

BASIC AUDITING

A lecture given on
5 December 1963

Well, hello!

Audience: Hello.

Imagine finding you here! Glad to see you today. Winter is upon us. In just fifteen days, I think it is, we get the shortest day in the year. And then the sun comes back north again. So remember at Christmas to burn your Christmas trees so as to attract the sun north again. Probably nobody even realizes why they have Christmas.

Well, what's the date?

Audience: December 5.

Five Dec., the nautical month, AD 13. And haven't anything to talk to you today, about at all, I gave you vent of meanness, cussedness and viciousness yesterday. I know several of you went through the floor. Not those who had their names mentioned but those whose pcs had been humming and doodling in session. The problems of auditing are divided into three classifications. I'm not mad at you. I wasn't then, I'm not today. I just want you to be successful, that's all. Sometimes I get a little snarly when I don't think you're being as successful as fast as you might be able to.

Auditing is divided into three areas. And these areas are basic auditing, technique, and case analysis. Now, when we say technique we mean the exact patter or procedure necessary to get something audited on the pc. We do not mean technology. The technique involved-let's take an old process-we're really exhuming them out of the rag bag. Reg was showing me a list of processes being compiled for Level II and nostalgia reigned in all directions! Waterloo Station that-gosh! You know? I remembered one myself, I used to run on groups. Always very successful. The only processes anywhere in that lineup that were at all dangerous were the mock-up processes. And you just get those out. And sometimes running a Havingness Process, it is too far away from the pc's Havingness command and you actually tighten his can squeeze up. But at Level II that's just tough. You wouldn't do very much about that. Of course you wouldn't be getting tone arm action; Level II is run by tone arm. There is no needle in Level II.

So that this still would not go unnoticed. But I was looking at some of these old processes. And one of them I used to run on a group was „Spot three spots in the body, spot three spots in the room.“ Remarkable process. That is almost an optimum process. You'd be surprised what that will drag a pc out of And drag him out of his body too, on some cases, if you keep it up long enough. It actually tends to pull him out of pieces of the bank, don't you see, and so on; it's quite interesting. So any exteriorization process, short of actually exteriorizing the pc, is quite valid. It's quite a decent process. You know the original exteriorization process, not included in that remark, and that is of course, „Try not to be three feet back of your head.“ That was the original exteriorization process. „Try not to be three feet back of your head.“

I don't know if you know it but somebody put that over the air on a New York radio station. I can see the cab driver now, you see? Tried not to be three feet back of that cab. But these-the actual act of exteriorization generally brings the person back into his body more solidly. Because he becomes alarmed. He becomes upset. He is unstable. And this is-actually

occurs at higher levels. You inadvertently exteriorize somebody while doing Level VI, what now amounts to Level VI processes, or Level V processes. You can actually blow somebody out for a moment, and he has some adventure that he doesn't particularly like and he tends to come back in and hold on harder. Fortunately at Level VI, with your OT processes and so forth, why, he recovers from that because the GPMs being gone, there's nothing to upset him.

But the fact is that various things happen to people. It's not that exteriorization is bad, it's just that they become frightened and stay in harder.

Such a fellow's walking down-or he's driving down the street, and somebody has exteriorized him and he's been exteriorized for a day or so and he's feeling wonderful by the way, and he draws up to a stop light, and there's the body in the car, don't you see. And he draws up to the stop light and stops the car. And then wanders off. And sits up on top of a building and starts surveying the city and how isn't it very nice up here. And then suddenly horrifyingly comes to himself that the light has changed and every car down there is honking and he becomes afraid that he'd just walk off and abandon his body and his property, don't you see? And this alarms him, so he goes *spang* back into his head again. And the next time you get him out it's rather hard to do. A bit harder to do. And then it gets a bit harder and a bit harder and so forth. Well, the reason why is that he's so mucked up with energy and masses-GPMs and implant engrams and all that sort of thing, you see-he goes through these ridges, they disturb energy masses and it's these which are upsetting him, not the misadventures which he has as a result.

He merely misassigns it and misattributes these misadventures to being frightened, when as a matter of fact the reason he was frightened is because of energy masses that are exerting certain emotional responses upon him. Otherwise he couldn't care that much about it.

But any exteriorization type process, like three spots in the body, three spots in the room, anything that tends to bring somebody out of something, like, „Where aren't you?“ You know, „Where aren't you now?“ and that sort of thing, why, these things are quite marvelous. And they work on groups and individuals and so on. There's tremendous numbers of recall processes and so on, which fall into those categories-which is, „Something you wouldn't mind forgetting-tell me something you wouldn't mind forgetting.“ That sort of process.

Now, the liability of these is that they run into GPMs which have RIs in them, such as „forgetting,“ see? You run into the RI „forgetting.“ This becomes restimulated and pulled out of line. But this happens less often than you would think. And frankly, the individual audited up to about Level III the way you will see them coming up, are just about as far from a past life or a GPM as you actually could get. They're riding in all this overcharged fat in the top RIs. And anything is a lock, and anything you audit off of that is improving the pc's perception, his orientation, making him wiser with regard to his environment, so he's in better shape with regard to his environment and as a result the GPMs tend to destimulate, not restimulate. But always remember when you're running a repetitive process-always recall that the danger of restimulation of an actual GPM RI or a lock on an actual GPM RI or an implant RI or a lock on an implant RI and so forth is always present. And the fancier and more comprehensive or-or goofball the wording is of the process, the more likely you are to do this, see.

Now, you actually run this same problem at Level I, of all places, when you say, „What solutions have you had to that?“ Because what is the entirety of the track but a series of solutions? And the only thing that saves your bacon in this particular instance is because they-they don't have any reality on any earlier lifetime or any other interior proposition; these things just bite in this lifetime.

Now, if in doubt-if in doubt, you should presage your auditing commands with „In this lifetime.“ And you'll probably start doing that at about Level III. That starts to get possible. And by Level IV-present Level IV-you will find that you jolly well better had! Because this individual's awareness and alertness with regard to his existence is coming up to a point

where he slides through and out of this lifetime just about as easy as slipping on a banana peel. You couldn't move him out of this lifetime, ordinarily at Level I, with a building jack, don't you see? You couldn't do anything about that at all. Let's take-let's take Doctor Snodgrass. And he's been working away for a lot of years and he knows all about life and death. He's seen more bodies, you know, lying there dead, and he knows all these things, this tremendous overburden of false knowledge, don't you see, that's sitting there. Why, you start running a process on him, he'll always apply it to this lifetime. See, automatically and immediately.

When he gets processed enough and he gets enough charge off this lifetime, he'll begin to realize that it isn't this lifetime that is aberrating him. And let him collide with this reality all on his lonesome. Nothing's happened to him in this lifetime enough to aberrate him to any great degree. And let him run into this propounded problem. Self-propounded! „Well, if there's nothing in this lifetime that could make me hate spinach, ahhh, where's it coming from? Must be coming from someplace.“ And this dawning feeling, „I wonder if I ever lived before, that might have something to do with this?“ And by that time he's getting creaky. Well, by that time of course, you must start limiting your processes if you're going to run repetitive processes and so forth. Otherwise you really will collide with GPMS, RIs, implants and all sorts of stuff of this particular character.

Well, they slip through in due course. And they will collide with the materials of the whole track, willy-nilly; some sooner and some later. Main trouble you will have is the fellow at Level I who's on a manic on backtrack and hasn't been in this lifetime yet, don't you see? He keeps arguing that he can only run stuff on the whole track and so forth. Well, that's all right. That's your problem. I've already had that problem. A problem of that type was what first shattered the first foundation in Elizabeth, New Jersey. We had a couple of blokes around there that could only run past life engrams on each other. Couldn't find any present life engrams. And they were busy running past life engrams, and I remember poor old Joe Winter and Parker Morgan and John Campbell and the rest of them, all sitting around there and they proposed a motion that past lives must not be researched or mentioned. Of course, they didn't know up to that time that I could get mad. They found it out right then, right that minute! Upset them! They went into terrible shock! Walking around sadly for days.

But they were in terrible shock because they were trying to make me guilty and make me back down on the thing, because they said it had bad public presence! That was their argument. Well, one asks this fantastic question: Public presence? What are we doing? Public presence? Or are we trying to pry people out of the mud? Now, which are we doing? And the *Saturday Evening Post* reporter that was mucking up my weekend here a couple of weeks ago-I finally recovered from it-took some doing. He had collected every bad news story that had ever been printed anyplace about anything anywhere and he was sitting there with this stuff stacked up at about a foot and a half high, don't you see? And he's trying to take up each one of these stories one by one to find out if there was any truth in it. Of course, I just cut his throat and let him bleed all over the place. Because I told him no American newsman has ever interviewed me to get any of the material for any of those bad stories you've got there, so why are we taking them up? That finished it! Left him completely adrift.

Anyway-well, it was! It was nonsense! But the point here is that the university depending for its endowment upon its public presence; the politician, depending for his next election upon his public presence; this planet is public presenced to death, see. And there's no room in all this for truth. No room in all this for truth. Because, of course, if anybody-even in the field of psychology researching, they have to think of this because the university in which the research is being done of course must think of its good name. I think it's a remarkable state of mind in which to do research, you see. Well, now, you can go over the other way and become completely antipathetic with what you research. But my point of view is that truth came first and everything else fell in second, and if you could fit it in second or third in line,

good! By all means do so, but truth came first. And that's how we got where we got to, which was good, forthright, straight look at the whole situation.

Public presence, though, very often got in our road. You-you'll have these problems and so forth. This dear, sweet soul who has been the-just as calm and as pleasant and cheerful in this particular co-audit comes in one day and she's found out that she was a submarine commander in World War I. Or something like this, you see, or she was a space commander, you see, in the second galactic battle, or something, you see, and the other people start getting upset with her, you see, and try to jar her, and you don't want her reality to be knocked apart. And you actually don't want their reality to be knocked apart. So you ordinarily solve it by being just pontifical about the whole thing. And standing beautifully aloof, telling them, „Well, if she believes it she believes it. And if she was she was, and if she wasn't she wasn't, and that's all there is to that.“ Truth is truth, and that is all there is to it. A truth-a fact is either true or false. And no amount of opinion will make it either one. So you get around it to this degree. But you're going to run into trouble in that particular direction, even at Level II and these low-level processes.

Now, I don't think you will often run into it at Level I. But even then you might run into it. Because I remember one time at a swimming pool out in Kansas-it was a very country-club type swimming pool. And this society matron had been reading *Dianetics: Modern Science of Mental Health* and was pleading with me to tell her that children could not remember prenatal existence. And she read it in the book and she was pleading with me to tell her this and so forth and I said, „Well, I can't tell you that,“ I said, „you've got a little boy over there, he's four or something like that, why don't you ask him?“ She called the little boy over and says, „Now, how far back do you remember, Johnny?“ And he said, „Oh, I remember when I was in your tummy, mommy.“ And went over and jumped in the swimming pool. Very embarrassing!

But there's apparently such a thing as acceptable truth. And I don't think that's true at all. I think that's the biggest lie at all, because that gives you a-that gives you a bonus for not telling the truth. So you actually can't compromise with truth at certain levels. About the only thing you can really do is to hold the line. On the average, with a pc, any effort to go back into past lives or something like that early on before their PTPs are handled will be met with catastrophic results. They will turn on somatics the like of which you never heard of, they're stuck into things that they can't handle, they're disoriented and so forth. They're actually being audited against hidden standards; they have terrific present time problems. They don't know yet whether they should go down to the doctor or not, to see about their tonsil which is sore. They're not quite sure in this direction or that direction. Life is just sort of a disoriented confusion to them. And all of a sudden you blang them into some new, startling datum! Well, you haven't got their present environment resolved at all and here they are confronting this big, new datum. And it turns on somatics and upsets them. Op-also lays them wide open for invalidation.

So you'll find most of your problems are solved by following this rule of: process them within their class.

Now, you're going to ask yourself, „Why? Why within their class? Certainly cases can be processed at once, higher than Level I. Certainly. They can be. Certainly.“

You'll find the bulk of them can't be. The bulk of them really can't be processed higher and that accounts for most of the processing failures. They want to talk about it. They want to talk about it a little bit. Their idea of control is so nervy and so upset that to do more than to just sit there and say some things about some section of their life is quite beyond them. They want to talk about this or that or the other thing, even-if you start to guide them into O/W or something like this, they can't take that much responsibility. You'd be surprised they even get results getting off motivators. As-knowing the mechanics of the mind better, you'll often be surprised at how improvement can take place in the teeth of some well-known datum.

This guy sits there and gets off all his motivators, don't you see, and of course if you could get off the overt the recovery would be quite rapid. And the recovery really doesn't take place fully until you do. But nevertheless getting off the motivator does get them some distance. Of course, that's an auditable situation. Somebody can do that with this person, but also this person is capable of doing that.

Now, if we look at all these various classifications and so on, we'll see that it's just an increasing level of responsibility for self and for the dynamics. And this is what this is basically plotted against. So the processes laid out for the individual in any given class-of course that's a gradient scale of processes, too. That gradient scale should be plotted against increasing level of responsibility. So it starts with motivators more or less, and ends with overt, don't you see? So any type of gradient that can be made inside a class is actually just increased level of their own awareness of their own responsibility. You'll find out that this is a fairly successful pattern of operation.

But oddly enough-oddly enough-as simple-I've just discussed these various levels to increase your familiarity with them. Still talking about these three factors of basic auditing, technique and case analysis. You are still looking, don't you see, there, at technique, when you are looking at these processes. Now, those are all techniques. Those techniques must be programed. The programing of those techniques is based on case analysis. Which technique do you run first? See, that's case analysis. What's this fellow really worried about? Well, that's what we're going to do with him, *don't* you see? That's a case analysis. So in actual fact, every level-not for somebody just at a high-level auditor, but in actual fact every level-has its own case analysis. Has its own case analysis. And case analysis rises up to the highest level at the high complexity of GPMs and implants and all of this sort of thing. All the bric-a-brac and machinery and bits of mass of the mind are taken into account there. But you can say almost the same thing at a very, very low level. At II you can ask the fellow, „Well, was this something that was done to you?“ (implant) „or was this something you did?“ (actual GPM). I'm indebted for that clever wording to my friend Edgar. He slickered somebody here into a case analysis situation, did something with his potential tuberculosis in thirty-five minutes or something with this type of a case analysis. Now, he just took the basic steps of case analysis, discovered what the pc's sitting in, get him to itsa it and then fix it very-as accurately as possible. See, there was those three steps of case analysis.

Well, you find out that there's no need to depart from that pattern of case analysis in any level. And that, oddly enough, probably delivers the whole world of-this mustn't be on the tape, Peter, so don't bother to erase it-the whole world of healing, the whole world of healing is actually at this moment, at our complete mercy. At our mercy! We may not take it up, but this was one of the research targets that I set last January. And it unwrapped itself. And you got it very casually the other day as case analysis. And these steps of case analysis have some fantastic workability. And apparently have a fantastic workability in the field of illness and disease, which I think is quite remarkable. Now, no auditor is being advised to use these in this particular field, but there it sits! There sits the H-bomb that blows the medical profession over the hill and into oblivion.

Every one of these levels has its own approach for case analysis. But this first level is just sort of an-at Level I it would just be a discussion of how they're feeling or something like this, don't you see. Or what considerations have they had about some illness which they have. You possibly wouldn't be more definitive than this. But certainly that's a perfectly valid itsa. Now, as soon as we move up to Level II or Level III, certainly, we're into a case analysis which goes like this: Where is the person sitting? In other words, what engram or something are they sitting in? What life-we used to do this, by the way, in Dianetics. We'd say, in-“When I snap my fingers an age will flash (snap).“ And the person would get something like twelve, something like that. „All right, is that twelve years old? Yes, well, all right.“ That's where he was sitting, see.

„All right, what happened to you when you were twelve years old?“ See. And you'll finally be able to fix the fact that he was sitting in an engram which occurred when he was twelve. And the thing is frozen there in his mind. Now, there's a crude level of that same case analysis going forward. Of course this moves up to the situation at Level VI, „Is this an implant GPM?

Is this...“ you see? „Is this an actual GPM? Is this only a goal? Is this an RI? Is it an actual RI? Is it an implant RI? Is it a lock on an actual RI? Is it a lock on an implant . . .“ Well, look at the technology here, which the pc has to know. Actually progressively he has to know more and more technology from a Level I up, to get any response at all.

But at Level VI we have all of this panorama, but only those three steps of case analysis. See. Discover what he's sitting in, you know.

„How do you feel today?“

„I have a cold.“

See, that's Level 0-Level I, you know. Well, that's it, good.

„What have you done for it?“ See? „Do you feel better?“ They're-actually your three steps, don't you see, of case analysis, shoved in at Level I. They're-they sound almost social. But as an actual fact they are those three harshly definitive steps. Which is.- discover what the pc's sitting in; get the considerations he's had about it, in other words get the lies off of it which tend to make it persist; and then establish accurately this-conditions, see. And tell him about them. These are your three steps in every case.

So case analysis-case analysis has a considerable breadth of view. It apparently takes anything in, from healing out, very broadly into the whole track, all the rest of this.

Now, a word of warning. As a pc runs additional actual-this is-well, let's go really out of this world, now-as a pc runs actual GPMs and starts stacking up actual GPMS, the sub-itsa and the pc's ability to itsa-in other words what the meter reads and what the pc can actually see-come closer and closer together. And they come closer and closer together and then on case analysis fold over. And the pc can see better than the meter.

You can get a Condition which develops about halfway through to OT, where if the pc doesn't say it is it, you won't get it to read. And you try to do a case analysis this way: „Is this an actual GPM?“ See? That's it. Your needle just kept on-maybe there was the tiniest, little stub here; if you had a microscope, you might have seen it go, see. Maybe. But no significant read that anybody in his right mind could detect. Pc sits around and thinks about it for a while.

Says, „Yes. It's an actual GPM.“ Crash! Rocket reads, bang! Down goes the tone arm.

„Are we-is this a wrong item we have here, or are we listing from a wrong source? Are we listing from a wrong source?“ You see, you can't find the next item, it won't prove out. „Are we listing from a wrong source? Have we found a wrong item? Are-we are listing...“ That meter's not doing a confounded thing. Doing nothing! Obviously one of the two are true. See? There's only two things can be wrong at any given time. You found a wrong item or you listed from a wrong item. That's why you're messed up at this particular line, see.

It's only two, and you get a smooth flow on both of them. It's got to be one or the other! Pc sits back, thinks it over, „Well, I told you all the time it's a wrong source!“ *Psssswww!* Crash! Bang! Down goes the tone arm. Everything blows down. In other words, there is a point of case where the meter becomes useless.

Now, originally that itsa gap between the itsa and the sub itsa-what the meter reads, and what the pc can tell you-that's pretty wide! That's reading down below all the fat, don't you see? That's pretty wide! So your case analysis can be very adroit at about Level III. And practically ceases to exist at the upper end of Level VI. Quite interesting.

Now, you get somebody with eight, nine or ten GPMs run, actual GPMs all run accurately and the whole case smooth and so forth, you will see this. You will start running out of meter. It isn't registering, because of course, the meter depends on mass and the meter

depends on connections and short circuits in that mass and that sort of thing, in order to read. And you're getting a person up to a self-determinism where unless they think it, it isn't so.

In other words, your basic auditing at the beginning of the line, in the earlier parts of the line, particularly Levels II and III, has to be magnificent. Because the pc doesn't know what the hell you're talking about. You get the idea, see? Pc, in order to work anything through this about his own life, or something like this, is a herculean proposition. He's got no nomenclature, he has no reality on this thing, he can't put these things together easily or smoothly and so forth. And what's the whole burden? The whole burden is on basic auditing. Which, of course, is just handling the pc's itsa, improving the pc's itsa. Most basic of basic auditing. You've got to handle the pc and handle the session and handle the meter when it's present. But above all these things, you've got to handle the pc's itsa and improve that pc's itsa because if you're not working all the time in improving the pc's itsa-in other words, never give it to him on the meter when he can give it to you. That's one of the little laws that go along with this. But at the same time the pc says, „Would you check this on the meter? Is it a guffball or a gumshoe?“ See? And you say, „Naw, you tell me!“ I'm afraid that violates handling the pc's itsa. It actually isn't being courteous; isn't helping the pc.

But somewhere along the line you got to wean him. You got to wean him off a meter. Give less and less dependency because it's going to happen anyway. And if you haven't enormously improved the pc's ability to itsa as he came on up the line, God help you if you get half through a bank having knocked the pc's itsa in the head all the way. Pc's now in a Condition where he can't tell you and the meter won't. See, you could get yourself into a wonderful impasse here. On Level I they don't know what you're talking about. The thing is turned a full cycle. In both of those cases you've got basic auditing standing in.

The easiest area where basic auditing can be poor and not be noticed is at about Levels III and IV of the present chart scale. Basic auditing can be pretty cotton-picking poor. Because you've got a meter and it answers most of your questions at those levels and you haven't got much to worry about and so on.

So-but even through there, if you're not working at handling the pc's itsa and improving and increasing the pc's itsa, why, he won't make anywhere near the progress that he could make. So regardless at how the basic auditing-I mean, at what level basic auditing is applied, it is the dominant point in all levels. Now, you get-there is a technique and many techniques and types of techniques for the various levels. Those things are something you can learn. Like a good pianist learning a new tune. Doesn't take him long to do that. Your basic auditing is grooved; that's fairly easy to do. You have to do these things and they have to be quite precise.

And your case analysis-your case analysis is on the same fundamental steps, but it is quite variable, all the way up along the line. And the only things that vary in basic auditing-the only real things that vary is that a-your start with a meter tone arm. You've still got a meter, there isn't any place on that scale where you omit the meter. The meter can be at any place on that scale. You can also run without them at the very early scale. But you expect somebody's going to be sitting there with a tone arm. And we don't care what level, their auditing is going forward; at least get them used to that tone arm. Because they will get a familiarity with a meter and they'll begin to appreciate what it is. And you've gotten a tremendous bonus so that when they get trained on the meter it doesn't appear to be an unfamiliar article to them that scares them to death. And so you've got, as you move along this lineup, the complications of metering are added to basic auditing. Metering gets more and more complicated as you go on up along the line. And you think you're playing a theater organ on a meter when you get to Level VI. If you can't handle a meter that smooth, fast and good, why, it will find you out, man! If you're having any trouble.

There's little tricks on these Mark Vs. By the way, there's something I've been meaning to tell you for some time. You know you never run these Mark Vs at Levels V and

VI-you never run a Mark V meter higher than eight sensitivity- And a lot of your trouble, if you're having any trouble at such a level, comes from setting the meter sensitivity too high. I've had some trouble lately-a couple of times, I've set it too low. I've left it on one and wondered if the pc's RR was shutting off or something until I suddenly wake up with a shock and realize that I haven't advanced it from the start-of-session can squeeze. Just a point of amusement.

See, a pc gets so-needle gets so loose as you're-as you're moving up into these levels that frankly, Level I on a Mark V is reading quite nicely and it never occurs to you to run the Level I because it looks like somebody at about a Level III process, you see, operating at full blast on the meter. But eight-eight is about as high as you ever run the sensitivity on one of these things. You'll get any read that is at all significant at that.

If you're getting a dirty needle, your basic auditing is just too sour for words. You shouldn't ever have to advance sensitivity to get rid of a dirty needle so that you can move through it. Bah! It's just a horrible comment. And also I put out a bulletin the other day and I said that your basic-it was session ARC breaks that caused the dirty needle. And therefore those were solved by L1. And it's at-it's in that bulletin, but it possibly is not stated strongly enough that the violence of the ARC break is actually caused by the bypassed technical charge. Like the wrong goal or something like this and you've got to pick it up with L4 and so forth. But it isn't going to cure your dirty needle. It's just a technical fact that you've now got to go back to your session ARC break to cure that up. It could have sat there without a session ARC break and never keyed in and never given you any trouble. But you gave it a session ARC break, and it keyed it in. Quite in addition to that, none of these heavy charges ever have the power of creating a dirty needle. They don't create dirty needles. Dirty needles come solely and totally from basic auditing. What's the value of this thing is not how you handle ARC breaks, but how you supervise auditing. Or how you supervise your own auditing. Because you see, you're sitting there looking at a dirty needle, you know darn well that you've done something in this session which was not very good in the line of itsa.

And also in supervising auditing you can go down a line of auditors and look at the meters. And anybody that's sitting there with a dirty needle, you've got somebody whose basic auditing is awry for that particular level. That's for us a very, very good point to know. It's not because he's got a wrong goal that he has a dirty needle, it's because his basic auditing is sour.

Now, basic auditing cannot help but increase-as you come up the line - cannot help but increase with practice and familiarity. I'm quite surprised the degree that the basic auditing can be improved. I was quite amazed a few months ago when I made some tests. I actually played you the tape I made some tests on-those of you who were here a few months ago-and I just busted the pc's ARC and so forth in the session with an inadvertent cut of itsa. And a few things like that. Well, it woke me up to the fact that my auditing could be improved. And so I set out to improve my auditing and to handle itsa and that sort of thing and just made a project out of it. And I've been working on that for about three months. Same length of time as some of you have been around here. My auditing has improved. Has yours? Aw, that's a nasty thing to say. But I have noticed a considerable improvement in auditing. Which is basically expressed in the tremendous amount of TA action which I can pull out of a session.

Now, of course, I know I'm running Level VII; you can't expect TA action like this at any lower level. But in the last five sessions of sixteen hours and ten minutes total auditing time, 638 TA divisions down making an average of 39.8 TA divisions per hour of auditing and 99.3 I think it is, per two and a half hour session. Average.

Now, that is done-that is done with basic auditing. Now, you can say the technique is responsible, but do you know the same technique used and the same amount of elapsed time and so forth, might only have brought off - you've only got as half as much work done-but it

only might have brought off half of that, don't you see? It was the basic auditing which made the big difference. That's what made the difference.

Now, I listened to the tape that I played you yesterday and I didn't think I made my point well. Because I listened to that tape and it all sounded very comfortable and very easy. It sounded very relaxed. Well, that's a liability. Because from the auditor's viewpoint-was a liability as a demonstration. I thought maybe I hadn't put my point across at all, because I heard that thing playing on and it all sounded very casual. Very calm. Well, of course it was meant to sound very casual and very calm. Actually the auditor in this particular case was auditing like a mad, whirling dervish, you see. You know, that was really a driven session. But it sounded awful calm. But the auditor wasn't particularly calm running it, don't you see?

But here were all the factors of basic auditing. The auditor was not uncomfortable running this, don't you see, but he was right up on it. See, there was no relaxed frame of mind from the auditor's point of view. See, he was right up on it. You know, the „Do fish swim“ or whatever it was, see? The pc was adding long comm lags, you see. She felt self-conscious about this later. Adding these long comm lags. Finally the pc answered it and said *t-t-tt-ta-da, t-t-t-ta-da, t-t-t-ta-da*. The pc obviously had finished that answer, obviously said everything she was going to say and so forth, and bang! There was another auditor action right there. Get that? It was no lag! No auditor comm lag, see, it was right there. Right on top of the pc, see. PC never had time to breathe. No wonder the pc was comm lagging-only time the pc didn't have to work! But now, in that very session you were looking at, that TA was rolling-that TA was rolling all the time that was taking place, there. It was in constant motion. I gave you a slightly bum datum when I said you only go to the stop-point or a still-point of the TA, don't you see. You don't just sit and wait for the TA to move in case it moves again. You go to the stop-point of the TA. And I got to thinking about it later and I got to looking at it in last night's session and I was quite struck by the fact that there were no stillpoints of the TA. So I have to amend that for you. TA notably slowed down.

Doesn't have to be a stopped point of TA, because if you're really auditing they cease to exist. There is no moment in the session when that TA isn't jittering. It's moving from *whum to whum, to bing, to bow, to zzzzzzz-bump! To dip, to dap, zzzzzzz-thud! Up, up, up, up, zzzzzzzzz-bump!* That's the way it's going. It's just moving all the time.

You're only getting fifteen TA divisions in a session, see? That's what? Five every hour? No, it's not quite, it's-it's what? Clever arithmetic-sixpoint something. You get-you know your TA is stopped most of the time. Stopped. Stopped dead still. There are long periods in the session when that TA isn't budging. Isn't moving a hair and so forth. Well, you get up to TA quantities like 99.3 TA divisions down in two and a half hours of auditing, which is at the rate of the one I just gave you, 39.8 TA divisions per hour. Actually, well below that point, I think it's about twenty an hour, you don't have stopped points. There aren't points when the TA is motionless. The more constantly the TA is moving, of course, the more TA you're getting. But it gets up to a certain accelerated type of activity and there just are no stopped points. It doesn't come down and stick. It slows down and drifts. And then it gets into businesslike action again, you see?

Well, that makes it, perhaps, very hard for you to judge when should you talk, and when not talk and so forth and it's basically on the basis of the big, fast swoops, you keep your mouth shut. If it just so happens that at that moment when you're expected to say something you've got a big, fast swoop in progress on your TA, you wait until it has eased off before you start talking. I wanted to give you a little more accurate presentation of this thing, because it's-I say-what I told you was not quite accurate. It would fit very well, see, on the auditing you're doing at the moment. But if you thought that was all there was to know about it you'd start coming a cropper a level or two above where you're auditing, you see? Because here you're getting accustomed to the fact that the TA stops, which it is doing at this

particular time with you, and you go much higher in terms of levels than this and your TA doesn't stop. So you just have to learn to talk only when the TA is moving slowly.

Well, you get blowdowns such as-you don't have extreme blowdowns to get TA like this, by the way. Half-half of that action was from something like 2.75 to 3.5. No extreme highs, no extreme lows. Now, look how frantic the tone arm had to be only running over .75 area of a dial, see. That had to be pretty fast. And you run into oddities as you go along on this, you get such a steep blowdown that it doesn't have time to recover before your next blowdown, but does recover and then you get a blowup! You get into this kind of nonsense. And once in a while you'll sit there and be terribly puzzled as to what the devil happened. Well, probably your meter didn't track with everything that was happening in the session. See, or you were busy doing something or other, and you didn't get the recovery that did occur. But you didn't set your needle to it, because it happened too fast. Something like this.

So you'll finally find that the rule gets to be at the upper grade of the thing is, when the TA is remarking with blazing speed, if it's moving with a blazing, white-hot speed, shut up! And if it's not moving much, talk. And you'll more or less keep out of trouble.

But you can turn off somebody's heat very easily by talking when the TA is in motion. Because if somebody's got heat on, they got fast TA motion going on and if the auditor says anything, they suppress the heat at these higher levels. And you've got to get the Suppress on. It doesn't do any good to get the Suppress on the item, you've got to get the Suppress on the heat. You got that? You've got to get the Suppress on the heat. „Has anything suppressed that heat?“

„Oh, yes, I suppressed it, because you said something.“

„Oh? All right, thank you.“

The heat goes back on, your tone arm's moving. Now if you went ahead and made the same stupid blunder again, your TA is now flying because the rest of the heat is coming off and you say, „Oh! Well, that's good! The tone arm is moving now!“ You see? *Whohhhuup!* That's the end of that heat blowoff. And you say, „On this item has anything been suppressed?“ No, nothing's been suppressed on the item. The heat's been suppressed! So you'd have to get it back on.

This-I know this looks very complicated and something or other, but these things all have ramifications, they all follow in along the line of basic auditing. When you've got a bunch of action going on in the pc, when you've got a bunch of introversion going on in the pc, when the pc is very happy telling you all about something, when the pc is introverted and looking at his own case, when a lot of action is going on, what is an auditor doing starting action? I mean, it's as simple a problem as that. I'll show you how complicated the problem can look. You see, TAs move fast at some types of processes and don't move so fast at others and you have to adjust your TA and all this thing.

Yeah, but let's just get the basic rule, what really is this basic rule? You've got a lot going on with the pc, shut up! If you've got nothing going on with the pc, right now start talking! Don't wait till next week. It's the auditor that raises the mischief in a session. Two ways. If there's nothing going on in the session the auditor should start something and he raises the devil with the session if he doesn't. And if there's something going on and the auditor starts something, why, then everything goes to pieces.

What is this? This is just a crude handling of communication cycles or action cycles. See? You've got a bad handling of an action cycle, that's all that is involved in that. Something's going on with the pc, why are you trying to start something with the pc? Nothing's going on with the pc, what are you doing not starting something with the pc? That's about all it breaks down to and therefore it's true for all levels.

But you'll find at the upper levels that you haven't got time to pay any attention to basic auditing. It better be something you're practically born with, you know? You don't go along a street wondering about the steps of walking. „Now I pick up the right leg and I let the

body fall slightly forward and I put the right foot out in front of me to catch the body so that it doesn't hit the pavement. Well, I've got that done now. *Whew!* All right. Now the left leg is back a little bit so I pick up the left leg and I put it slightly forward. Now the body must be made to fall slightly forward again and I catch it with my left foot. *Ahhhh!* I finally got that step!"

You shouldn't be in that Condition with basic auditing when you're trying to run a whirling dervish type process like Level VI. I know it sounds obvious. I know it sounds awful obvious, but as obvious as it sounds, it is horribly true. And I had to learn it the hard way. It is something that you assume. You know, it's an „everybody knows“ and that sort of thing. But you shouldn't be sitting around worrying about you talking when the pc's not talking and *oohroooohrooo* - sorting all this out. Man, you ought to have that stamped into the bone and marrow of your auditing. Because just handling an E-Meter at Level VI, well, that's a-that would be a-that would be a full-time job for a theater organist.

Keeping that thing paced in there and keeping that needle somewhere approximating Set and because I audit with a counter on the thing, of course I mustn't move the TA while the pc is moving. Because it throws your TA division count out. You'll have TA counters in the very near future. They're quite successful; they're marvelous. You'd never have time at Level VI to record TA. You'd never have a chance. You just wouldn't be able to do it. The only thing you can do is when you ask the question you can write down where the TA was sitting at that instant. And you better had, because that's the last glimpse you'll have of it. See? And then you know what it blew down from. Because you've got to mark your blowdown in terms of figures after the item when you've got it. Well, you've got lots of time to do that, because of course, you're marking it while it is blowing down. See, you use the time that you would be silent in order to catch up with your administration, without distracting the pc's attention too much.

Well, usually during a steep blowdown at having been given the item the pc's too comatose to see it anyway. The pc wouldn't notice it if you were doing something, as long as it isn't too distractive. So you've got that little period there in which to do your administration and this thing went from 4.2 to 3.3. And you write that down, „to 3.0.“ You know, „4.2, to 2-to 3.3,“ you write down, „to 3.0,“ which is their-theysaid a little bit and it gave it another push. But that of course wasn't the original blowdown. That was the itsa blowdown so it's added with another „to it.“ And that gives you your codification. Therefore you know how this thing behaved.

Well, of course, you can sometimes notice that the tone arm is going up badly as you're doing a list so you can make a notation over on the left side of the list occasionally that the tone arm is now at 4.1 or something like that. It gives you-all you're looking for is the figure. Because when the blowdown happens you won't have a chance to see where it blew down from. So you just keep a handy reference. And that is only tone arm noting that you have any opportunity to do at Level VI. It's just not possible to keep a painstaking tone arm record. You couldn't do it. You'd spend no time doing anything but that.

Prepchecking, oh, heck, in Prepchecking you've got all the time in the world! If you didn't have a tone arm record to keep, you'd get nothing to do at all! But the tone arm-tone arm counters are marvelous. And you have to be very careful when you're using a tone arm counter that when the pc starts using the cans for a pair of dumbbells to do some setting-up exercises or something like this, you see, you've got to notice the pc is doing this and then not touch your tone arm till they bring the cans back down into their normal position. Otherwise you're going to add a lot of false TA to your meter all the time, you see? Then your tone arm counter then is telling you a false story, continuously.

So you've got all these various things to note, and action; and of course, even at eight, a pc who is running at Level VI, even at eight sensitivity on one of these Mark Vs you get this

quite remarkable meter response. Your meter responses are big. And they're not minute at all. And the pc's needle is so loose that you've got a problem in keeping the thing exactly to Set.

Now, you don't think this is a serious problem. Perhaps. But do you know you cut your pc's itsa to ribbons by not knowing the interesting trick of a trained left thumb. That thumb has got to be so trained that when you swing your needle back to Set, your thumb also puts the brake on the needle. And stops it cold at Set. In other words, you not only move the needle to Set, you stop the needle at Set. Now, the delicacy of thumb touch and practice in order to do this is quite remarkable. If you don't believe it, turn your meter up to 128, put your sensitivity up here to 32, and try to kick the needle over here to Set. Just no more interesting like that. Just, you see? Just try to kick it to Set. Without that wobble. See that wobble? All right, let's-the needle came down here. All right. Now, let's kick it back to Set with no wobble. Notice I'm pushing it here with my fingers, not in an educated way. But you see? That wobbles all over the place! How do you get that needle back there to Set?

Well, while you're doing that, before you ask the pc the question you are putting in a silent spot and you're inviting itsa and you're chopping his itsa line to pieces and you've got his action cycle all disarranged, simply because you're not right there with your meter. See? And that's what makes a lot of auditors look kind of silly. They-auditors try to get this needle in and they - you can see them start tipping their heads.

Pc becomes interested-attracts attention, you see? Well, you should take and-and turn it up to an extremity like this, and see how-how good you are at bringing a needle back here to Set and stopping it. Swing it over here and just bring it around to stop and brake it. You actually can brake the needle right in at Set. I've just done it, but if I turned it around and showed it to you, I couldn't do it. Because I've not ever run a meter so the pc could read it.

Now, all right, that's an interesting gimmick on meter reading. There - there's then refinements above refinements above refinements on the subject of meter reading. Possibly you hadn't even thought of that particular one, although you may very well have had trouble with it.' But you actually can educate your thumb, believe it or not. That will bring that thing right back, it'll bring right back to pang, and stop it right on the button. And there it is, right there. Also you can get that so practiced that you begin your question as you do it, so that during the last half of the question the needle is freely drifting. The last half of the question. The first half of the question, you're talking there: „In this session, has anything been suppressed?“

„In this session . . .“ needle braked, stopped, „. . . has anything been suppressed?“ Click! This sounds like-this sounds like an old professional Marine or something like this, what they can do with rifles and so forth. And what they can do with drill manuals, and that sort of thing. But it gets up to that line you say, „Well, this guy, he's just doing a parade-ground drill.“ Well, you'd be surprised how that parade-ground drill can develop. The Princess Pats of World War 1 fame, particularly, used to have a manual they called the Princess Pat manual. And they would drop a rifle from slope arms, off of the right shoulder. The rifle would do a complete spin, opening its bolt, and move sideways to inspection arm. See, they just let the rifle fall off of their shoulder and then over the biceps and it would come up to inspection with the bolt open. Dropped more rifles doing that! It's really goofball types of maneuvers.

I remember embarrassing a Marine captain, one day, I did a Princess Pats spin with a rifle. See it's-bring it up from order arms, catch it in this hand and without this hand being far away from you, since that would look clumsy, the rifle does a whole parabola-it goes all the way around, see. And drops to inspection arms. But it's like you handled a small straw, you know? The thing goes through the air like a-like a ton of lead, you see, traveling at a high speed. And these things weigh about nine pounds. And I think you get a deck court-martial in the Marine Corps for dropping a rifle. And he saw this happen and so forth. I'd seen an old professional Marine do it and was finally gotten able to do this thing, you see? And he said,

„That looks interesting.“ He said, „How did you do that?“ And he picked up this rifle, fortunately it wasn't my rifle-and he threw it up toward his arm, you see, and he missed and the rifle went about twenty feet through the dust, plowing up a canal of dust. He turned around and walked off the company street, saying no more about it. Even letting somebody pick up that weapon. Of course he'd laid himself open to a summary-I mean, a deck court-martial.

No, a real pro-I'm not making any real point out of this-but in any particular field you'll find that the real pro, the guy that's been around for quite a while-take a professional truck driver. Let's get down into those levels, you know? The things those guys can do with trucks! The ways they can turn them around and that sort of thing. It's unbelievable. Nobody can do that. You can do the same thing with meters.

At first it just looks like it's very simple. And there's not much to a meter and there's nothing much that you could amplify with a meter. But you finally get up to a point where there's just tricks galore that you can pull with meters. And you can set meters up in various particular ways. You can make meters - well, if *you're* really used to needles you can tell whether or not the pc is telling you the truth or not without even asking for missed withhold. Have you missed a withhold on the pc? If you're really smooth as ice, why, you know you've missed a withhold on a pc. If your basic auditing is so good you know he didn't-you didn't cut his itsa. And you just look at your needle and you could go on talking to the pc along these lines. And you say, „Well, and so on, something you didn't mention to me in the mid ruds, so forth?“

„No, no, no . . .“

„You sure there isn't something you didn't tell me?“

„Oh, well, except last night I was drunk, and I . . .“

Brrrrr! You see. Pulled a withhold without withholds. You can watch the responses of the needle. You can see how-well, let's take can squeeze. If you're real sharp as an auditor, you don't have to run Havingness. You just ask the pc what has upset them. What's upset their havingness during the session. Pc tries to give you an introverted remark. Well, they thought something or other, they thought something or other. No, it'll be something with regard to the room. It won't be anything with the session. So you say, „Well, was the room too hot? Was the room too cold? I mean were you uncomfortable at any time? Was it noisy around . . .“

„Oh-it was awful noisy around here.“

„Thank you very much. All right, squeeze the cans.“ Bang! His havingness is up to what it was at the beginning of the session, you see. They're just ... And here is lots of commands of Havingness and getting the pc wrestling around down in the middle of the bank where you had just fished him out of Do you see, it's clever. Ways to bring up a can squeeze. It comes under the borderline of meter handling.

You know that meter is responding to pulled-in mass, or the pc is more introverted than he was with regard to the room, not with regard to his case! And you can bring up his havingness accordingly.

You can inspect the meter during the last part of the session and know that his havingness is down. You can also-you can also look at the-at the way the tone arm is riding, to be very obvious about something. You can look at the way the tone arm is behaving in the session. And you know this tone arm up here-I'll give you the extreme view-it's up here at 5.25. It's been there for quite a while. Well, anybody would wake up to the fact that there was something wrong around here with that. Well, let's take it just a little bit more mildly than this. Let's take a higher-level process. The tone arm is at 3.5 and has not been riding at 3.5. And for the last couple of minutes has been riding up here at 3.5, which is brand-new. Then we see the tone arm starting to rise one way or the other. Conceive that the pc must be upset about something. Conceive that something must be wrong in what we are doing. Conceive

that something is going awry. And simply keep an eye on it, expecting trouble. Doing no more than just expect trouble. And then of course be not startled at all when it suddenly breaks around our head, and say, „Well, I don't know...“ You've already sorted it out: „Well, the pc probably listed down into something or other and, I don't know, we probably missed an item here, we-something's-something's going on here that-probably some implant RI or another that we haven't gotten ahold of. Hmm, or haven't fully discharged something, I don't know, I don't know-don't know.“

You're going on auditing all this time, you see, and you're just waiting for the first-the first break-loose on the part of the pc. Well, all this is informed meter operation; you've already been told this pc's going to ARC break if you're not careful, because this meter is behaving differently than it was behaving before and it's starting to ride higher than it was riding before and all is not well. All read off a meter. Well, it's not in the textbooks that you should use meters this way. Well, I gave you an idea of the pro, see?

Well, it's like the thumb trick. Is bang! It goes down, so forth. You bring it back to Set, stop it dead on at Set. See? Of course it goes bang! Down again. All right. Bring it right back to Set, see? Stop it motionless every time it comes and so it can-you'd be surprised, with a little practice, how you can manage this sort of thing.

Well, if you're that familiar with the meter, you should be that familiar with the communication cycle of the pc. What do you mean, having trouble with a communication cycle with the pc? Any more than, well, you have trouble with-you missed a read? That sounds awfully corny, this sounds something that might have happened in-oh, I don't know, I guess you could hear-somebody in Poughkeepsie at some time or another might miss a read. Or Los Angeles ... They-something, you see? Something. But no Scientologist-certainly no Scientologist would miss a read. Or clean a clean. Now, if your worries about meters are at the level of missing reads or cleaning cleans, well, that's fine, that's down there at perhaps Level III, Level II. And I'm sure that one should worry about them at some time or another, at about the same time he worries about the on-off switch. But there is a-if you are-if you were to have no greater familiarity with the meter than you're still worried about things like that, man, you could never run Level VI for the life of you. Because you've got no attention for the meter! This meter is something-you don't sit there and worry about how you put a piece of beefsteak in your mouth! You've got no time at all to spend on this meter. And your technique is an all-devouring monster.

You know, I've had to develop shorthand methods of recording on Level VI, just to keep up with it. And even that the only thing that slows down Level VI now is the recording of Level VI. If I could figure some way to speed it up again, Level VI would speed up again. But it's practically at zenith. You can't-you can only write so fast. And you can only shorthand what you're doing so well. And never write an item twice, never do this, never do that, got those things all cut out. And keep the thing all straight on the sheet of paper and so forth. But that's what's slowing things down.

Now, it's-that's no time to be worrying about your basic auditing. About the handling of the pc for instance. Let's see, the pc has now answered the question. Let's see. Now, I think-I think I'm supposed to say something now. That is not the level in which you should be worrying about that. Now, let somebody at Level II worry about that, see? But not at Level VI. See, you just won't ever make it.

You've got to get it up to a point where the pc's itsa is just rolling along like a well-oiled perambulator, see? And you instinctively promote the pc's itsa. Well, you got a list here, and you see the pc's looking very introverted and so forth and you say, „Well, which one do you think it is?“

And the pc says, „Oh, *uhhhhh*. Cat whiskers! Cat whiskers!“

„All right, that reads. Is that your item?“ Now, there's an opportunity to do that. But next time the pc is looking you know ... That's not the opportunity to say, „Which one is it?“

He's liable to say, „How the hell should I know? My God! This is too terrible!“ You almost ARC broke him, you see, by overloading his reality. His reality you can-is pretty poor at this particular line. He's just done a long list and he's very puzzled. „Which one do you think it is?“ That would be about all you'd need to torch off the haystack, don't you see? But a lot of times you can do that.

But doing Level V or Level VI is not the time to be worried about how you handle basic auditing. Now, I admit that I've learned a great deal about basic auditing while doing these upper levels. I haven't had any opportunity to do it any other way. But I've been quite surprised that basic auditing is basic auditing regardless of what level it is practiced. Any level it is practiced, it's still basic auditing. And there's practically no zenith on how good your basic auditing can become and there's nothing unknown about any of its laws. These are the laws-simply are based on observation; and you say, „Do fish swim?“

And the pc says, „Hmm . . .“ A long silent period. Well, that's no time to say, „Well, all right! All right! I'll check it on the meter!“ See, no! Give the pc a chance to answer the auditing question, man! You busted up your comm cycle. Of course, you're going to bust up his itsa, you're going to dirty up your needle, you're going to distract his attention, you're going to shift him, startle him one way or the other, you're going to throw him out of session, turn him against the auditor, pull his attention out of his bank, put it on the auditor-can you think of any more?

See, I mean it's not just a crime. It's a hanging offense! So, no. The pc - you say, „Do fish swim?“ you know, and the pc says, „I don't know. I-I don't know.“ Well, you know better than to say, „Yes, thank you, okay!“ at that point because he's - says, „I don't know, yah, oooooohhhh . . .“, You can hear the rest of the communication that is going to follow this, see. „Oooooohhhh, don't know. Well, I don't think they do.“

„Thank you.“ See. Now, here would be another horrible error, you see: „Do fish swim?“ Pc's silent.

„Well, I don't know. I don't think they do.“

Auditor: „ . . . „

Pc: Hmm-hmm-hmm-hmm-hmm.

This is too corny for words, don't you see?

Well, the funny part of it is you could probably make some mistakes with technique, you could probably make some mistakes in case analysis - not very many-and get somewhere with pcs. But I'll tell you where you can't make mistakes. And that's basic auditing. And it sounds like it is the area where you could afford to make the most mistakes. And that isn't true at all.

The advance of your pc is totally dependent upon your basic auditing. And it's no better than that and it's no worse than that.

So here's your three zones of auditing. They are-actually, if you do sloppy technique you'll pay the penalty. Your basic auditing will be stretched to a singing high whine. It'll sound like a banjo-banjo tuned up for the days of 49, you know? Bzzzz! Because your basic auditing will really be called on here. You didn't quite master how to handle getting down an implant GPM pattern and he gets halfway down and you've left half the items charged. Your basic auditing is now going to be under strain. That I assure you. But it's your basic auditing that's going to be under strain. Let's say we analyze the case wrong. We decide that he really should have this particular next series of whatever it is run, don't you see? And we shouldn't finish off the engram-the whole track engram that we were doing because it's getting too hard and solid on the pc. So we make a mistake, you see, somehow or another. We cut off something he was deeply interested in doing. Your basic auditing is going to come under a fantastic strain. But the funny part of it is, nothing very serious is going to happen to the pc because of errors in technique. Nothing very serious. And errors in case analysis. Nothing

serious is going to happen to the pc. This is mostly true below Level VI, because a pc is pretty much under stress at Level VI, and ... Nevertheless, it even holds true at VI.

It's basic auditing that's going to pitch him on his head. If your basic auditing is bad, no matter what level you're on, that's going to catch it. If the technique is wrong the basic auditing catches it. Case analysis is wrong, it's going to be the basic auditing catches it. So let that be a good, strong wall on which to build your sessions and you will be all right. And if there's anything awry with basic auditing, then you're going to pay the full penalty. Slightest error in technique-crash! There goes your session. Slightest error in case analysis-boom! All in flames, right now, see? Do you get the difference of ratio here? You want to know why some pcs are feeling badly. Well, the auditor-the usual thing is, the auditor's basic auditing is out. It's missing somewhere. Of course there can be technique errors. Don't forget this. You can start down a GPM- an actual GPM, with the wrong technique and you'll have more pc into more ditch in a short time than you could possibly shake a stick at. And a case analysis-case analysis has to be pretty accurate. Nobody's running these things down.

But you can recover easily on those and they actually aren't terribly hard on the pc unless the basic auditing is out. The only place you get somatics turned on, for instance-and this is a new datum for you-the only way you turn on somatics in Level VI OT processes is by invalidation. You found an item, you said it was the item, then you said it wasn't the item. Result: somatics. You found an item that wasn't the item, you said it was the item and said another wasn't the item-you see you're invalidating items: somatics. And you can really wrap a guy around a telegraph pole with somatics. Somatics are very, very rough at Level VI in exact ratio to the amount of invalidation done. It's an exact ratio. Lot of invalidation, lot of somatics. Little invalidation, little somatics. It isn't that items turn on pain. You'll get your pain turned on in this wise: You find the goal „to spit“; you analyze it all out! Rocket read, everything said it was an actual GPM and then somehow or another because of the collusions of the confluences of the something or other and the next session and so forth and couldn't get it to read and so forth, so you abandon it. And decide to extend the goals list. And so forth. Don't be surprised in thirty-six hours if you got a good, sick pc on your hands. Invalidated the goal, don't you see? Well, you ca-it's also true that you can find things that aren't right. So, you pays your money and you takes your chance. And that's about the only thing you can do. Just do it as possibly-as well as you can, with as little invalidation as possible. That's a pretty hard one. So that makes the steps of case analysis mandatory in preparing these things. The considerations must be taken off. These things must be straightened up before you go on. Otherwise, your pc is going to be bogged down with somatics.

But even so, if your basic auditing is in, that is cut to minimum too. Because the pc has an opportunity to talk to you about them. The pc has an opportunity to comment on it. The pc expressed his opinion concerning the thing and his itsa's being promoted up along the line, his opinion is apt to be more accurate so you make less mistakes. So even that buffers up against this potential somatic situation. You see how we're headed in this way?

Now, those are the relationships of the three parts of auditing. I haven't too much stressed technique, I haven't too much stressed case analysis, but both of them are built on the single point of basic auditing. And I'm just giving you a wide-open invitation to become an absolute, whiz-bang genius on the subject of basic auditing. Not talking when you should be silent, not being silent when you should be talking, riding it right straight up, driving the session all the way through in a very relaxed attitude which is going forward in an awful hurry.

And you'll find out that the heaviest dividend that you can get out of auditing, out of auditing training, is actually the perfection of your basic auditing. And you can move this-of course that includes metering. And you move this all up into a zone of perfection and so forth, you'll find you're so relaxed you've got an opportunity to learn a technique. You'll find

you're so relaxed about this you can do an accurate case analysis. This gone, you *can't* even start on the others. That's how these things sit in their relationship.

I know I've been studying my own basic auditing for about three months. I was never any slouch at auditing. But when I think back over what I once called good basic auditing, I'm horrified. I'm actually horrified! Because the blunders are just wide-open. It looked very smooth to everybody else, it looked very smooth to me at the time. And I had to really work on it for quite a while to find out how bad it was. Maybe some of us are in that particular Condition. I don't mean to say so, I'm just saying that I had been in that Condition. And I'd be very happy with you if you'd-if you'd sweat this one out and make it look real grooved in and alert and carry it on down the line. And I can guarantee your tone arm motion will triple with some concentration spent on this particular subject. Okay?

Thank you very much!