

WHAT AUDITING IS AND WHAT IT ISN'T

A lecture given on
25 February 1964

Thank you. I like you too.

I'm the first survivor to return from the Battle of the Goals Plot. The casualties have been pretty heavy – pretty heavy, but fortunately it is mostly in terms of GPMs.

I was just telling Reg that there isn't anybody could have done it. And then he suddenly looked at me and he says – he says, „But you did it.“ And I said, „Yes,“ I said, „that's the – that's the joke.“

But the progress is going along. You're very lucky. That's all I've got to say. If any one of you had gone into this flying blind with your hands tied behind your back, why, you would have come up a mass of putty.

Trickery. The actual GPM contains trickery. Treachery. It's no wonder they never came apart. No wonder. And that's why we teach Class VI at Saint Hill and a few years from now, when there have been a lot of Saint Hill graduates and a lot of successes and we've made a lot of OTs and so forth, several years from now, why, we'll let Central Orgs teach this stuff. The franchised auditor who is sitting out there right now waiting for the next bulletin on Class VI, you see, he's going to be very upset because I would just as soon place in his hands a hand grenade with the pin drawn, see? You know, „Here, here you are!“ you know?

You see, as long as we were in old R3 we weren't deep enough to do anything to anybody. That was perfectly all right, you couldn't mess anybody up at R3. R4, we were still running at too shallow draft to upset anybody. Moved into R6, you see, and all of a sudden you stand there looking at the real tiger. These things had enough charge on them so then you could take off surface locks to a tremendous degree. And just as in processing level by level you can take off surface locks, well, so in these goals – actual GPM processes you see, you could also take them off at various levels. So at R3 you find a goal and run a terminal. Oh, there's nothing to that – fairly safe, you could do any of those variations because you really weren't handling anything, don't you see?

Then you finally get down to – You finally get down to, oppose – why, you can run a whole GPM on oppose. You can find seventy items, pc has tremendous numbers of cognitions, everything happy, and matter of fact I might even hand it out sometime as a process, you see? Let anybody run it, you see? Wouldn't do him any damage. Lots of charge comes off, lots of TA action, you see. Now the moment that it's moved into the bracket of „solve,“ the moment that you move it down toward a command like „solve“ on an actual GPM, you're between the devil and the deep blue sea. You're close enough to the real tiger so that he can knock your head off, but not close enough so that you can get back at him. So it becomes, at that point, a very dangerous process.

Now you take R6, where you're handling nothing but purebred Bengal type tigers, starved for a long time, and you take somebody that could have run the oppose line, you see, you take somebody that could have run the oppose line very easily, you know, find a goal,

doesn't matter really if it's the wrong goal, right goal, that wouldn't have upset him too much. And he goes along, that type – that type auditor, see, and then you just nonchalantly say, „All right, well, just go through that door. All right. And, you find there on your right, you'll find a rather flimsy chair. Pick that up.“

„Oh, is that what I'm supposed to do?“

„Yeah, that's all you're supposed to do, and then you lift the cage door at the far end, and in come the tigers,“ you see?

Honest, I'm not exaggerating, I'm not exaggerating. I have found enough aberration. You often want to know – if you want to know what it takes to make a thetan aberrated, you have to find enough aberration to account for the fact that a powerful being would now be un-powerful, see? How would he get in that state? Well, actually it's a direct proportion. It takes as much aberration as he was powerful. And there's that much aberration on the GPM – actual GPM lineup. I guarantee you, there is enough. And there's also quantitatively and qualitatively enough.

Actually then, the whole of auditing is simply peeling down toward these things from the first time you have a person sit in his chair, you see, and itsa. He's taken off some of the top crust. And it's perfectly safe on up to IV, service facsimiles, so forth – it's even safe into, as I told you, it's even safe into finding a goal and running oppose on the items. Perfectly safe. Nothing to that. Now, you really got to be an expert from there on.

Well, this is just a prelude to this lecture. This has nothing to do with it, I was just saying hello and telling you about where the score was about now. We got it – we got it licked, there's no doubt about that, but them tigers, the – them tigers have got some pieces of cloth in their teeth.

All right, what's the date?

Audience: Twenty – fifth.

Twenty – fifth? It's the 25th? No kidding. Twenty – fifth of February, AD 14, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, student lecture.

All right, we've got – we've got some business today. We've got some business to transact. These are data vitally necessary to the auditing of Class VI and if you're very clever you cannot do without them at the lower levels. The main problem with the data I'm giving you is until you get to Class VI you can sometimes get away with it. At about level Class IV is the first time you could start teaching it. And it would be terribly useful at Class I, but you can't teach it at Class I. You can teach it and then the fellow will think he knows it, but by the time he's gotten up to III or IV, why, he would have to be taught it again because it would have brand-new values. By the time he gets to VI he can't audit without it.

And that's very peculiar, then, to go into this level and you're about to see some of the very fundamental fundamentals of auditing which will explain to you why auditing has or has not worked here, there and so on, and which will be very valuable to you at any level that you're operating at in Scientology.

So this lecture actually is useful for all levels and would be quite good at the lower levels but probably could only be taught at about Level IV with any real comprehension. And by the time you get up to Levels V and VI, becomes vital. Not slight, because omission of this data brings about catastrophe.

Now let us take this up then in a very *rat – a – tat – tat* fashion, and if you get this down, if you get this all squared away and get this all aligned in anything under fifteen or twenty hours of study, why, I'll be very proud of you. Because the first moment that you see this, you'll all say „Yes, yes, yes,“ and then you'll go tanglefoot with it. Because it's this type of data; it's too simple. I was tanglefooting Suzie Belle the other day with it, so don't expect to grab it at the first brass ring.

First thing I want to tell you though is there's something here to grasp. You have to grasp it with your total comprehension. And it's so confounded simple that – see I was using a very cruel example with her – I'll give you the same example.

Here we have a Ronson lighter in a little hide case. All right. Now, the task is to put the Ronson lighter there on that paper, you see, and then put it over here on these pencils, and then put the Ronson lighter in the center of the desk. Now that's the totality of the operation. See, heh! Got this object here and we want to put it on this piece of paper, then we're going to move it over on top of these pencils and I'm going to put it in the center of the desk, hm? Now let me show you what happens with this operation. We put it over here and we say, „Is that over there?“ and somebody we're trying to train says, „Yes, but, that's got a hide case.“ And you say, „Yeah, well that's – that's true. However I want you to put it down over here on this piece of paper.“

„Yes, but hide, you know, I imagine the Ronson company must have some kind of contract with the Indians up in Alaska,“ and you say „Yeah, I'm sure they do. Sure they do. Yes, but I want you to put it down over here on this paper.“

„Yeah, but you know, there must be a terrific amount of trouble portaging skins, you know? They've got a skin there and they must have that, it must come from Alaska there, and they must have a terrific time trying to get these skins down the river and I wonder what design the Indians have on their paddles.“

And you say, „All right, that – that's fine. But all we want you to do is put this object on this piece of paper.“

„Yeah, but the Ronson company doesn't make paper.“

So when I tell you about the design on the Indians' paddles with regard to this while I'm giving you this lecture, you'll know what I'm talking about. Because you can make more complexity whenever you try to hand out an absolutely simple datum in its complete, naked purity. It, of course, blows more confusion in more directions than you can shake a stick at. And you just have to keep working with it. Now this actually is coached material, until a person can take this and ask the question and get the answer and there's no design on the paddles that are coming down the Yukon, see?

They put you – you'll – you'll – you've got a future here, in just this. Now, let's just go at it hammer and pound. Let me give you first a very brief outline of what we're going to do.

I'm going to teach you the difference between auditing and assessing, destimulating and erasing, the difference between a present time problem and an ARC break – it's just terribly elementary propositions. And the targets of the auditor – what he – what he fronts. All right, that doesn't sound like very much, does it? But brother, I know.

All right, let's take up right away quick the last one I mentioned, which is targets of the auditor. The auditor has two targets. He has the pc and he has the bank. When that auditor speaks he is speaking to either the pc or the bank. That's just crystal clear data. That's two targets. He says, „How are you feeling?“ or he says, „Catterwump.“ He says, „Catterwump“ and the bank goes crunch, see? He says, „How are you feeling?“ and the pc says, „Well, let's see, I'm feeling so-and-so and so on.“

You understand? There are two things that an auditor talks to. Two things. One is the pc, the other is the bank. Auditing is addressed on the auditing cycle to the pc, and assessment is addressed to the bank. Once more – very, very simple. Nothing to this at all.

And you're saying, „Catterwump, cat whiskers, bat fur“ and so forth, you're talking to the bank. And reading the result on the meter. Or reading the result on the pc's eyeballs. I don't care what you're reading the result on, but you're talking to the bank. Now, you understand then that when you are talking to the pc, when the auditor is addressing the pc, that he very often restimulates the bank and he very often has an effect or an influence on the bank. Very

often. But, that as – does not debar it at all. Sometimes when assessing, the pc talks and the auditor has to acknowledge the origin and so forth. But these are separate actions. And I – if you could only see them as separate actions, you would save yourself a great deal of complexity in the matter.

All right. Now, two targets. The auditor has the target of the pc – a thetan, or the bank. Very good. There are therefore two types of processes. But they are not processes, one of them is not a process at all and – you're about to get your first headache – is not auditing.

Now what is auditing. Auditing is an operation which culminates in destimulation or erasure. It has only two end products: destimulation and erasure. You can get the pc to dust himself off or you can use the pc like you would an ink eraser to scrub off the piece of bank that you're heading for. In other words you can get the pc out of it or you can use the pc to wipe it out.

Many auditors have the custom of using the pc to wipe out pieces of the bank and then in view of the fact they can't wipe that bank out totally, then using the pc to wipe out another piece of bank which they can't wipe out totally, so they try to wipe out another piece of bank. The pc comes to session, he's got a present time problem, so they wipe out – try to wipe out the present time problem but they already haven't wiped out the service facsimile they were auditing yesterday, so now they've got this present time problem, so they're going to erase this present time problem and they can't really erase the present time problem because halfway through the present time problem the pc comes up with the fact that he's worried about his mother. And when he was young he was very worried about his mother, so now, we try to erase mother and, having in the process of erasing mother, of course we run into the subject of father, so we try to erase father and so forth.

This is what is known as – this type of auditor is known as a „mudder.“ All he wants to do is erase. Throw the pc into the heavy energy and use him as an ink eraser. See, that's perfectly legitimate on erasure and so forth, as long as you complete your cycles of action. But practically all of the early levels of auditing are destimulation, which means you unstimulate what has already been restimulated. I refer you to earlier lectures on the subject of restimulation and destimulation. What you're trying to do here is take the dogs that are barking at them and get them to lie down quietly. Erasure would be to go over and eat up all the dogs, you see? But all you want these dogs to do is lie down quietly and the pc to come away from there. That's destimulation, don't you see?

So we have this pc and he is – got a present time problem and therefore is not in the auditing room and therefore is not in-session. So we say, „What kind of a problem – what – what's this problem all about?“

And he says, „Well it's about so and so, well, it's about my early life.“

„All right, well, what about your early life?“

„Well, I used to have an awful lot of trouble with boys in my early life.“

„Well, did you ever have any fight with boys in your early life? All right, that's good, pick up that early fight that you had. Have an overt against boys when you were very young? Oh, that – that's good. It's go – you got hurt, huh? Like where – where's the somatic?“

What are you doing? The pc wasn't in the auditing room to be audited; the pc was elsewhere. So you send him else elsewhere. Now, what do you think this pc's going to do? Means that you could never complete your cycle of action, because the pc is elsewhere when he begins the session. You've got to get the pc here before you can complete your cycle of action. Now, therefore you never have a chance of completing yesterday's auditing if you can't get the pc into the session today. So if the pc has picked up new problems or new difficulties in life between sessions – this is quite common I am told – and if the auditor does nothing but

plunge and Q-and-A with this new situation which is arisen, he, of course, never cleans up yesterday's cycle of action. You follow that?

Well, destimulation is the only tool or the only action you can undertake to get a pc oriented and located; and if an auditor cannot destimulate a pc, he of course can never follow his own cycle of action. Do you see that? The pc's restimulation takes charge. So therefore you can never bring it up to a point where you can finish that Problems Intensive you started last August. And ever since that time he kept coming to session and we had other things to handle. We've always got other things to handle if we can't destimulate the pc, so therefore the destimulation of a pc is a very, very important skill. Very, very important skill. There are various mechanisms by which one destimulates the pc.

Running engrams, no matter what process you use to run the engrams – running engrams, running RIs, implant GPMs, RIs, actual GPMs. I say implant GPM RIs and actual GPMs – all are under the heading of erasure. Nothing but erasure. That's using the pc to eat up the dogs, you see? Now, there's always a certain amount of erasure takes place, even in destimulation. A tiny amount takes place, you see?

Let me give you an idea of destimulation and erasure and how one operates somewhat with the other one. Pc's fallen down, hurting – hurt his knee and we use an old-time assist, we say, „Where did you hurt it?“ and „Where are you now?“ and „Where did you hurt it?“ and „Where are you now?“ And what we're trying to do there is simply destimulate it. We're trying to get the pc out of that area of time and that location and get him where he is now sitting, you see? That's destimulation. We're not trying to do anything about the injury; we're just trying to get the pc to sit there in front of us. In the process of doing this, you will notice a pc quite commonly turns on somatics. A certain amount, then, of the incident or injury runs out in the process of destimulation.

Most wonderful example of this I ever saw – and I remember vividly – happened at 42 Aberdeen Road with no less a person than Burke Belknap.

Burke was having a lot of trouble casewise and he was having a lot of difficulty somehow or another and I straightwired him and – it happened in the little office, just inside the door, any of you there were there – and he was standing up against the wall and I gave him a – gave him a bit of straightwire and gave him a *clip – bing – bang*, hit the locks, the key – ins of this little incident, had to do with this – and man, he came straight up PT, practically Clear right there. See? You know, terrific result. You know, bang! You know, five minutes' worth of auditing and wow, you practically got a Clear on your hands. You see, that kind of action, see.

Then I turned him right around into the thing and erased the top engram on the chain. The second he hit it, it all keyed back in again and he collapsed, sliding down the wall and sat on the floor with his head in his hands. He had never felt better and never felt worse in two consecutive seconds in his life. The – oh, I got him out of it, of course. But the first action is destimulation. See, little straightwire, „Where was it,“ you know, and „When,“ and „Who did you know – who did you know that was like that?“ See, he's complained about a condition, you see, „Well, who did you know that was like that?“

„Oh, well, yeah, Joe.“

„Well – well, did you ever see him – you ever see him acting like that?“ You see?

„Oh, yes, I did, yes, yes, yes, yes.“

„Well, all right, good. Does that have anything to do with the – what you're going through right now?“

„Hey, you know, it has a lot to do with it!“

And the guy's right up in present time – bang! See? All we hit was the key-in, see? We walked no closer to the tiger's cage than the outer perimeter of the bottom seats, see. We went nowhere close. And yet he came away from there, see? Now – now we go and find what keyed

in and we throw the pc into it and start erasing this. Well, we can erase it, we've had erasure technique since the word go. You burn your finger, you very often erase it. Sometimes you destimulate it, sometimes you erase it. And you – sometimes you use a combination of both on some light injury of this particular character. You tur – you go to the beginning of the incident and run yourself through to the end of the incident and so on and eventually all the pain turns off and you're fine.

You might, however, just do a Touch Assist on it, you know. Touch it for a while and you'll feel little pains come off of the thing. So it is very difficult to do a total destimulation, see, that's a difficult thing to do, because a tiny little bit of erasure will occur in any event. But you can do a total destimulation from the basis of totally destimulate something. I'm only saying the one thing you can't do is avoid erasure totally, because just the pc's attention on the subject for that moment necessary, you see, to detach him from the subject may bring about a slight amount of erasure. That's no reason then, when you wish to destimulate, to become a professional eraser. See, it seems to be an invitation. See, there seems to be an invitation.

You're saying, „Where were you? Where are you now? Where were you? Where are you now? Where were you? Where are you now? Where were you? Where are you now? All right, that's fine. Now how do you feel?“

„Well, I seem to be stuck with this knee here on the pavement and so forth...“

„Oh, yeah? Well, let's use some Effort Processing.“

You see the temptation? See the temptation? Well, the funny part of it is, at that level you can get away with it. You can take the whole injured knee out. I did this just the other day. I first did a destimulation and got the pc feeling better and then ran the incident out, oddly enough, with nothing but Effort Processing. Way back when, you know? Because it was a serious concussion. I didn't want this hanging around and so forth and knew the pc was perfectly capable of doing so, so we actually then went into it and knocked the stuffings out of the incident, you see, and then did a destimulation and so forth and it all worked out just fine. One of the neatest assists I've done in many a day. But that's a combination of two things. And the auditor should be aware of the fact when he is combining two things.

See, you made the fe – we could make the pc feel better by destimulation, you know? „Where did it happen? Where are you now?“ Any such process – destimulation. Now we got the pc feeling a little bit better, well, we got him a little bit better in control, right? A little bit better in present time. Now we could go back and start at the beginning of the incident, erase it right straight through as an engram. Or we can leave it alone and go on with the program which we started yesterday. But it puts choice back into the auditor's hands. The auditor now has his power of choice over the pc. It so happened with this pc I didn't have any cycle of action that was taking place yesterday, see, to engage upon. There was no reason not to do this. You understand?

So these two things can combine, but they are separate. There's destimulation and there's erasure. Very, very important to realize this. You're going to have a headache trying to work this out and then you'll finally get through – I don't mean to be a bad teacher and tell you how confused it all is and how difficult it all is. I tell you it's very easy if you're just simply willing to grasp it and use it. But along about this time we get into the paddles business, you see?

You see, it's birch bark canoes. And birch bark canoes are basically held together with gum, aren't they? Well, does Ronson have anything to do with Wrigley's? Because what happens here? What happens here? The door seems to be wide open here, that if you destimulate you can then erase and today we're busy auditing our pc on a Prepcheck on – see, it gets more complicated in its applications, but the same principles hold. Where we're prepchecking this pc on the subject of Mata Haris, see. And it's all very fine and we're prepchecking him just dandy

and we're getting a lot of tone arm action and everything is going along. In actual fact we're carrying about a destimulative action. Prepcheck, destimulation, see. Synonymous. Well, we're doing all right here, see, and we're going along and all of a sudden the pc – tone arm, tone arm's beautiful – beautiful action on the tone arm you see, we're still getting nice action, you see, or maybe it's come to a momentary pause. If we ran for five more minutes we'd get five more divisions, you see?

And all of a sudden the pc unfortunately – pc, unfortunately for all concerned, happens to remember in the process of doing this that he had a goal, „to kitterwigit“ that was found on him in 1961, that has a lot to do with this. So the auditor says to himself, „Well, look how much more we could do for this pc, you see, if we found actually the basic reason.“

So he says, „Well, what – this goal to kitterwigit, is that – is that an actual GPM? Is that an implant GPM? All right, what number is it on the track? Is it upside – down? Is it backwards?“ Well, oddly enough, the difficulty isn't – doesn't arise in trying to find this GPM. That's not the difficulty. The difficulty is missing. The difficulty is that you half – destimulated the subject you were working on previously, Mata Hari. You've half – destimulated – and in the process of destimulating it, you of course have somewhat restimulated it, right? You haven't got it totally destimulated, you've got it slightly restimulated in the process to destimulating it, you see?

You're right in this Condition where the fellow has fallen down and bruised his knee and the auditor's trying to get him into the auditing room so that he can audit him, see, and then all of a sudden gives up and puts him back on the roadway and starts erasing the knee, you see? Well, if he'd just kept this up and brought him into the auditing room it would have been all right and he kept – could have kept along with another cycle of action, don't you see? The cycle of action which you already have in progress. But just in the process of doing this, the fellow's attention, of course, a little bit more goes onto his knee. So you take this pc whose attention is fairly heavily on Mata Hari – we're destimulating Mata Hari, we're not erasing her, you see, just bringing him out – the process of coming out the door however, he's still got his feet sort of tangled up with silk stockings and old German documents and then we've turned around and gone into this other activity which is never a destimulative activity – which is a cannonball erasure process.

You don't destimulate goals. You destimulate the whole track and the actual GPM, or even implant GPMs, somewhat like taking somebody up to the top of a springboard and telling him to dive in and halfway down you find that nobody put any water in the pool, so you say, „Go on back up top to the springboard,“ see? The destimulative activities which can take place now are minimal. Now, it isn't just that; if the auditor had simply made up his mind that it really wasn't Mata Hari – it really wasn't Mata Hari, it was goat's milk that was the pc's trouble, and has shifted his Prepcheck to goat's milk, he would have done the same thing. He would eventually wind up all these areas of restimulation, which he was trying to destimulate. He would have half – restimulated them, you see, then not finished the job and so he would not have Mata Hari and goat's milk and if he went on with that a short time afterwards and got submarines mixed up into it he'd now have submarines and Mata Hari and goat's milk and this is why we would call that auditor a „mudder.“

So there's three actions he can undertake there. One of them is just to give up the destimulative action and say „Oh, that's hopeless,“ because he notices some restimulation taking place and then begin erasure. See, shift his target from destimulation to erasure. Or the next action which he could undertake was shift his target from – that he was destimulating – from target A, while it was restimulated, to target B while it was restimulated or he could do a proper action. And the proper action is when you set out to destimulate, destimulate. When you set

out to erase, erase. And in either event complete your cycle of action. In either event complete your cycle of action.

If you're going to go into the destimulation activity here and you decide that you had better get this individual destimulated on the subject of home and mother so that you can audit him on the subject of something else, or service facts, or get someplace on the case, because he's PTPs, PTPs and he's always got PTPs on the outer perimeter of the thing he's – he's so introverted into his own living room that we can never get him into the auditing room, and that sort of thing. All right, we're going to give him a Prepcheck and we're going to isolate what this is, then his PTPs – that is very, very rough, we're going to prepcheck this thing. All right, *finish it. Finish it.* Don't say, „Well, that's – that's the – that's good enough, we've got the tone arm action down now – we've got the tone arm action down now to two divisions TA down in ten minutes of auditing. We got this cooled off now and he doesn't seem to be terribly frantic about it so now we're going to shift over and do something else, see. Yeow! Just practically murder, you see?

By the time you've done that three or four times you have your pc stuck in the restimulation of destimulation and he doesn't know whether he's coming or going. See what happens when you cross it?

All right, let's take the other cycle of action. We're going to erase – you never can erase a single engram; something we didn't know back in 1950, because we could occasionally erase a single engram. As a matter of fact, you apparently can erase a single engram. Now, let me put it this way. But you often can't. Our remedy in that day, you see, was to go find another engram that you could erase, see? Or go earlier. Now that was what we knew, we knew that you could go earlier, you see? So you couldn't erase this engram, then there must be an earlier engram and you better go earlier and erase that. That was the only remedy which we had. Therefore, some engrams won't erase. Well, why won't they erase? Because they're on chains. So engrams are always considered to be part of a chain. And new material on running of engrams which just came up last year is rather fantastic. And, my God, if we'd had engrams in 1950, the kind of running which you've got and this new technology on running engrams, nobody would ever have any quarrel. You can turn on anybody, as long as you get the proper duration, make no mistake in the duration, you always got visio in your pc, the one thing and so forth. And because you're working on a chain you can always get it back to the point of erasure, don't you see? These are not difficulties.

But sometimes – sometimes you run into an engram – and you run into an engram and you're trying to erase this thing. And it gums up on you or it gets stiff or solid or something weird happens with this thing and therefore you abandon the chain. You don't carry on and get the earlier engram that underlies it, you see, that will erase and finally pull the – pull the whole thing apart. In other words a half – completed engram erasing cycle. Absolutely deadly. And you can take a person and half – erase an engram and halferase an engram and half – erase another engram and half – all di – on unrelated subjects, particularly – and half – erase another engram and half – erase another engram and the pc's stuck up like he's in molasses. He – what's happening?. Well, the thing about it is, when you start to erase something, erase it.

Now, we see this in Class VI this way. When you get your hands on something – when you get your hands on something, why, you should finish it off. This is an ideal situation; the ideal is when you got your paws on a GPM, you erase it. You finish it. Right there. Well, this is debarred by the fact that it is held in relationship to the GPM above and below it by interlocking items so that you cannot complete its erasure without having the two adjacent engrams. This is further complicated by the fact that there's a vagary in the goals pattern that doesn't make it lie there neatly at all. So it's violated to that degree, but look, it doesn't have to be violated completely because you could actually take the guts out of the middle of the GPM this –

these days. And you could leave four items in the GPM and take out the remaining – you could take out the remaining twelve. You actually could destimulate it to that – I mean, pardon me – erase it to that degree, you see?

Now, the ideal then is to finish it up. Well, really what you do is consider the whole of the first series of goals, the whole series, as the first action. Or some half of it or some portion of it and the more you have of it the better you consider that one action, and then you go ahead and you erase everything you've got, you see? That's – that's – you're still dealing with the form of a big cycle of action, see? You say, „Well, we're going to find half of the first series, we're going to find all of the half – first series that we can lay our paws on and we're going to get it lined up as best we possibly can and then we're going to erase that and then we're going to finish getting the remainder of the first series, then we're going to erase all of those.“ Well, that's a completed cycle of action, see?

Now, you're going – going down the row here, you see? But in the process of doing that you can also foul up like mad by half – completed little cycles. For instance, you've started to check out the goal „to sneeze,“ and all of a sudden the pc offers the goal „to row a boat.“ And so you drop that checkout and you – you get this other checkout, „to row a boat.“ And now having gotten a checkout „to row a boat“ and so forth, that's inconclusive so you do a goals list on the „to row a boat“ on a represent goals list. See if you can get the right wording of this thing. But you can't really find that because no goal fires after you've gotten the list done, so you figure you must have something spotted in an incorrect numerical sequence in the series, so you start correcting the series in its numerical sequence of one GPM to the next.

Well, that doesn't work out very good, because the pc seems to be terribly nattery, so the best thing to handle that is in the first place if you could just find number one GPM on the track you could always erase that, couldn't you, so let's start listing for it again. The heart of certainty is arrival. And the anatomy of uncertainty is a failure to complete a cycle of action. Nonarrival.

So you want your pc to get less and less confident, doesn't matter whether it's Class VI or any other class, you want to get less and less confident, just never complete the cycles of action you set out to do and never complete your destimulative actions before engaging in a new destimulative action. Let the pc's new restimulations get in your road, you see, and just Q-and-A with his new restimulations and away we go and over the hills and far away, and bangety – bang and isn't life confusing and isn't the case confused, in fair rapidity.

This then – this then is the difference between restimulation and destimulation. And in either case, you complete a cycle of action. You get somebody into session by getting him into the auditing room. If he comes into session and he's got a lot of present time problems and then you decide to erase these present time problems, just run a – let's run a process, see, on problems. Every time he comes into the auditing room he seems to have an awful lot of problems, so we're just going to set aside the Problems Intensive which we are already doing and we're going to get started now and really clean this case up so he doesn't have all these present time problems when he comes into session.

Well, let's see – let's do, now, an assessment on his environment and let's find out what it is in his environment he's mainly having problems about and then we will run Problems of Comparable Magnitude on that or something of that sort and we'll get this thing all set up.

But, of course, in the process of doing this we run into his lumbosis. And this is side-tracked and there we go. We have now started the deadly – the deadly chase, where in a half – completed cycle of action we're going to get another half – completed cycle of action and so forth. All right, what is the auditor's answer to this? The auditor's answer to this is rapid destimulation, rapide destimulation. Techniques of rapid destimulation. What are these? Since mid ruds: „Since last time I audited you, has anything been suppressed?“ See? „When was the last

time I audited you?" "Why, we don't give this guy a chance. We don't give him a chance to have present time problems in the session. And knowing pcs, I would say that an awful lot of pcs who can't be audited without very expert handling of since mid ruds or something of the sort – there are lots of them. I don't care what good shape they appear to be in, I don't care how they can live through this sort of thing and so on, the auditor is going to be invited to a Q-and-A party before that session is very far progressed if the auditor has not destimulated the case first.

Pc's been thinking about his service facsimile – let's take somebody at Level IV – he's been thinking about his service facsimile and what we've actually been doing is we've been running „How would chewing tobacco make the hall maid wrong?" you see, or something like this. Or „Who would it make wrong?" And the pc's been thinking between sessions – and we haven't got that flat, see – and has realized – has realized that when he was very young – when he was very young there was a hall maid and she used to hit him with brooms and so forth, and it was because of the neglect of his mother and what the process is really all about is mother's neglect. So really what he's trying to do is make everybody guilty because of mother's neglect and we – hadn't we better prepcheck this, see?

Now, actually he doesn't come out with all this if it's destimulated. What happens? He's got a present time problem of some kind or another – minor, small – he's been suppressing, he's been thinking, he's got a withhold or two from the auditor, you see? So when the auditor tries to take control of the session, the pc is really elsewhere, there's a little, tiny bypassed charge situation because he hasn't informed the auditor of things, don't you see? And that alone is enough to cause a little bit of an ARC break. It's not really an ARC break, but you see a little alien – ness in the session and that, on the first slip of the auditor, can evolve into a – an order from the pc. See, this is just setting it up.

So you say, „But my God, at the beginning of every session I waste thirty-five minutes getting in my since mid ruds." Well, you waste thirty-five minutes but you get back – you get back an hour and fifty-five minutes of auditing. That's what you buy with your thirty-five minutes of since mid ruds. By not putting them in, you've wasted two and one – half hours of auditing. Flat. Not only that, but you have invited a mess because the pc isn't in-session – that is to say the pc isn't even in the auditing room. The pc is not going to follow through; the pc is going to open wide-open invitations to the auditor at every turn to do something else, rather than what they're doing.

Now, these are the fine ramifications of the thing. But the point is, is life is restimulative. I don't know if you've noticed this or not, but between sessions you get that sort of thing. Now, this is not an advertisement just for the subject matter of „get in since mid ruds." I'm just giving you an example of destimulation.

Now, let me show you – let me show a case in point here. Pc – we're running, Class VI, we're running him – pc comes up with the fact „I – I – I don't know, I kept all night long – all night long I kept thinking about these – I kept thinking about these creative activities that I should be engaged on. And just all night long and I – I – I think – I think there must be a goal here, 'to create.' I don't care what you said, I – I think there must be. I don't care what you said last month while we were checking that goal, I think there must be one, I think we missed it. And that's what's worrying me." Well now, you're not doing that at all. You're trying to get – you're trying to get a whole sequence of goals having to do with understanding. And the pc all of a sudden throws this one at you.

Now, a good auditor knows what to do. He destimulates it and goes on doing what he's doing. He doesn't neglect it, he destimulates it. Anything that is not on his main line of action he destimulates, right now. Gone. You understand?

Now, the technique that does that is case analysis. Case analysis has really, for its sole purpose, handling the present time problems as they arise. You'll see „case analysis“ has been misused as a term in the past. We're breaking it out into its pristine purity. There's been a missing word which is „track analysis,“ which is „Where do the GPMs fit?“ That – call that „track analysis.“ This other is just a – just a case analysis. But it's destimulative. It's just got the exact steps that it's got in the bulletin. What – it doesn't apply only to GPMs, God help us! I've seen this used to a Class I pc, trying to put his GPMs into place. It's a very broad, any – level proposition. „What's the pc sitting in? All right, the pc's sitting in a present time problem. What's the pc sitting in? He's sitting in a bad foot.“ You understand? Your second action is get these considerations. What considerations he had. All right, let's now get the bad foot related to something, whether present time or other bad feet or he's come up to the time when he used to have a bad ear. You're just destimulating him, you see? And you relate it to something; you now find the pc is sitting either elsewhere or in PT. And you can actually just go on along by a little concatenation getting his considerations of everything he is sitting in.

He's sitting in position one, position two, position three, position four, position five – get his considerations each time, get its relationship, find out where he's sitting now. Very, very elementary. Very elementary. It actually consists of, really, two auditing commands. It's no more complicated than that. Hey, you don't have to strain your brain on this one, see. „All right, anything you're concerned with, and so forth?“

„Well, I'm considered with the fact that I was up all night long, on – I was thinking about this – this GPM „to create“ and I'm a – sure I've got one. I'm sure last month when you said so-and-so and so-and-so.“

„Oh, is that so? All right, what considerations have you had about that?“

„Well, so-and-so and so-and-so and the last month we checked it wrong and we didn't do it right and so forth, and it...“

„All right, good, all right. Okay. Now, you got any other considerations you'd like to talk about with regard to that?“

„No.“

„All right. Well fine, now let's take up these goals that have to do with understanding.“

The other course is completely fatal. Completely. You're already taking goals that have to do with understanding – the pc is – suddenly shoves a goal at you which is „to create variety,“ so you check it out *again – aw – aw – awaw – aw – aw – aw – aw*! You pushed him into the mud. Well listen, if he was that worried there was nothing showing but a few sparse hairs on the top of his head anyhow, just about enough for you to pick up and grab out, see? Why push him in? An auditor not recognizing these things can get a pc in serious levels.

Now it isn't as apparent at Level 1. The dangers of this are not apparent at Level I at all. You can get somebody to chewing and yapping about this or that or the other thing – well, because he's running at about one – molecule depth, you see? And even when you get up to IV – even when you get up to IV, your processes are destimulative in the most part – you're really not trying to erase very much, there's no great difficulty with this. You could just get a pc so he felt kind of thick and jammy and kind of upset in general. And sort of nattery and so on, you wouldn't practically kill him. But you get to Class – Level VI, you might as well just take a pistol out of your pocket and shoot him between the eyes. It would be kinder. Well, you've got him in one great, big, overpowering actual GPM mass that you are busy checking out and you all of a sudden make him turn around while still stuck in that mass and get involved with another mass.

I had an example of this the other night. I had a goal – I was trying to place a goal, and when I hit the right number in the consecutive sequence, if I hit – I hit the right position for that GPM – I was trying to place another GPM in that sequence, see? This thing didn't bother me,

this one that was hanging up, until I tried to place another GPM in the proper number it belonged in, don't you see? I'd gotten to the number the original GPM that I was stuck in belonged in and tried to place another GPM there and like to knock – knocked the top of my head off! The GPM that belonged there, of course, rose up, full – armed, you know – joke of course – but get out of here, man! This place is occupied!

It's a sleeper, in other words. You're in one GPM and you try to do something with another, see, or you tr – in one series you're trying to do something with another series. It's just too much – too much stress and strain, that's all. So you carry out and complete your cycle of action with regard to this sort of thing. Now, I don't want to leave you in any difficulties with regard to this. I'm talking a lot about VI. You can just forget what level I'm talking about because it applies to all levels.

You can destimulate or restimulate. And when the auditor is restimulating, why, of course, he's normally trying to erase something. But an auditor always restimulates slightly. Restimulation in these factors enters into this very little. Very, very little. It's whether you restimulate or not, that's almost beside the point. It's whether or not you erase or destimulate. What is your final target? Are you going to destimulate this thing or are you going to erase this thing, see. And you have to make up your mind what you're going to do with it and then stick by your guns. Complete the cycle of action. That's the way you handle it.

All right, very good. What is auditing? What is auditing? This probably could take up an enormous lecture all by itself. As a matter of fact I could imagine somebody talking for several minutes on this subject without drawing a breath. What is auditing? What is auditing? Well, you think you know what auditing is but I don't think you know what auditing is.

Auditing is the action of asking somebody else a question, getting an answer to that question and acknowledging it. You go a little more broadly: It's asking somebody a question about himself or life which he can understand and which he can answer, getting his answer to that and acknowledging the fact that it has been answered. And then, also, when the person originates some observation with regard to that, to understand and handle that origination. TR 0, 1, 2, 3, 4. No more, no less. That is auditing.

When that occurs, TA action occurs. When that occurs, sanity occurs. When that occurs, this occurs. When that occurs that occurs. In other words, anything you want from this other. That is – that is auditing.

Now you say, „Well, what is all this stress on this definition?“ Well, you just never heard the definition, that's all.

„Well, I was auditing this fellow and we were assessing at the time.“ What is wrong with that sentence? You weren't auditing, you were assessing. „Yeah, but“ somebody says, „but assessment is auditing. I felt a lot better many times when I've been assessed on something.“ Auditing doesn't have anything to do with somebody feeling better. The final ramifications of auditing have nothing to do with the definition of auditing. That's what auditing is *for*. It's to make people feel better and so on. But *what is* auditing – that is all *auditing is*. And any time you say anything *else* is auditing you're going to lay yourself an ostrich egg! I mean, this is one of these horrible things.

Now, I've told you a simple datum. And in actual fact the next immediate action, of course, is to discuss whether or not there ought to be British war vessels on the Yukon to protect the Indians as they bring their hides down.

That's all *auditing is!* The technique is Scientology. Scientology is the embracive word for all of these actions. But auditing is this one peculiar action. Therefore when we use the word „self – auditing,“ we're using a misnomer. You can't have self – auditing. See, it's impossible. Now, I tell you that there's solid gold at the end of this rainbow, if you care to walk that definition out to its final conclusions. If you care to understand your actions at any level as

an auditor, only in the framework of that exact definition, there's gold at the end of the rainbow. But if you think you understand it and you don't understand it, you're going to get to the – not the end of the rainbow – you're going to get to the middle of it and fall off.

Now, this is one of those horrible definitions that admits of no exceptions, variations or anything else. And if you accept it at practically an engineering level of precision, you'll have it. And the next thing you know, you got tone arm action, you understand pcs, you can handle pcs, all this sort of thing, everything starts moving *together – click – click, whir – whir – whir*, nothing is very difficult.

You start trying to hang on to the fact that the reason this pc doesn't get tone arm action is because the technique – ah – ah! Well, yes, we can say the technique, we could say this, we could say that – but you're no longer talking about auditing. Oh, you can discuss technique, you can say, „Oh, it's this and that and so on,“ but don't get it so fuzzied up in your skull that you think you're talking about auditing. You're not talking about auditing.

Auditing is one *peculiar, particular action*. It's a cycle of action. And the odd part of it is that part of the cycle can be an origin on the restimulation of the auditor's presence – origin from the pc of something that then has to be acknowledged by the auditor. But that's just a comm cycle and that is the auditing cycle, and that two – terminal aspect which is what this physical universe consists of is what gives you tone arm action and is *what makes the pc better! It's not a technique that makes the pc better, and it never will be*. As long as you're counting on auditing, then auditing is that thing, and when it doesn't exist you don't get – it goes nowhere. Do you understand?

So you say, „Now, look, this...“ Look – let – let me give you the nonsense, here, see? This is the – this is the South Sea Islanders, once used to boil sea water and it generated a gas and they put this gas up in this thing, because it got from volcanoes and then – then Ronson has – has bottled this, you see, and – and so forth and that's how you can – so therefore the relationships with the South Sea Islander are very important. See, that's one of these data when you're asking the fellow simply to put it there, see? But whenever you go into this statement or make a statement of this kind, you're cutting your throat as a pro auditor.

„The reason we aren't getting tone arm action is because he is being audited at too high a level for his case.“ This is not true. Because it isn't true that you shouldn't put people at one level or another of case, but the error is you have introduced the idea of tone arm action independent of the auditing cycle. See, that's the error. Can't be done. Now, you can do an awful lot of things with this auditing cycle, see? You can put an awful lot of television programs through Telstar. And they amaze and wonderfy the audiences that look at them. But without any Telstar they would never get there.

So auditing is the carrier wave – as far as the pc is concerned – that handles anything and everything in Scientology. That is it.

Now, it isn't that you can't teach a pc, it isn't that you can't inform a pc, it isn't that you shouldn't move your technology around, it isn't that he shouldn't go up through levels. It's just that that has nothing to do with the Definition of auditing!

Auditing is simply auditing. It is that action of the auditor asking a question that the pc can answer, you see, or making a command, and the pc understanding it and responding to it, executing it, informing the auditor that he has done so and the auditor acknowledging that fact. And that's all auditing is.

Pc originates something of the sort. Well, of course, it's a result of an earlier cycle. So he goes ahead and the auditor acknowledges it. It's the same thing. So you could have somebody who was letter perfect on Class VI but who never audited. Wouldn't that be a wonder to behold?

It – it's one of these – it's one of these horrible things that – it – maybe someday you – some of you have got it already. That's – it's – some of these days – one of these days, years from now, somebody else will hear me and they suddenly say, „Well, *that's* what he's talking about, you know?“ Because unfortunately it's one of these things that just shoots through everything. You want to know „How do I crack this case?“ Well, define auditing. „Well,“ you say, „that isn't very informative!“

All right, but that puts us into another type of activity in which an auditor can engage. There may even be an additional type of activity to this. But there is one other principal form of activity in which the auditor can engage and it's called assessment.

Now, auditing goes somewhat to the pc's bank or to the pc and it restimulates his bank and talks to the pc and so forth. It isn't that auditing goes purely and entirely to the pc. It goes mainly to the pc. But assessment nnnnnever goes to a pc! And you cannot assess a pc who thinks he's being addressed. Now, you want to know what happens to all these wrong assessments, well, look at that Definition. How do you ever get a wrong assessment? How do you get your E-Meter going so flickety – flock? How does it tell you so many lies? Well, you're auditing a pc who isn't up the level on this particular subject. He thinks somebody's talking to him. The auditor says, „Catburrs, batfur, caterwumps.“ And the pc says, „Oh, batfurs, yes, batfurs, yes, yes. I had a batfur once – so forth.“ He thinks he's being addressed. He thinks somebody's talking to him. And nobody's talking to him, man. His views of the situation are about as useful...

But this must be somebody who is pretty restimulatable and rather easily restimulated to be so egocentric that he is always being addressed. And he must have some fantastic protective mechanism into the middle of the auditing cycle to keep anything from going through anywhere. He must use his present time problems to defend himself at every turn, he must use this – his rebuttals and so forth to keep it going forward – a lot of things must be going on here the like of which nobody ever heard of wrong with the auditing cycle.

So when the auditing cycle is out, assessment can't occur. But that's the – about the only way that the – that the assessment can occur, by the way, with the auditing cycle out. Pc can be madder than blazes and you can still assess the pc. What I mean is, that the auditing cycle is out and the pc thinks he is being addressed, every time you say „catterwump“ or „batfur“ or any part of the list, and answers it as a question. You're never going to find out. You're never going to find any items or goals or anything else, see? Because he is insufficiently – insufficiently able on the subject of the comm cycle, auditing, you know – auditing. He's insufficiently able as far as auditing is concerned to be able to sit there relaxedly, because he feels, you know, alert. He feels nervous. He – he – something's wrong. Something's wrong with the comm cycle. His auditor, he doesn't like the auditor, something's wrong with his ability, he can't answer questions, he's afraid of this or that – some part of this thing is awry. So you try to assess this guy. You wonder why assessment was jacked up so high in these levels. Well, I'm giving you why right now.

Until the auditing cycle is very well remedied and the pc can sit there very, very relaxedly indeed, you haven't got a dog's chance of assessing anything on the pc because he criss-crosses in all directions, and his mind is like a darting sparrow or a hummingbird. It's all over the place – zip, zip, zip, zip, zip, zip, zip! You call „catterwump,“ you know, and my God, you don't know whether the rocket read had to do with the – with the pc thinking, „I don't like caterwumps.“ „He's now going to read 'catterwumps,' I know it!“ you know? Never saying anything and so forth.

That auditing cycle is out so therefore assessment is difficult. And you very often have to do assessment with the auditing cycle out. And it will still stand independent to it because even so, if you ask the right question, even on a thoroughly ARC broke pc, if you ask the ques-

tion exactly where the mind – not the pc – where the mind is living, that meter will read. And of course, the more the pc is calm and able to respond on the auditing cycle, the more reliable reads – the more, the deeper the meter reads, you see? An ARC broke pc himself doesn't read on the meter, but you can always bang his bank into reading.

ARC breaks. That, that I just told you, is a mouthful all in itself. That's about fifteen or twenty hours' lecture – the difference between an auditing cycle and assessment and what isn't assessment and so forth that – that – that's – that's all – that's all very interesting stuff.

Let me give you an example. R2H, ARC Break Straightwire, that's assessment, isn't it? No, that's not assessment, that's auditing. How is it auditing? You're assessing, aren't you? No, you never assess for R2H. What do you mean you don't assess for R2H? You got a list in front of you, you're reading off to the pc, aren't you? Yeah, but you're asking the pc the whole way. Now you could turn around and run it on an – on an overt assessment. Just do an assessment. But R2H is basically not an assessment but a two-way comm with the pc concerning what parts of the comm cycle were out here and seeing which one agrees was the one out in that particular incident. And you're asking the pc to remember the incident and you're asking the pc this and you're getting the data from the pc that and you're asking that. What the hell has this got to do with assessment, man? You start looking over R2H, it's nothing but solid auditing from one end to the other. What's the fooler is, is there's an assessment sheet in it. There's an assessment sheet in it. But you – actually, in its purest state and as best used, you do not assess with it.

„Well, Class VI – look, Class VI – full of goals lists and item lists and everything else – there's all kinds of assessments to do in there, yeah, it's nothing to do with auditing. Well, wait a minute, it gives you tone arm action so therefore it must have something to do...“ No, I'm sorry, tone arm action doesn't have anything to do with auditing. These Indians, you see, when they come down often have grease paint. And the Ronson company... Doesn't have anything to do with it, you see? The point is here that assessment is assessment and auditing is auditing. And you get somebody who is chittering away like a magpie while – while you're trying to assess, because you can't keep your auditing cycle in, you're in trouble. Also if he's in that state, why, you're probably going to get a wrong assessment anyway. Lots of things are wrong, but they're just – we're not talking about the wrongnesses of it, we're just talking about the purity of definition.

There's two targets: the pc and the bank. Assessment is addressed to the bank and is the one process that addresses straight to the bank. And it's just from the auditor to the bank. It has nothing to do with the pc and there's the meter.

Now, sometimes you run an assessment procedure on a pc while the pc is trying to put in the comm cycle and you get into trouble. But that's why you get into trouble, is you're trying to put in the – an assessment. You know, you're saying, „Is this a wog? Is it a bog? Is it dag? Wog? Is it eight years? Nine years? Eighteen years?“ and so forth – and next thing you know your pc's ARC broke. Why is he ARC broke? Well, he actually originated and you didn't take up the comm cycle. That's why he's ARC broke. It's not the fact that you're talking to the meter. You di – he originated and you didn't take any attention to it and so forth, that's the source of the ARC break.

So you assess and audit and assess and audit and assess and audit and assess and audit and audit and assess – at the same time, sometimes. But that doesn't make them any – any the less two different actions. They are two distinctly different actions. You go, „Bark – bark – bark, bark – bark – bark, bark – bark – bark“ on a list, you don't want an auditor – you don't want a pc doing this or that or the other thing – a pc – doesn't – it doesn't matter, he can be half asleep and you'll still get the same results on your meter. You shouldn't be assessing pcs in boil – off, because they're in boil – off because you've overlisted the list. But they could be in

boil – off and you could still pull a goal off of them. See, it hasn't anything to do with the pc, it just has to do with the bank. It's between the auditor and the bank. So that action is peculiarly between the auditor and the bank.

That's another part of auditing. Isn't it? So if you've got auditing there, and you see, and in... Caught you! Hasn't anything to do with auditing. You say, „Yes, but I got a lot of benefit out of it.“ That hasn't anything to do with auditing. That's Scientology. „Yes, I know, but when you find an item you get this terrific tone arm action. How do you account for that?“ I'll let you in on something: When you find an item when no auditing is present, you don't get any tone arm action. It is the auditing that gives you tone arm action, always. And the actual RI, big and juicy as it is, doesn't give you any tone arm action at all if there's no auditing present. Isn't that interesting?

Do you know that that happens to be an actual, provable datum? You can prove it yourself sometimes. You don't get tone arm action, you get a little needle slash. You find an actual RI – great, big, juicy beast of an actual RI. And you watch your meter behavior and if auditing were in progress, you see? You give it to the pc, there's auditing, he's in rapport with the auditor, you've got an auditing cycle going, so you get tone arm action because of the auditing cycle.

All right, same pc, let's put him on a one – hand electrode, don't go anywhere near the room, let him call out the next item that he's to find in the next bank that will give the auditor a division-and-a – half blowdown. Let him call it out and he'll get little one – inch needle slash. And that tone arm goes exactly no place. There's enough residual auditing in the bank that he has had to give him that. This is – this is very interesting. Assessing doesn't give anybody tone arm action. It's only an apparenency. He – he – the auditing is going on the same time, see – so you get the tone arm action because the auditor finds the thing and he says, „Catterwumps – is that it? Well, it's catterwumps, is that it?“

It's a very funny thing. You can – you can actually see an item start to go and you can't make it go all the way until you say to the pc, „Is that your item?“ and you have immediately started the auditing cycle. It isn't that – any mystery about the pc put his attention on it – my God, how could he help but put his attention on it, he's sitting in the middle of it, see? And you say, „Is that your item?“ And you'll see *pppsssswwww!* And you'll see the tone arm come down and so forth. And you very often don't get any blowdown whatsoever. You can find the item on the list, you'll see the needle slash. If there's residual auditing present, you'll get a little tone arm action.

But here's what I'm telling you: It's the auditing that delivers the tone arm action, not the assessment. The assessment is a pure, clean, clear activity all by itself.

So therefore, you should do case analysis during an ARC break assessment, shouldn't you? Well, you've asked the pc, you f – you found – you found that the bypassed charge of the thing was a wrong goal, so you – you – you ask him his considerations, in an ARC break assessment you ask him his considerations about this goal, don't you? Like hell you do! An ARC break assessment is given in times of ARC break. The list is also useful for other forms of assessment, but an ARC break assessment is simply an ARC break assessment. And it's a very elementary thing. All you do is assess the list, find out where the needle reads – it's between you and the bank – find out where the needle is and then you simply indicate what you have found to the pc.

That's all there is to an ARC break assessment. No matter how hard you try, you can't make anything more out of an ARC break assessment than that. And during an ARC break you *must not audit. Must not audit. Never audit.*

„Yeah,“ you say, „well, how the hell can you audit, possibly – now wait a minute, this is an awful brain-cracker, because if you can't audit, if you mustn't audit during an ARC break,

why, how can you assess?“ Well, an assessment doesn't happen to be auditing. You must *not audit* during an ARC break, period! All right, the pc sets very poor goals for the session and seems a little bit unhappy and says he has some problems. Does he have an ARC break? No! An ARC break is an ARC break. An ARC break is when the auditing comm cycle cannot take place. And that's what an ARC break is. The pc is very accusative and he's talking and so forth and he isn't answering any of the auditing que – well, that – that's – that's an ARC break. Pc's screaming, the pc won't talk, you understand – that's an ARC break. An ARC break isn't *anything else*, it's just an impossibility of comm cycle. If you force a comm cycle at that time, you will deepen the ARC break. You can practically kill somebody with this, man! An ARC break is an ARC break.

All right, at the beginning of the session, naturally you had to do an ARC break assessment because the pc didn't set correct goals. Aw! Can he talk to you? Well, what you doing an ARC break assessment for? He's not ARC broke! He's perfectly auditable. Got a PTP. Do case analysis.

„Well, what's been going on? Where are you sitting? Where's your attention right now?“

„Well, I'm thinking about the wog – wogs.“

„All right, what are your main considerations about the wog – wogs?“ or any other little destimulative process. „On wog – wogs anything been suppressed? Since the last time I audited you, has anything been suppressed?“ Anything like that. „What's your attention on? All right, let's do some case analysis and considerations, so forth and so on – ah, about that now. Oh, that's good, that's fine. Okay. Now, let's get on about our business.“ See? Get the idea?

Has nothing to do with an ARC break assessment. ARC break assessment is an ARC break assessment and what – why it is called an ARC break assessment is because it is given during ARC breaks. And auditing – and auditing is never done during an ARC break. Never audit a pc during an ARC break. Never, but never, but never, but never! Elementary.

Now, this is some more of „You put the lighter on the paper and you put it over on the pencils and you put it over on the desk.“ Do you see how the confusions can arise in these very precise definitions I've been giving you? A lot of confusions.

„Yeah, but a lot of these Indians wear bear grease in their hair and – and the shopkeeper down at the corner has awfully dirty fingernails when he tries to sell you...“ Hasn't anything to do with the price of fish!

What you've got to do is get these definitions *terrifically* clean – *terrifically* clear. *What exactly are they? Exactly what are the purposes of these tools and exactly what do they do?* How broad can you apply them? You can apply them awful broadly, man. Yes, you could use the ARC break assessment sheet to help locate bypassed charge in the pc and audit the whole time, you see? But that's not an ARC break assessment. It's mixed up your tools all right – so you mixed up your tools. The crime is not *knowing* you have mixed them up.

Now, there are other ramifications of this kind. I've told you some of these very precise actions and they are very important. If all you did was sit and remedy somebody's comm cycle and the auditing, even to this point: „What could you originate to me free and clear in a session?“ You see? „What chair would it be all right to sit in, in an auditing session?“ It doesn't matter what you ask them. As long as you're addressing their points of disability on the comm cycle, you're going to get yourself TA action. You're going to get this pc in-session and you're going to get a pc who's whizzing and coming on upstairs.

But it's all built in on the basis of knowing with great precision the exact definitions with which you're dealing and knowing exactly what those things are. And if you know what they are, why, you're going to make it. If you haven't got them all split apart and figured out, you're not going to make it.

One day the pc is *wuba – buba*, and you pick up the *babba – galog* over here and you say, „Now we're gonna – we're gonna blah,“ and all of a sudden everything goes bling! You wonder what in the name of God went on here. Well, you picked up this hammer, don't you see, in order to fix the watch. And it didn't work. But they're terribly elementary but you have to get them very straight so that at no moment do you have – no moment do you have any Confusion in your mind.

The ARC break assessment, you mustn't have an ARC break assessment down so badly that you feel the thing to do in an ARC break assessment is argue with the pc, you see? Or if you read line two, then indicate the charge that you found after you've read line two, as line three. These things are apt to cause difficulties. When you have an ARC break assessment occurring by reason of Step Six and then ARC break it by reason of a session ARC break and you can't go on with your Step Six, be smart enough to realize that you now have an ARC break on top of the ARC break and reach for your session ARC break sheet. You understand? Know your tools. Slippity – slip, slippity – slip. Soon as you got the session ARC break straightened out you got that found, assessed, indicated to the pc – let's take the R6 one, read it down, finish it off properly. Bang – there it is, straighten it out. Destimulate the whole occurrence, maybe, with a spat – spat of mid ruds or something like this, after the ARC break is all occurred. Because mid ruds are auditing.

These are your various things. Now, I've given you an awful hammer and pound in this lecture of very fundamental fundamentals. And if you look them over very carefully, all of a sudden you will say, „That is why this, that is why that, that is why something else, that is why when I audited Josie – Belle I didn't, and that is why when I audited George I did. That is why I don't seem to make any progress on something or other,“ and so on.

In other words, all these things are figure – out – able at this basic level. Okay?

Thank you very much.