

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 10 APRIL 1980

Remimeo
Cl IV Auditors and Above
Acad Supers and Above

AUDITOR BEINGNESS

Refs: HCOB 16 Aug. 71R II Rev. 5.7.78
HCOB 24 Dec. 79R Rev. 19.6.86
HCOB 26 Apr. 71 I
HCOB 10 June 79 Art Series 8

TRAINING DRILLS REMODERNIZED
TRs BASICS RESURRECTED
TRs AND COGNITIONS
A PROFESSIONAL

The data in this bulletin is for use by a student auditor or an auditor only after he has been thoroughly trained and drilled in TRs, including Upper Indoc TRs, and after he has been trained in metering.

When one is free of uncertainties on the technical basics of his profession and has mastered the mechanics of those technical basics, he can move up into another strata and assume the full beingness of a professional in his field.

So an auditor applies the auditor beingness step after he has acquired a good mastery of his basics, TRs and metering. To do otherwise would be out-gradient, out-sequence and would rarely, if ever, be successful.

BEINGNESS, correctly defined, is: THE RESULT OF HAVING ASSUMED AN IDENTITY.

ATTITUDE IS: THE OPINION ONE HOLDS OR THE BEHAVIOR ONE EXPRESSES TOWARD SOME PERSON, SPACE, THING OR SYMBOL AS A RESULT OF THE CONCEPT HE HAS OF IT.

TRs reflect an auditor's attitude.

And what is back of attitude? It is certainty and beingness.

Your beingness and attitude toward the pc are the things which your TRs measure. If you as an auditor simply go into a robotic imitation of a tone level or attitude or identity, you aren't there at all. It will be apparent in your TRs.

It is the beingness which comes first and that gets reflected in your attitude and your attitude, in turn, is then reflected in your TRs.

And what directly influences beingness? Certainty. Before one can assume the beingness of an auditor he must have certainty on the materials of auditing. That means certainty on TRs and certainty on the meter and his own metering.

The importance of all these factors is based on the fact that they, each one, immediately and directly affect the pc's "in-sessionness."

TRs AND METERING: THE TWO FOREMOST ACTIONS

There is a very good reason why you do TRs and metering as your two foremost actions. It has to do with the pc being “in-session.”

Any auditor worthy of the title has the goal of his pc achieving case gain. Toward that end, the first aim of the auditor is to put the pc in-session. Until and unless that happens, nothing else is going to happen in the way of case gain for the pc.

With your TRs in, the pc is confident that he is being listened to and that he is getting the attention that is desirable for the resolution of his case. Therefore he's willing to talk to you.

If your metering is very exact and you're not leaving the pc up in the air or plowed in with misreads or false reads, he has confidence in what you're saying because what you say reads is what he feels. There's a coordination there.

So between these two things we get the definition of “in-session” for a pc which is: INTERESTED IN OWN CASE AND WILLING TO TALK TO THE AUDITOR.

If your TRs are rough and your metering is bad, you won't get that reaction in a pc and you won't get enough case gain to bother with.

THE BASIC THING THAT MONITORS CASE GAIN IS: PC INTERESTED IN OWN CASE AND WILLING TO TALK TO THE AUDITOR.

Without that, you won't get any case gain on a pc. With it, given that he is audited on the correct processes, the pc's case progress is assured.

TRs AND IN-SESSIONNESS

There is some interesting data which points up this matter of TRs and in-sessionness.

Back in the days before we had TRs I had a funny phenomenon occurring. I would audit somebody in London, then go away and time would march on. I'd come back, pick up the same pc and find him at the exact point where I'd left him, even though he had been audited by a lot of other auditors. That would be 6 or 8 months and lots of auditing hours later. It would be explained away with, “Well, of course, Ron is a good auditor,” and naturally they were saying that. Actually, that would be quite a critical thing to say about the other auditors as, while we didn't have pc programs then, we did have processes that advanced a pc's case. That being true, how did it happen that that pc stayed parked right where I had left him? The answer is elementary. When I was auditing him, he was interested in his own case and willing to talk to the auditor. That was all.

The phenomenon was pronounced and it showed up in other ways. Every now and then I would arrive at the London Org and people would come in from the surrounding cities or areas and hang around in the hall. I was moving around the org a lot and as I would move out into the hall someone would rush up to me and tell me an awful tale of woe. This person's husband had just left her, or that person had just gone through a bankruptcy or something horrible. They would give me these stories and I would acknowledge them and then start to say something about what we might do about it. But they didn't listen any further to what I was saying after the acknowledgment; at that point they would go off and seem perfectly happy.

It didn't just happen once; it was rather a consistent phenomenon. I never did anything to solve any of those problems, and they were legion – there were hordes of them. Very peculiar. I began wondering what exactly this phenomenon was and the HCO Area Secretary at the time volunteered: “They just want you to know about it and that makes them feel better.” But the truth of the matter was that it was simply TR 2.

They were willing to talk to me about their troubles and I was concerned, I was interested in them, and I did acknowledge that it was a rough scene, etc. And apparently that was adequate to convey to them that they had now talked about their troubles and been heard, and that was it. Somebody was willing to listen to them and acknowledge and that, apparently, would blow it. That's TR 2.

I am not holding myself up here as the last word in TRs. The whole point I am making is the fact that if your TRs were good enough you could almost bypass processes and get a surface level of case gain. You wouldn't get anything in depth but you would get a surface level of case gain.

The phenomenon described above has been going on for a long time. It's been going on since the earliest days of Christianity and I'm sure the Christians picked it up from somebody before that. It's a basic mechanism so somebody picked up this confessional idea somewhere along the line. It's very far from the only mechanism there is in the mind, but it in itself was good enough to carry the Roman Catholic Church through hundreds of years over the out-TRs of those father confessors. (There is no way that confront and TR 0 could be construed as in when the father confessor goes into his box, pulls the curtain and then listens to a confessional.)

Also, anything that Freudian analysis ever had to offer depends exclusively upon this same mechanism – the person feeling that he has been listened to. But there is not a psychoanalyst in the business who ever heard of TR 2. You want to know how someone being analyzed can sit there and talk for hours and hours on the same subject? Obviously the psychoanalyst's TR 2 is out because he's making the pc overrun. And all the psychiatrists know how to do is give the person another pound of tranquilizers or electric shock. That is lousy TR 2. It is not even a substitute.

Some years ago I didn't even know TRs existed, that they were anything special or could be broken down into anything. But in Phoenix, Arizona, when I was giving live demonstrations on closed circuit TV for students, one staff member came out very, very excited about a discovery he had made. His discovery was:

“You acknowledge what the pc says!” There apparently wasn't another auditor the length and breadth of the world who was doing that, so I decided I had better study this. It led into, over the years, a very deep analysis of the cycle of communication. Apparently nobody had ever analyzed this before but there is a very full analysis of cycles of communication now and the bulk of it is contained in the early Saint Hill lectures.

You are now studying the near ultimate of this strata of auditing.

The whole point here is: If your TRs were good enough you would be known as a great auditor without doing a single thing. I'm not advising that you shouldn't do another single thing but I want to point up that just this factor alone – good TRs – makes people feel better. It becomes safe to talk to the auditor and they become willing to talk to the auditor with confidence they will be listened to and acknowledged.

It comes down to the definition of “in-session”: interested in own case and willing to talk to the auditor. That definition of in-session is such that I can C/S and spot, even from fragmentary worksheets, whether or not the pc is in-session. When I am first C/Sing on a new line, that is really all I look for. If it's out, I mend it. When I've got it mended, then we can begin to get someplace.

If you've got thousands of years of background history where they were getting along without knowing a blasted thing about TRs and it still had a workability, you can see where you could get if you really knew your TRs.

The potential is there and it is up to every auditor to realize it.

METERING AND IN-SESSIONNESS

The pc's in-sessionness is going to be influenced by your understanding of the meter and your metering. When you have confidence in the meter and your metering ability, you build greater confidence on the part of the pc.

First, it's got to be real to you as an auditor that the meter has something to do with the being you have it attached to, that it does connect up with that person's bank and that the meter works. It is important for the pc to realize that too.

There is a drill which makes this real to both auditor and pc. It's called the pinch test.

Whenever I have a new meter to test, I put someone on the cans, give him an R-factor on what I'm going to do, and then I just reach over and pinch the person. Then I ask him to recall the pinch and when he does I see a meter read occur. I know then whether that meter works or not.

The theory behind this is quite simple. Life has the ability to register an impingement and to retain it or reduplicate it. Life has that ability and that is all the meter measures. So, when you do a pinch test you'll see the meter read. You can actually see the meter read before you pinch if you reach up and then don't pinch. It is simply a matter of reactions.

The meter is measuring reactions to impingements in life. That is all there is to it. In a pinch test it is measuring the reaction to the impingement of the pinch.

There is another datum that can be stated here to make it even clearer to an auditor how the meter connects up with the pc's bank. The E-Meter is an interlocking device with the electrons of the bank. With the bank you have a sheet of energy there and it is made out of electricity. When you pass a current of electricity near the thing, it is going to monitor that current of electricity and that is what shows up on the meter.

The auditor who understands that datum will have certainty on the fact that when the meter reads it is reading on something.

If the meter reads when you ask about "ARC break," it is reading either on the fact that the pc has an ARC break or that he is startled to be asked if he has an ARC break when he really has a problem, but it is reading on something. You don't just walk on by it.

This is what I had to teach Class VIIIIs: that you check Suppress and False when all is not running well. Because for a meter to read something must exist for it to read on. And normally it is exactly what you said. You said "Do fish fly?" and it read. There is something there. An accurate meter does not idly read.

Your knowledge of the meter and your skill with a good operating meter has to be such that you have certainty on this and can't be given a sales talk and sold on the idea that "There's nothing there, really; it just happened to read."

Without that certainty it goes off the rails. Instead of asking "What was that withhold?" and really cleaning it up, you'll say, "Well, maybe... All right, maybe it was in some past life or something so let's go on to the next question..." NO! There goes your pc out of session. That's it. He can't be interested in his own case now. His own case has just been alter-ised.

Without certainty on the fact that when the meter reads it reads on something, you're going to waffle on what you ask the pc. That will deteriorate your beingness and your attitude and put the pc out of session.

An auditor must also be a technician on meter interpretation.

He observes the meter reaction; that's an observation. After observation there is a point of interpretation.

Those are two different steps. You have to get observation down pat before you get into interpretation. So sandwiched in between your auditing question and interpretation is observation.

What the auditor must not miss is his observation of the needle on the dial, that it moves and that it reacts and that it does so because it is connected to the pc. So there is a point of action in there which is observation.

An auditor determines to find out something. That is an interrogation. It is followed by an observation, and that is followed by an interpretation.

You've got to single out the observation as to what it is, and then the interpretation as to what it is, and the causation that makes the meter read as to what it is. You will then have these things unstuck and separated out from each other.

There is nothing complicated about any of this unless someone makes it complicated. You can have a million interpretations and one truth. What makes the road hard to travel is that the interpretations (or alter-is-es) are, every one of them, liable to be given the same importance as the truth. There can be an infinity of "facts" and only one truth, so that one truth gets lost like a drop of water in the ocean. Which is the drop of water? I'll tell you what the drop of water is: It is the point of observation. And part of that observation is the fact that the meter is connected to the pc and the pc does have a bank. It then becomes clear that the meter reads because there is something there for it to read on.

So there is an area of confidence in the meter for the auditor which contributes to his auditor beingness. This results in greater confidence on the part of the pc which, in turn, contributes to the pc's ability to be in-session.

BEINGNESS AND ATTITUDE

Once you have acquired certainty on your TRs and metering, the next step is beingness.

This can give rise to an infinity of questions: "What is this 'beingness'?" "How do I assume a beingness?" "Is it an artificial beingness I'm wearing?" "Do I need to adopt a different beingness?"

It is NOT a matter of a listing question, such as "What am I being?" It is something you simply have to work out for yourself; there isn't anybody who can do it for you.

In sorting this out, one can get into such matters as interesting and interested. It should help to realize there is nothing worse than an interesting auditor. It's a wrong beingness.

If you're disturbed by having to sit on a hard chair as an auditor, it will color your beingness. It will color your attitude. If your confront of evil is very low, it will show up especially on your TR 0 and will cause you to do all sorts of oddball things with your TRs.

What does confront of evil have to do with beingness? Well, what being can confront evil? It is not necessarily an evil being. Let us say a pc comes in and says, "I have just strangled a dog and took a great deal of pleasure in it," and you say "WHAT????!!!" You are never going to get him in the kind of shape where he doesn't go around strangling dogs. Why? Because he has just learned that he shouldn't talk to the auditor.

Whatever you're doing as an auditor, if you're doing it through a colored beingness you've got a misattitude and your pc becomes unwilling. You start developing session withholdings in the pc. These will be innocent withholdings, such as "I don't have any interest in that but I won't tell him so," or "I didn't really think that read..."

They will most likely be innocent withholdings, but you now have a pc who isn't in there pitching. And that's the point at which the session deteriorates.

If you're not sure of your beingness, if you haven't decided upon your beingness, if your beingness is wobbly, then your attitude toward the pc will be uncertain and wobbly. And your attitude toward the pc will then color your TRs. In that case you can ask "Do fish fly?" until hell freezes over and drill and drill and drill continuously and religiously. And you are not going to get anywhere until you get your beingness and your attitude settled.

What IS auditor beingness? Well, what are you being as you sit in the auditing chair auditing the pc? Are you a beingness somebody would be willing to talk to? The general attitude connected with your TRs is what signals this.

Your beingness as an auditor is something you yourself must DECIDE upon. It's a step to be taken when you are certain of your auditing basics. It could be done in minutes or it could require hours or days. But if you take a look at all of this data and apply it, you actually could simply decide "What is my beingness as an auditor?" and "Exactly what is my attitude toward pcs?" and your beingness as an auditor might suddenly go click. Your attitude then will fall comfortably into place, and that will be reflected in your TRs.

These are the skills you need to acquire. But it is basic simplicities you are after, as I have described them here.

I've given you an analysis of the scene that hasn't been stated quite this way before. It begins with certainty on technical basics, TRs and metering. It's then a matter of assuming an auditor beingness which comes across in your attitude. At that point your TRs, already well drilled, can be brought up easily to a point of flawlessness.

And from there it's a short step to your pcs, each and every one, interested in own case and willing to talk to the auditor.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

BDCSC:LRH:bk