidence that Scientology would rescue a PTP. The pc has no confidence that this somatic which is now turning on, would ever turn off again. The pc is all leery. The pc may think he's being psychoanalyzed—he's never found out about it yet, don't you see. You never know what the devil this pc was all about. He may be gauging all of R6 as to whether or not his ears sting. His hidden standards are in his road, you see. R6 isn't working because his ears don't sting. He knows when things work—his ears get warm and tingle. You know? When you've got all of those liabilities fighting against you, you're just asking for it.

So if you take a pc off the street and put them on to R6, don't write me and say, "Ron, this person has spun in and this—he's having a terrible time, what do I do now?" Now, I'm telling you what to do right here, see. And there isn't much of anything you can do if you haven't done the other first.

So the nonsense of taking somebody and immediately putting them on R6 just because they wave a lot of money in your face or some other insufficient inducement, it is—it is simply becoming the effect of somebody's bank. And it's nothing more than that. You're just making yourself the effect of their bank. And boy, don't think you aren't going to be the effect of their bank from there on, even more so. It's going to get pretty grim.

So what you want to do in a case like that is say, "Fine. Fine. Oh, we'd be very happy to run you on R6—very, very happy to run you on R6. Yes, sir! We will sign you up for R6. All right. Now, tell me about your life." And pretty soon he says, "You know, I'm not getting any of these goals and so forth."

"Well, I think we're clarifying your goals pretty good. You see these session goals up here? They're pretty good. Are you making them?"

"Well, I'm not making that one, 'I want to be OT by Tuesday,' because then I get another promotion from the something—or—other."

"Well, all right, I'm sorry you're not making that particular goal."

And go right on auditing him with what you're auditing. And all of a sudden about Tuesday, three months later, why, this guy—after a few sessions a week or something like that—this guy all of a sudden says, "You know, I don't—I think my anxiety about being OT

is the fact that I thought I was going to get worse. And you know I've just realized that I'm not going to get worse. That's quite remarkable."

And you've hit the first thing that was really real to him. You made a Release. He isn't being audited in a frame of mind of total desperation that if he doesn't get audited, you see, he's now going to go through the floor and disappear or something is going to cave in on him, don't you see? The most remarkable frame of mind.

Because most people start in their auditing—no matter how quiet they look to you on the surface—they start in their auditing in a total desperation. Oh, they say, "Well, well go along with this and I'd be very happy to get better, and yes, I want to be able to play ping—pong better," and so forth. And they go along with this and so forth. But actually sitting back of that is a—is a total desperation.

They see themselves going on the same old treadmill, don't you see, down the same old chute into the same old bunch of mud. And they know it's a very steep chute. And they know that if they don't keep running like mad on that treadmill they're going to go into that chute and uhhh. And you build them up to a point of where they have a little more confidence in their own future, see. Just that little point. And all of a sudden they come off this desperation kick. And fine. So move them on up the line.

And you would actually overestimate, now, the amount of time necessary to make somebody walk that ladder. See, you'll probably assign him too much time to it in your own mind because you're assigning it out of your experience and there's been a great deal of technical advance here, a rather dizzy amount of technical advance in the last eighteen months, and it'd be pretty hard to catch experience up to it.

See, you'd have to audit a lot of different kinds of pcs, and that sort of thing and apply the techniques exactly as they were supposed to be applied to gain experience. So actually, your prediction of how long somebody would be on one of these levels—from your own instincts and so forth—would probably be at fault, you see. You probably would overestimate the amount of time and you'd probably tend to overrun the pc at any given level just to be sure. Which is fine. Go right ahead and do so. But recognize that you have to adjust your reality and experience against what's actually happening with pcs.

And you'll find that there is an acceleration of gain. The gain accelerates. That is it—for any given moment of time the gain increases per hour of auditing time, better. You get more gain per unit of auditing time, you see, and then you get more and more gain, and then you get more and more and more gain per unit of auditing time, don't you see? And your slow freight on a pc is 0 and I. That's really slow freight. Because you've got a guy who is crawling out of that well; and he crawls up three inches in the auditing session and he falls back two and seven—eighths inches in the intervening period, see. And his actual rate of advance is an eighth of an inch per session on a well which is several thousand feet deep.

Life to him looks terribly, terribly forbidding.

Now, you actually are only dealing with that strata of the society who are voluntarily seeking auditing. And this is a new thing. Nobody's done that before. They've only really

addressed treatment—that is, the—a majority of treatment given in a society was to those people who were lying across the track of society; they were in the road of society.

From psychotherapy and treatment the—of the Aesculapians, and other things, was to get out of the road of the society or out of the road of a family somebody who was in a bad way. And they considered these chaps were a liability. They kept running around the forum, you know, with no toga on, you know. And interrupting the speeches being made, you know. This sort of thing, you see.

So they'd—somebody would say, "Well, there you are, Bill," and get him out of the road. Well, that's because the state could see this and therefore the state or the family head or something like that would then be quite willing to put out money in order to get this fellow straightened out. So the psychotherapist or the Aesculapian or the medical doctor or the witch doctor or any other of the more archaic forms would just follow the line of the least resistance, you see.

"Well, the state's willing to get rid of the very sick and the very nutty and so they'll pay us to get rid of the very sick and the very nutty. And of course, we can't do it, but we can certainly keep them out of their road. Now, what we need is more institutions and more hospitals, and more hospitals and more institutions and more appropriations. And we need more appropriations and more institutions and more hospitals."

And what they needed of course was a better understanding of man, but they weren't paid to have that. See, they were only paid numerically. There were eight squillion nuts in the society and they were allocated as their pay so many—so many drachma or something per bed, don't you see. Quantitative basis. Wrong method of appropriation, you see. So there was no incentive.

Now, you're dealing—and you get very easily confused with that other laughable nonsense, because what you're doing—what you're doing is handling a level of society that yet has some inkling that they can do something about themselves. Now, you remember that; that's your basic entrance point. Now, you can promote that entrance point and you can increase that tiny spark. But if it isn't there at all and you can't communicate with it at all, the guy is—the guy has "went" because he can't go up from there. Because the only person that can make a thetan well is a thetan.

And what's the point of no return? Well, the point of no return is no faintest idea at any time ever that self can do anything about anything. When you hear somebody saying, "Well, there's no reason to vote," and so forth, "I couldn't do anything about it anyhow. I don't care to talk about politics, because there isn't anything you can do about it anyway. You know…"

Well, that person is gone on the third dynamic. And these big supersocialist states that are supposed to take care of everybody (inside the barbed wire)—these states in actual fact only come into existence when the majority of its population is in that frame of mind. It actually isn't the fault of the state. The state comes into existence because a bunch of blokes out through the society no longer feel that anything can be done about anything and therefore they just go through the treadmill and they're simply staying alive, you know?

And you wonder why does one of these socialist or communist states fail to produce? Why do they always have production problems? Why is everybody in Russia starving to death at such a rate that they had to get rid of their premier, or whatever he was? And their boss over there was moved off, moved off. And it didn't have anything to do with, really, political issues.

People were hungry and people didn't have any shoes to wear. And nobody could do anything about it anyway and that was the prevailing thought. And he must have Q-and-Aed with all these people who couldn't do anything about it anyhow and he did have a few leaders around who thought you could still do something about it. And so they gave him the deep six and the population never said a word, because of course they couldn't do anything about it anyway.

It wasn't that they approved or disapproved of the removal of the head of state of Russia last month, do you see? They just couldn't have done anything about it.

That's pretty wild. That's a pretty wild frame of mind.

Well now, let's add that up on the first dynamic—that's the only reason I'm giving it to you on the third, see. "Ohhh, I don't have anything to do about it, the brain is all composed of cells. I have to obey these synapses and neurons. And they do it all. And if you could do anything about it, there isn't anyplace to do anything about it because who wants to make a synapses well? Nobody can get any better. I can't get any better. There isn't anything there to get anything any better. There *isn't* anything there that could get any better anyhow—even if you could get better." And you get a philosophy like Wundtianism, see? "Man is an animal. There ain't nothing there. He is a bunch of mass brain—work that is very interesting under a microscope." You know? I mean, that's the philosophy which you would get at that point. So that again is not premeditated, but is itself only a symptom of the individual attitude.

You actually, then, are appealing to a person who has some tiny, tiny dim spark that maybe he could do something about himself or maybe he could do something about the society. See? That's the person you're appealing to. And so therefore you're appealing to a minority.

The kickback, of course, that we get from the—from the state, and that sort of thing, is they tell us—they tell us we're a bunch of fakes and bums, you see, and that we can't do anything and we can't do anything we promise, so ... Well, that's because they know there's nothing can be done about it, you see.

The medical profession spends I don't know how much money per annum in the United States listing and enforcing into Legislation diseases that can't be cured. And they've got bills. There's twenty—five diseases which you must not treat in California, for instance, because they can't be cured. And their bulk of contribution to the Better Business Bureau, and so forth, is to get literature released that demonstrates completely that people can't be cured.

Well, you say that's a very funny thing for a healing profession to be doing. Well, of course, they—the bug in that is because you call them a healing profession. That's a very—that's not a very funny thing for a bunch of guys who are getting their total appropriation in proportion to the number of sick people there are around. So naturally they'll

be trying to convince everybody something couldn't be cured because of course this puts more money in their pockets; this puts more power in their hands, you see.

The less that can be cured in the society—if you follow out the reasoning—the less that can be cured in the society the more tops they are. And they themselves are incapable of thinking the thought through, that that includes them!

And somehow or another these birds are never able to equate this last one. They're sort of mad and low toned anyway. And they—you'll find some atomic physicist: "Well, it doesn't make any difference whether you kill one person with a rifle or the whole population of Earth. I mean, the same degree of morality has nothing to do with it. You can kill a city; you kill one person. I mean, war is war. That hasn't anything to do with anything, you see? And there's no difference between these things, and so forth. So therefore, it's perfectly okay for me to build atomic bombs and give them over to a bunch of gibbering boobs that have elected themselves heads of states." That's how he—how he justifies the whole action.

See, there's no difference between it, and so forth. And he goes on and he builds all these things, you see, and he hands them all out to the ... You know, like some five—year—old kid and two—year—old kid: "Here, Johnny, have a cocked .45." "Yeah, well, he wants another cocked .45. All right. We'll build him one." You see? And when he gets down to this point, why, he hasn't included himself in.

And just for fun one time, as I think I've told you before, I made an experiment. I took a salesman who wasn't interested in the atomic bomb and I carefully broke him down to points of his possessions that he was worried enough about to be worried about the bomb.

I was trying to explain to him what of his and what around him would disappear if he were in a bombed area. And I broke it down point by point, don't you see. Well, you know, almost a repetitive process. Well, would he be upset if his wife and children got knocked off by a bomb? Why, hell, he couldn't have eared less. It didn't make any difference to him. He'd be all right. And ... That's right!

And I just kept breaking this down. And I finally got to his wallet and he started to get worried. And—but it wasn't the money in his wallet, oddly enough, it was his social security card. And when he finally realized that his social security card would be charred beyond recognition, he started to worry about atomic bombings.

And he left the room nattering a little bit about people making and using atomic bombs, that it wasn't quite nice. But I had, of course, had trailed it down to a demonstration that it did have something to do with him, see.

Well, similarly, you on a broad public front, first by setting an example that people are getting better and next by showing them, you see, cutting it back to a point where they might possibly themselves quite possibly be able to do about it—in other words, re—awaken this spark—then you would make progress through the society. But that is the course which you will follow up through the coming years. It will be that sort of a—of an action.

You're doing fine and you're getting better and things in your vicinity are running all right, don't you see, and somebody says, "Maybe it was luck, maybe it was this, maybe it's

that," trying to explain this all the time. It's a bug that has appeared in their immediate social environment which they can't appear. You're a sort of a—you're an oddity, see. You aren't all falling to pieces like everybody else is, see. Why? And ... Well, they're prepared then to have the question answered. And it's answered on the basis of "Could they do anything to help themselves?" And that would be your first edge in.

There'd be some spark of something that they could either resent or resist or help or something, you see. There would be a little scale running, and when a person hits that line he'll eventually walk up the line to want some processing.

But you're doing something that has not occurred before on this planet, see. Therefore, it's very easily confused and gotten upset about, is because you're taking people who yet have some tiny inkling that they can get better. But all through their auditing that must be improved. And therefore, this emphasis on wins. That's how we must keep the pc winning. Keep the pc at cause and winning.

We mustn't ever knock them around into a situation where they believe they can't better themselves—have them get tremendous auditing failures, you see, with a tremendous crash. And it's that little point of self at cause which must be reached. And of course, your readiest people to reach are those people who do believe they can do something about themselves. You see, they're very easy to handle.

But rekindled by various mechanisms, such as example, discussion, and that sort of thing, in others, you see, and you're working with that level of society, and you're not following the route of "There are eight million nuts, and so therefore, we have eight million people in our charge, and therefore, we get appropriations to take care of these eight million people," don't you see. That's the old approach. And that's why nobody was really interested in doing anything about anybody. They're being paid for their disabilities.

Well, now, you're going at it on a reverse line. And that reverse line isn't harder; actually, that reverse line is easier. It's always easier to indulge in a successful activity than one which simply holds everybody in cages and they grunt and groan, you see. You follow that? Because it's more rewarding. The actual fact is, it's easier to make somebody better than it is to make them worse.

A thetan resists getting worse; he's resisted it for ages. And he's so used to resisting getting worse, don't you see, that it's a brand—new vector, it's a brand—new vector to say you could get better. And it—he finds it very hard to resist this. He has no built—up resistance to this at all. And you keep telling him he can get better and he keeps hearing he can get better and so forth, and then all of a sudden he begins to realize that he himself would have to do something about it in order to get better. At that point, why, he moves up and he gets to the point, finally, of realizing he's not now going to get worse. And he at that point is a Release.

And if you're not at least working with a Release on R6, why, the guy is just sitting there going through some kind of motions and the environment around him is going to smash him in and his cognitions, you see, aren't really very pertinent. It's rather ridiculous to listen to his cognitions. He's running the actual basic points of the bank and you'll find him

cogniting on the fact of "Oh, I see now, maybe that's why I cut my finger yesterday. And maybe that's why—why I sometimes cut my finger, yes. We've solved my life," you see. He's running some engram "to kill everybody in sight," don't you see? He doesn't cognite on any magnitude, don't you see? There's nothing going on, really.

And you're just handling charge and there's no pc there much to handle the charge, and you can just assign it to the point that you as the auditor are running through, now, at R6, the same experience that Dianetic auditors had perpetually. They could always knock out somebody's arthritis and they would be very, very happy as an auditor to have fixed up somebody's lumbosis, or something of the sort, and the only difficulty was the pc hadn't found out about it.

Actually, you could force somebody through an auditing session, cure them up one way or the other, straighten them up like mad, fix them up so they never had any more domestic trouble. You do the wildest things with these people, you see. And it was like repairing a typewriter. It was still a typewriter.

And the—one of the reasons we came off from Dianetics is because selfdeterminism and other factors of that character had entered in. And we ourselves in this study had found out that there was something there. And there was something doing it. There was something getting better and it wasn't all just negative gain; there was also positive gain, hence Scientology.

Now, the auditing styles are all part and parcel of this. So you've got these things plotted at the most win or the most likely win at that level where you find the pc. Now, the pc originally will most likely win at Level 0. It isn't that you need tremendous, new, sparking, beautiful processes in order to push this pc up the line. No, he's more likely to win with this very simple process of itsa, see. He's just talking. He finds out he can talk to somebody. Big win, man! Terrific. It isn't what you're erasing, it isn't what you're doing. Nothing like that.

So, the auditing style, then, is adjusted to the most likely progress for the pc. You possibly have never much thought of this subject of "How does the pc receive auditing?" see. "How does the pc react to auditing?"

We think in—more in terms of the pc has a case and the case gets better, don't you see, or the case improves, the pc's behavior improves or his environment improves, or something like this. And we probably don't too often equate that to just this: That's the pc's reaction to the processing. See? The pc, then, responded to a certain level of processing. That's why the pc won. He didn't necessarily respond to a particular button that was pushed on his case.

You see, we've always had with us this other factor, that just auditing—almost gobbledygook auditing—was quite capable of improving somebody's case. Did you ever get puzzled about this? Did you ever see anybody in a—doing TRs get a case win? Well, why? There's no process!

And sometimes, particularly back in 54, there were quite a few auditors around who were absolutely mad on this subject of *the* process. The process was everything, and there was no auditing connected with the process. The process did it all and they didn't have to do

anything, and the pc didn't have to do anything, you see. They had it mixed up like it was a pill or something. I quickly broke them of this but—as fast as found, but the point I'm making here is actually, yes, the process is very valuable. Unless you knew what processes to run he'd soon come to a point of no gain, don't you see?

But the actual fact is, the actual fact is that the actions of auditing all by themselves, completely devoid of processes, account for a very respectable portion of the pc's gain. It makes a terrific mystery to some auditor who sees—if he sees that Joe always gets gains on the pc ... But the question he's liable to ask Joe is, "What did you run on them?" No, the answer to the question was, is *how* did Joe run pcs? It's *how* he was audited, see; it wasn't *what* was audited on the pc. And that is something that we have never paid very much attention to and haven't covered it to any great degree. But you'll find it in auditing styles. And it's how you audit the pc to a gain.

And frankly, if you were simply to ask him about his old boots and hobbies, at itsa—style, don't you see ... It—see, everybody's being very significant, saying, "Well, what questions do you put on the blackboard?" Well, at that level it just doesn't matter what questions you put on the blackboard. You shouldn't put too beefy a one on the blackboard that's too significant because that isn't what's happening. It's the style. You're conditioning somebody to speak to somebody else. See, that's what you're doing. He finds out he can talk without getting his throat cut.

"Hey! There's somebody I can communicate with," is his most usual cognition. Whether he expresses it or articulates it or not, that's usually his cognition. Well, actually it doesn't do much good to run him beyond that cognition. That's the ability regained. But it's regained by the style, don't you see?

All right. Now, let's take the very next style above this, which is muzzled auditing. Boy, that's quite a jump. That's a fantastic discipline. And unless you train your pc to some degree as to what's expected and show him what this auditing cycle is and what this muzzled auditing is all about, he can't predict it and he doesn't know what to do and he tries to fall back into itsa.

Well, no, let's just graduate him upstairs at a hurry, because he's quite capable now, you see, of taking this step. He has learned he can talk to somebody. All right. Now, let's teach him this other thing that he could enter into a piece of this drill. And that is when he's asked a question, to actually look it over and answer it. And now, that's something.

Do you realize that that is a sort of an 8—C all by itself? That's a fabulous thing to ... And you know there's tons of pcs I've seen that—somebody's trying to audit them on some upper level who have never gotten that skill. They have never, never been able to do that. You ask them a question, you know, "Do birds fly?" and they say, "Birds ... Birds ... I visited the Smithsonian Institute one time or another."

Do you see—look on that as not something fundamentally wrong with the case, so much as an inability which can be knocked out and the ability of it can be regained. Can you answer a question when you're asked one? And if you put muzzled auditing to the pc on that basis: "All right, now we're going to go through a long series of processes and processing and

so forth, and the one thing which is at stake here is whether or not you can answer the question you've been asked." That's quite a process all by itself, isn't it?

And therefore, he'd take very kindly to your saying, "I'm sorry, but I don't think you answered the auditing question."

"I guess I didn't. Well, I'm not so good at it yet, am I?"

Instead of ARC breaking, you see. He had an understanding, that that's—completely aside from other things being run on him—that that basic fundamental is something he should learn how to do. And you can pull him up short then, can't you? You can say, "Hey, hey, hey now, let's see if we can't get a little bit better at this," you know. "All right, now in this next session here, we're just going—we're going to see if you're very good at this. We're running times you've communicated. All right, that's fine. That's all we're running. But let's see if we can't really get the ball here."

Well, what in essence is the whole gain of 8—C, which is one of the—one of the most fabulous processes? You don't think patting the wall is going to do anything for anybody? Well, it isn't going to do very much, it's reach and withdraw from mest and that sort of thing. Well, that's fine, yes. We know there's a gain involved with it, but what is it essentially?

The guy finds out that he can execute an auditing command. Well, that's pretty interesting after awhile, he finds out, "You know, when he says to walk over there, you know, I do. And I'm—he says touch the wall, I do." And then the next thing that it picks up, all in one fell swoop, is duplication. And boy, the individual who has individuated from all of life on the basis of not being able to duplicate anything in life is a mighty lonely Joe. He's way out, man! He can't be anything. Remember the old beingness processing.? He can't be anything because he can't duplicate anything.

Well, this is all part and parcel to orders too, isn't it? You'll find out that this person, when you give him an order, you say put the cans down, and so forth, why, he'll put them in his pockets or something.

Well, unless you've gotten a human being out of that wobble and scrabble and so forth, you haven't improved his ability to confront existence because of course he can't—he can't see those things he can't be. He can't duplicate, in other words. Well, duplication is simply a repetitive action.

I may have skipped over that a little fast for you. Some of you may remember the old Beingness Processes. That was taught up in London about 1954. A thetan can only be what he can see. And what he can't see, he can't be. And he can only see something because he can duplicate it.

Actually, he can't see anything—you'll be—you know the remarkable stories and reports you get of an accident. Well, it's peculiarly an accident. It isn't that people's observation in general is bad. They're looking at something they jolly well don't want to be. And so you get the most distorted stories of what happened at this accident.

A cop is always up against this. He always gets a half a dozen different stories. And how a court ever admits evidence of watching a crime as reason enough to hang somebody, I

wouldn't know. Because it's the most unreliable evidence in the world. Because of course the fellow couldn't see it; can't be it. He just knows very well that he wouldn't want to be hit by a car. So he actually doesn't see anybody hit by a car.

Well, you have a slight occupational liability as an auditor is that you're looking at a pc all the time that you don't particularly want to be. You're trying to improve him, aren't you? Well, fortunately for us it isn't necessary for you to be willing to be aberrated to get well. You follow that thought through? It isn't necessary for you to be willing to be aberrated to get well, see. Because we have the whole anatomy of the reactive bank, there's no sense in it, see. You see, if a thetan didn't have a reactive bank and he hadn't made his GPMs and he hasn't agreed on all of this, and so forth, he would probably be completely unaberrateable. He couldn't be aberrated at all. He—there would be no dwindling spiral.

See, there's basic things that you say could get wrong with him, but in actual fact he wouldn't have any of those things wrong with him. He would actually have to determine to have something real wrong with him. And when he determined it as thoroughly as make a complete reactive mind that would keep him crazy from there on out, this was almost the accidental perfect trap. The trap he ordinarily wouldn't fall into. But there he was in it. He did it.

You see, he had to decide to be aberrated with exclamation points, for some reason or other best known to him, and then having decided so, he was too stupid to get himself out of it. It's just—it—you see, that that is what's wrong with everybody means in essence that the other things that were wrong with him actually have blown. See, there's just that one thing left. There were a lot of things that could have been wrong with a thetan but that one—he had to decide to be aberrated. He had to decide to make and create and put in place, and continue to create a reactive bank and the universe. He had to decide this all off his own bat, incredible as it may seem.

Oh, he could have agreed and he could have been persuaded and he could have talked to somebody, but let's not miss the point; he did do it. And having done it, why, he was then in the soup. And that's actually all we're unwinding, don't you see. There isn't anything else there to unwind.

But because there's so many locks on the reactive bank and because it tends to group and bunch up and get into restimulation, you have degree of aberration of cases. And there's certain basic things that can go wrong with a thetan which are above the level of the reactive bank and GPMs, and these certain basic things include duplication and communication.

They can be aberrated all by their little old lonesomes, regardless of any end word. Yes, there's some end words that have to do with these things, but that really doesn't matter. These are then not low—level ideas. These are very high—level ideas. These would be native to any thetan anyway, whether he had a bank or didn't have a bank.

And you can work on them and you can improve them because they have such a strong influence. You see, these things he should be able to do pretty well. He shouldn't be stumbling around on communication and duplication. Bank or no bank, end words or no end

words, you see. And actually, they do improve rather remarkably, and he comes up scale to a point where he can confront bank, and that sort of thing.

So what are you asking him to do? You're asking him to—at itsa, your Listen—style Auditing—you're asking him to communicate and find out he's doing it, and he does; and somebody's going to receive the communication, so it must—therefore, it must be communication. It proves to him that he is communicating because somebody's receiving it, don't you see? And then we go up to the next stage here of muzzled auditing. And now, he's got to receive a communication, and he proves it by answering it. Do you follow that?

And then he proves it to himself that he has answered it. And he proves it to himself he has received a communication because the auditor is satisfied with the fact that he's answered the auditing question.

And of course, any time the auditor lets a pc receive a communication or a question that he doesn't answer, then the pc is not then satisfied, because he knows he didn't answer the auditing question. And so therefore, he begins to doubt his own ability to receive a communication. It's as elementary as that.

It isn't he's doing you in as an auditor by not answering the auditing question, it isn't that the process wouldn't work unless it were received or anything like that. No, he now doubts that he's received the communication. And he doubts he's received the communication because he didn't answer it. And then the auditor, the auditor didn't call him up on the fact that he didn't answer the incoming communication, so therefore, everything gets kind of unreal to him.

Now, he's proving it to himself continuously, by answering the auditing question, that he is capable of receiving a communication. Because it proves itself; he's answered the thing he received. And not only that, but he can do it repetitively. He can do it again and again and again and again and again. And when he first gets the idea of answering three questions in a row, man, he's ready to go round the bend.

You may not realize it ' but you ask some people the same question, just twice, and they blow up in your face. Did you ever have that happen? Ask them the same question twice. So therefore, you've got to make a point to the pc, "Now, we're going to get you so that you can answer several questions in a row, all the same question." And he'll begin to see this is a skill, see. All right, so we've got muzzled auditing.

Now, the next level is mainly devoted to "is there something there?" Now we're up to Guiding—style. Is there anything there? You see, the whole world to him is reasonless. Although he's being very reasonable about everything, actually there's no reason for anything. He's on the lower harmonic of the truth. All reasons have to be dreamed up. But he's down to a point where they really—the average human being—there's no real reason for anything. He doubts, for instance, that there's any real reason for him to be unhappy. He's unhappy, but there is no reason for him to be unhappy, there's nothing making him unhappy.

You get this expressed all the time as "I feel nervous today." Somebody says, "I feel nervous today." It's an accepted fact. There's nothing causing this nervousness. Hence, you get people going off into numerology. You know, like "On the 17th of the month I feel

nervous." And it has something to do with the number 17, and 1 and 7 added together make 8. Eight is money, so therefore, it must be money. But that person is still trying to find a reason for his nervousness.

You'll find the bulk of the society does not ever try to find any reason for their nervousness. And you very often as an auditor are completely baffled. You say, "All right, let's find out why you've got the headache." And you see the person says, "Oh nuts! You've just said something awfully silly! There's no reason to have a headache, one simply has a headache! Of course!"

Now, the doctor gets far too serious about this. This person has a headache every once in a while, so the doctor wants to—wants to remove the brain.

It's like the American military with their "overkill." I think it's fascinating, a fascinating word—"overkill." They've got a thousand times overkill now in the arsenals in the United States. They've got enough atom bombs to kill every man, woman and child on Earth a thousand times each. I don't know how you compute that. You'd almost have to be a Scientologist to even approach it. And by that I mean, yes, well, you could figure out that every lifetime you could kill them and you'd have enough to do that, so we could stretch it out in Scientology to make sense. But it doesn't make any sense to them because they think you only live once anyway. And you're just a brain, see. So it's a completely senseless statement—overkill. Why should they have one, see?

Now, you take—you take reasons for headaches and things like this—completely beyond people. They've got a headache; they've got a stomachache.

Now, once in a while—once in a while you get a big cognition out of somebody, you know. You say—they say, "Oh, well, I've got a terrible stomachache today." What you're missing, you see, is you, yourself, know that things cause things. See, you're not living in a causeless world and environment, you see. So it doesn't make any sense to you to have somebody over there that you're talking to living in a causeless world, see. The stomachache is a fact. Nothing caused it; it appears and disappears with complete mysteriousness. See?

And you get a big cognition out of them one day when you ask them, "Well, did you eat something that disagreed with you?" And every once in a while if you ask somebody that, under those circumstances, they would say, "By George, you know—you know, I—I did. You know? I had twenty raw weenies last night. You know, I'll bet that's what . . ." You know?

But you wonder what's the pur—and what you would become hung up with is "Why?" Why the emphasis they're putting on this, see? How come they seem to be so happy about this? Or they seem to be so relieved about this? Well, that isn't what they're cogniting on. They're cogniting on the fact that stomachaches could be caused by something. That there is cause. Big idea. Big brand—new idea. See? And they'll be pleased as punch. They haven't really grappled with the idea itself, you see. But it's just suddenly they're very relieved about something.

Then this goes hand in glove with it: "Natively, I'm just not a stupid man. There's something that causes my stupidity." You see? That go—that thought goes along with it. Then they get other thoughts that "Well, my life doesn't have to be a horrible mess all the time;

maybe something in my vicinity is causing this." And they do a terrific resurgence. "Maybe something is causing the condition I'm in, in existence. Maybe it isn't—just isn't—it isn't just reasonable that husbands and wives fight all the time. Maybe something is causing this." Well, of course, it's the wife, naturally, you know? And then they'll hit the handiest target, you see?

But—in other words, you now got the guy looking. He's got a new idea, a brand—new idea that things are caused. That's terribly elementary, isn't it? It isn't something you ordinarily would even look at or even respect as a source of aberration and yet it's one of the primary ones. Your Guiding—style Auditing gets him to look around in his life and find the causes of things.

Now, having found them, of course, you can do something about them. And as you will get another bulletin on this, it's—just covering here the bulletin of November 6, AD 14. But there's another bulletin, just a little more recent than this, which talks about what styles you use with remedies. It's the beginning of the series of bulletins about how to adapt auditing style to *The Book of Remedies.* Just neating up Level II, you see?

And there's Guiding Secondary style, which is the most elementary thing in the world; although you'd use it in session, although you would also use it in assists, it's peculiarly adapted to several remedies, which is simply steer plus itsa. Steer plus itsa. We used to have a number for it. Steer plus itsa, see, and you guide the guy into talking about something till you get a tone arm blowdown and then you make him talk about it, you see, to get the tone arm action out of it. And then while he's talking about it he mentions several new things, don't you see, that give him tone arm action, so you note those things down and you come back afterwards and talk about those things, don't you see?

Well, that's the process that goes with it, but this other is just a pure style all by itself You get pc to look and then you steer him and his looking, see, and you herd him around and head him off here and head him in there, don't you see? And then you get him to talk about what you have found, see, while holding him on this subject. You don't let him wander. And he itsas on this subject. "Well, it's—a—this and it's—a—that and it's—a—something—or—other"; it makes a marvelous assist. Remedies A and B, of course, are the first two in *The Book of Case Remedies,* so the auditing style with which they're handled should be quite considerably described. Because they're the most flagrant ones. They have to do with definitions and—definitions in Scientology or the present subject.

You mustn't miss that it's present subject—immediate subject. It's the immediate subject the guy's trying to study. You see, it's not just applicable to Scientology. This guy's trying to study engineering and he hasn't understood a term in engineering. All right, well, you can handle that, see, with Remedy A.

Remedy B is former subject. That's what makes them different. He's got the present, immediate subject mixed up with some former subject. So now you've got to find the former subject and find the word in it which hasn't been defined.

Well anyway, these have nothing to do with Clay Table, you see. They are processes all by themselves, and they are Guiding Secondary style. But the only difference between

Guiding Secondary style and Guiding Primary style—or just call it Guiding—style—is that Guiding—style runs in and does a repetitive. You guide, and you do a repetitive process on it. You guide, and you do a repetitive process on it. And we want that process to be the dominant process for Level II because it teaches the two things the fellow is now doing, you see.

He's finding out that there is some cause. And then he can answer questions about it and look at it. See? So you've still got repetitive action on the cause.

But this is—this is the style that is improving him. See? It's quite important what you find but it's only partially what you find.

He's got this new style. Things cause things. Wow! See? Gee! The world isn't all a solid block with no distance between anything, there's A causing B and there's D reacting to A and golly, this brand—new world out here. There is some reason for things, don't you see? Buildings don't just suddenly disappear in a puff of smoke, don't you know? There'd have to be an explosion. Big cognition, see? And then after the explosion, why, the bricks would be lying around on the ground. And what causes bricks to lie around on the ground? Well, there must have been an explosion to cause it.

And although the person realizes these things instinctively, he never thinks them out or looks at them. Things cause things. And life then is—looks entirely different to him, because he's no longer just a pawn. If things cause things, you might be able to predict. If things caused things, you might be able to do something about something. If things cause something you might be able to do something yourself! Hey, whoa! What do you know! Gee—whiz! You know.

And that's the doors you're opening at that particular level. You're guiding him and he finds causes. And having found causes you can now do something about the thing, too. Wow!

You find out he's been suffering from a present time problem for—same problem all along the line—and now you say, "Well, what communications didn't you ever finish to that person?"

"Oh, so—and—so and so—and—so." The problem's gone. You've asked the question repetitively, "What communication haven't you finished to the person?" "What communication haven't you finished to the person?" "What communication haven't you finished to the person?" "What communication haven't you finished to the person?" Maybe only ten minutes worth, but the tone arm action disappears out of it. "Wow! I don't have any worry about Aunt Martha, you know. Gosh!"

What's unpinning him? He's stuck all over the universe. And by this causes of things" and that he could locate it and then do something about the cause and straighten out that situation—that's pretty fabulous! And that's basically what he is finding out at Level II. So it's the style that's doing it. See? You're always beating yourself over the head about how clever you have to be. Actually be clever enough to realize that the style is doing it.

Now, by the time he's learned all that, it's perfectly safe to, run him on an Abridged—style. At muzzled auditing the pc cognited or did something or other and didn't answer the auditing command. Of course, because we're teaching him what we're teaching

him at that level, is that he can receive and answer an auditing command, we must say always, "I will repeat the auditing command," so forth, so forth, so forth. Always at Level II. But not at Level III, because our pc is now capable of doing that. See, why rub it in?

A lot of people get irritated after they've been through the basic of the thing. At first it seems to be all right to them to have this happen, and so forth, but after a while it isn't all right. The auditor's sitting there saying like a wound—up doll—they've said, "Oh, I've just realized, that solves a whole problem of my life."

"I will repeat the auditing command." See?

Well, why, why is the pc now reacting that way? The pc might not have reacted that way earlier on the line, you see. The pc is now over this hump and you're auditing something that doesn't have to be audited, so you have an Abridged—style. And it's—of course, "abridged" is termed to the lower styles. It isn't an Abridged upper style, it's only an Abridged lower style.

So it's the styles for 0: Listen; I: Muzzled; and II: Guiding. And now we can abridge them. And by abridge we mean we can look and see what's going on.

Now, the pc is getting pretty good because he thinks his life is more easy to handle and that sort of thing. You find out his PTPs are blowing quicker and various things are happening with the pc that wouldn't happen ordinarily, and so forth. And you're just slowing down the whole progress of the game by putting in the whole package, do you see?

Now we do a present time problem. The pc has—says he has a present time problem. We don't guide him into it, we say, "What is it?" Bang! See? And he says, "Well, this present time problem, I've got an awful problem. I've got to go to Aunt Martha's tea party. And my God, I almost die every time she feeds me a cup of tea. She boils it for fifteen hours on the back of the stove, you know. You could float a sounding lead in it!" "Well, all right," you say. "Fine. Is it blown?" If it's blown, you don't do anything else. In other words, this is audit by pure result. Having brought our pc up and gotten him out of his nappies, why, we can now let him walk, see.

He says it's a present time problem, that's what it was, we saw the reaction on the meter and it blew. Oh well, an auditor would be very foolish to pursue this thing. In fact, he'd get the pc all invalidated if he pursued it, don't you see? "Well, that's the end of that present time problem!"

But if it—the pc sort of looked *googed* on it, and so forth, you'd say, "Well, give me some communications that you haven't given to Aunt Martha." Well, he says, "So—and—so and so—and—so and so—and—so." You get multiple answers and things of this character. That's where that belongs. "Well, I didn't do that and didn't do that," and you find a pc eventually gets indoctrinated into a multiple answer, you ask him one question and he gives you the five answers necessary to flatten it and that's the end of the process. Along about the fifth question you get a blowdown on your tone arm, and that's it.

Well, by golly, auditing can happen at an awful rate of speed. And you watch some pc who is—who is well indoctrinated as a pc, who's, you know, had enough gains now—it isn't

that they've trained, it's that they've had enough gains so they're more self—determined, they're more present, they're more there. And they can as—is things now; they don't just dodge, you know? And you ask this pc—you'll see some auditor do this sometime in some session and I'm sure somebody at Level I would say, "That's awfully sloppy auditing."

"Do you have a present time problem?"

The pc said, "Yeah. Yeah, I was afraid I was going to be late for the session. I realize I haven't, and so forth."

And the auditor says, "All right. Thank you. Now, what we're going to do this session..."

And the lower—scale person will say, "What—what went on? You know, that auditor didn't handle that pc's present time problem."

Oh, yes that auditor did. That auditor's good enough now to notice that meter moved. If the meter didn't move, why, he would ask him another question. In other words, you audit against a finite result, and that's abridged auditing. You just audit against what you want to have happen. You audit enough to make that happen. You don't audit another step beyond it.

You make sure you've got the tone arm action out of a question; you do not then run it for twenty minutes to find out if the tone arm action is out.

In other words, you're good enough at this particular time to know when the tone arm action is out of something, during the last ten minutes of the run or the last five minutes of the run, don't you see?

Well, that tone arm is starting to climb and that tone arm is not now blowing down. You must be into some other zone of action and the pc has been going on and you've been going on with your process, don't you see, and you see that this tone arm action is out and it's gone. You're going to give this thing a twenty—minute thing and stick that tone arm up good? No, you're not. In other words, you don't now give it a twenty—minute test or something like that, as you would, you see, at Guiding—style. Guiding—style: grind it through, man, don't take any chances, see.

Well, at this level, you see, well, it blew! Pc says, "I have a PT problem. Well, it blew." All right, you know you're not going to get anything out of that and besides you don't want to audit Aunt Martha anyway. So you just sail on through, pocketa—pocketa—pocketa, see. You're just auditing against the finite result. You want that result. You want that cognition. You want that ability regained.

Now of course, what's the pc learning? Wow! He's learning that he gets a finite result. When he gets audited something happens. And he doesn't get beaten to pieces because something happened, he just—when he gets audited something happens. *Bow—bow,* you see? He's taught against the finite result.

The auditor also at this point realizes you can obtain a finite result from auditing. Hence abridged. Everything is out except the absolute essential action. The whole works is out. So the pc's audited—being audited now against direct result. He doesn't say another word beyond what is necessary to obtain that result and he is upscale far enough now to know

when he's gotten the result. The pc's comm lags are all the same now, the thing is regained, the ability is regained, the pc's had a big cognition. Tone arm action seems to have damped on this particular thing. Well, out man! Don't fool around.

Now, we've got Direct—style Auditing. We want—we've got Direct—style Auditing. Now, if you'll notice, an Abridged—style is not necessarily direct. It's simply got things missing out of it. And some of the things I've said about the auditing against the finite result apply to Direct Auditing style more than they do Abridged. That is to say, you've got the exact result. Direct means straight, concentrated, intense, applied in a direct manner. We do not mean the sense of direct somebody or to guide, we mean it is direct—boom! Do you understand?

Now we're getting somebody up that—suddenly the pc realizes that he can be given one God—awful assignment, he's supposed to just carry it out, and that's it. Big look, see?

All right. Well, let's apply this to Clay Table Clearing: "Give me something that you want to improve." We're not going to have a pc saying—giving a goal or something like that, because if he's been brought up properly, why, he of course won't tell us "to be Clear." No, he'll give you a subject he wanted to improve. "To be Clear," you see, doesn't answer the auditing question at all. It's a goal. And it isn't even a GPM. So then you try to audit that, of course you've already flunked. But you say to this fellow, "All right, give me a—give me a subject you want to improve."

And he says, "Ah, golf."

"All right. Tell me something there that you—some term, things like that, in golf, you never understood."

"Fore.

"All right. Good. Represent it in clay ... You didn't label that."

"I know, that's a golfer."

"You didn't label it."

"What do you mean, I didn't label it? I got a sign on it, 'golfer.' "Yeah, I know. You've got some pants on. Oh, you're on a course. The club, club, club. Label it, if that's what it is. Go ahead. All right. Well, I'm glad you realize the fellow's in a shooting jacket. Fine. Good. All right. Is that it?"

The pc's, you know, looking at it.

"Well, go on. All right. Give me another term you didn't understand about that."

"Greens."

"All right, represent 'greens' in clay."

Now, from the pc is coming a total shower of action. The pc's action is all direct back, direct, direct, direct, direct, direct, straight to the auditor, straight to the auditor. He doesn't expect anything. He doesn't even expect any encouragement. See, he's just work, work, work, work, work, work, bzzzm. You see? And to somebody outside it looks like the auditor isn't

doing any work, and it looks like nobody's doing any work, looks like the pc is running the whole session. It looks like the pc's in total control of the whole session. Of course, the pc would be in total control of the whole session right up to the moment when he failed to label that club! You understand?

And then, in R6, of course, we combine all these styles. The person does them one and another, and the other one. The pc, by that time, can stand up to it. So it's bringing a pc up right. It isn't just training the auditor.

You understand auditing styles a little better?

All right. Thank you.