AUDITING AND ASSESSMENT

A lecture given on
3 March 1964

Thank you. What's the date?

Audience: The 3rd of March.

The 3rd of March, AD 14, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. Well, I'm glad to see you looking so well. I'm glad to see you looking so well. And you do, too, you know? I've seen some creaks disappear here since the last time I looked at you.

Well, I got my complete line plot last night, thanks to my auditor. Complete goals plot from one to forty-two-the lot!

Yeah, that's much more to the point-the auditor on this case-what she's had to suffer! What she's had to suffer through. And it's very interesting, that until you get a goals plot done properly, the amount of faith and confidence that you can put in a goal, until it's been completely plotted, is so slight as to be negligible, on actual GPMS. And the wild abandon with which we've been running wrong goals is really marvelous! Great, you know, great.

The materials-this lecture is not connected with or concerned with R6-only slightly impinges on it; it's at lower levels. But it is interesting that the most complete body of knowledge today is at Class VI. That is complete, codified, completely buttoned up, squared around, all auditing skills, everything necessary to put it together exists there at that level. And this is not - was not an accidental or momentary achievement. The truth of the matter is it required thousands and thousands of hours of auditing, required fantastic amounts of put-together and look-up and square-around, and so on. And it is quite a happy thing to look at and see that that material is all squared around.

Oddly enough, it happens to be all codified. It happens to be all on tape, or in notes, or so forth; all for study, and so on. And from-well actually, Class II-Class II looks very thin and spotty with, you know, with a great deal of additional bits and pieces, and nothing lined up too straight and so forth. But the information is all there at Class II, don't you see? But it's not really in a concise, tight assembly, and so on. But Class VI is. Quite in addition to that, we have all of the Instructors and Saint Hill staff personnel are just finishing up their Class VI Course. So we even have trained Instructors along this line.

Of course, we don't dare say at this moment that we have trained Instructors, because they get their examination Thursday night.

But anyway, the information at Class VI is the most codified piece of stuff that anybody ever wanted to look at. And that is quite comforting in Scientology, because we're quite used to having it all in fragments, don't you know. And it's released here, there, and this or that. And it's an HCOB that also contains methods of snapping your fingers, you know. And then there's another bit of vital information that comes out in 1958. At the same time, it's accompanied by „How to Assess for the Rock," and-you know? It has scattered and spattered about. So you have to root and dig for it. Well, that isn't true at Class VI. And it's a good thing it isn't, because this is precision skill to end all precision skills.

Now, the lecture I'm about to give you delivers into your hands some additional information concerning your more basic auditing- Now, this is, of course, also applicable to

Class VI, but is the very stuff of which life is made at Classes III and IV. And frankly, I don't see how anybody could do anything at Class IV without this data.

Now, I want to-I want to give you-so that's-the tape-the classifiable level of the tape, of course, is Class IV that I'm-data I'm giving you right now. But it's also Classes V and VI.

Now, you are accustomed to regarding assessment as something that you use to find something to audit. That's the basic-been the basic purpose of assessment for many, many years. And then more latterly, to find the cause or source of an ARC break-Assessment.

Assessment is an activity which is totally independent of auditing. And as you move up in the classes from IV on, you'll find that assessment commingles with auditing because Class VI is just practically nothing but solid assessment, don't you see, with auditing thrown in. We bring about the primary cause of bad auditing or bad ARC breaks from just one thing; is the inability of the auditor to differentiate between assessment and auditing, and failing to shift his gears or, schizophrenically, do both at the same time.

The way you do both at the same time is when the pc originates in the middle of an assessment. You're going down the sheet and the pc originates. Well now, you actually never do them both at the same time, but you must learn to lay aside the assessment for that instant, handle the auditing situation competently and then resume the assessment. And when you realize that all this may take place in a shorter space of time than twenty seconds, you realize that the auditor has to have a terribly good ability to differentiate between the two, and to shift between the two activities. The two activities don't really mix. They are entirely different things.

And let me give you some reason why. The assessment is addressed to the pc's bank. It is not addressed to the pc. Now, when auditing intervenes during an assessment, then something has been addressed to the pc. Inadvertently something has gone to the pc, but it's not that it's an accident or anything. You've bit something in assessing, so therefore the pc has been reminded of something and so originates. Well now, this is the pc talking. The assessment is addressed to the bank and the pc says something. This is perfectly all right; this happens constantly in auditing. Well, what does the auditor do?

Well actually, he lays aside his assessment at that moment, not with the physical actions of picking up the paper and putting it over alongside him, but with the mental realization that that is in effect what he is doing. Handles the origin competently. Understands the origin. Doesn't-doesn't-this is one performance which is utterly deadly: Auditor is so busy assessing that he hasn't got any time to understand what the pc is saying, see. So, he simply acknowledges, hoping that it won't be noticed, you see? He just gets rid of this auditing action and then tries to go back to his assessment, and of course he can't. And the session will lock up, right there.

It locks up if only to the degree that the meter ceases to be as responsive. You might not notice it, you see. It might not be a glass-shattering ARC break. The pc might not even feel upset about his auditor. It's just that it ceases to be so responsive. Your assessment now doesn't run so well.

And all bad assessment, where the meter isn't operating properly, comes about because the auditor can't shift his gears between assessing and auditing rapidly enough and handle both of them competently each in its turn. Do you follow me?

I, by the way, am addressing this lecture to you with a great deal of hope and élan. I gave you a lecture on the comm cycle in auditing a few weeks ago, and I was also-learned something because I had the lecture-those two lectures replayed to you. And you-you immediately made tremendous use out of this. And a great deal of upgrade occurred, and so forth. And I was very pleased. It gave me a nice win. And I was very happy with you about that, so I'm not talking to you today as though the information will be 50 percent wasted. I have confidence that you will use it intelligently. It was a nice win.

Now, I was amazed at the number of auditor reports which showed up exact accurate use of that information I gave you about that comm cycle. I've lectured about it before but it's never been picked up and used. So therefore, I was able to put it into a communication form which was understandable and usable.

Well, this is another one of these. And you also heard me talk a week ago about assessment and so forth. And I actually just gave you a bunch of hot bricks. I just took them right out of the furnace and put them into your bare hands. There's a lot of definitions in that last lecture I gave you-rat-a-tat-*tat-a-tat-tat-a-tat-tat.* It's practically a whole subject like chemistry, all in that short space of time. Well, I'm giving you some of the fruits of that information right now in talking to you about shifting gears between assessing and auditing.

Now, there's many an auditor thinks assessing is completely impossible. He gets of this opinion. He takes an old Prehav Scale, and he's going to find the Prehav level-which, by the way, are mostly items out of actual GPMs or locks they're on.

But he gets to going down this thing, you know, and all of a sudden, there's his meter. And his meter's-seems to be completely motionless. Nothing happening on the meter. The needle was sort of swinging about and all of a sudden it isn't doing so well. So he thinks he's hit something in the assessment. That's his first mistake. He thinks the pc must have hung up someplace. He thinks a lot of things. But that needle is no longer free.

So, he goes back over the list to hit what he had previously been going over and getting little ticks on. And he finds out that most of them are scrubbed and he can't get much of them back, except some other one that hadn't read before or something now gives a bigger tick. And he just sort of goes into despair about the whole thing and just hands up any level and of course, it's usually the one that's most protested by the pc. Then he audits this on the pc and wonders why he doesn't get any gain, you see.

Well now, that's a failure of assessment, what I've given you there. Obviously, isn't it? It's an assessment failure. But actually, actually, it's an auditing failure. It's an auditing failure. The auditing which got put aside shouldn't have been that thoroughly put aside. And the pc's origin, the auditor's inadvertent question of the pc, see: Like, „Well, is it all right with you if I now assess this list?" you see. That's an auditing question, man, that's not an assessment question. And the pc says, „Hm-mm-mm-mm..." and the auditor says-see and he-"All right," you see, *pocketa-bock, and backity-back, and boobity-boop, and soopa-soop.*

What's he doing right now? He's got an incomplete auditing cycle. The pc didn't know if it was all right to assess the list or not. Really didn't know quite what the auditor's going to do. And maybe had his attention on some cycle of action that the pc thought was incomplete, see? So, he's given the pc-now you understand, there's two targets here: One is the bank. One is the pc. So he starts the assessment by addressing the pc. Look at how elementary nonsensical this can get, you see. And then doesn't permit the cycle of action to take place, you see?

In other words, he's going to assess, so he starts an auditing action. And then he doesn't complete the auditing action and keeps assessing. Well now, that in itself, all by itself, is enough to thoroughly defeat an assessment of such a delicate nature as old R2 Prehav Scales, or something like that. That's quite adequate, see? „Is it all right with you if. . ." (I'm just giving you the reduction ad absurdum of it, you see this), „Is it all right with you if I assess this list now?" See? *Buckety-bow, boppity-bow, bungity-bing, bockata-bok.*

Now wait a minute, he said something to the pc, didn't he? Well, the pc has heard this. As a living-we wont say breathing being, because there-the pc could be too-too far gone to breathe, or actually you could be assessing somebody who was up high enough so they didn't have to. But this pc is an analytically responsive character, see? When he's asked, „Do birds fly'.?" then he expects to answer „Do birds fly?" Furthermore, he is not, probably, very well indoctrinated as a pc, and so thinks all assessment questions are addressed to him personally too. And has an anxiety ... But you wont find that enters into it very much providing you keep

your auditing cycle going. But having asked the pc this question, if you don't complete that cycle of action, then you tend to channel the remaining assessment to the pc. Do you see this?

So the pc now feels honor-bound to answer, whether or not communication, and so forth, is the level. So the pc sits there and says, „Well, it really shouldn't be communication. No, I don't think it's that. Well, I don't think it's this," and so on. Why is he going into this? Well, he could be going into this for many reasons-but-in-anxiety about questions, and so forth, he's not well in-session or something. But remember, part of this and what keyed him into going into this was the fact that the auditor asked him a question and then didn't complete the auditing cycle and so threw the whole assessment on to an auditing line.

Pc is still trying to sit here, saying, „Well, is it all right for him to go with the…" The pc didn't get a chance to say, you know, „Well, I don't know, I feel sort of dopey and groggy. Will that have any effect on the assessment?" See? Only the pc doesn't say it. So, well, look at the mechanics involved here. The pc has an incomplete auditing cycle, may have had an answer-is therefore put on a withhold. And this is what you're going to assess through.

Now, this gives you some idea of how sharp an auditor's got to be to differentiate between auditing and assessment. You complete one-particularly the auditing cycle-and you complete the other. They're both action cycles and they both have to be completed.

Now let me give you the reverse look at this thing. It looks kind of idiotic when you start looking at it, but you'd be surprised how easy it is to slip into this one. I mean, what I'm talking to you about in general-it's-how easy it is not to differentiate between these two things. Well after all, you've got a pc sitting in front of you and you're just there, aren't you? You're doing this for his case and naturally, he has his opinions. And we've got all kinds of rationale, you see, to go through with this that breaks down what should be a very, very sharp view of this. We're auditing or we're assessing, see? We're either/or, you see, that's all. We're not auditing and assessing.

So, the pc-the pc sits there in a state of batter-batter, yackle-yackle to himself; comments on everything because he's already on a withhold to the auditor. Now, there's many a pc, when he sees an auditor assess, goes on to an immediate detached withhold state of mind. Well, how did he get there? That's what you should ask yourself Did he just get there automatically?. No. He has to be put there by disobeying certain little tenets that are the ideal operation, see?

Perfectly all right to say to a pc-oh, yes, you should-"Is it all right now if we assess this list?" Perfectly all right. But for God's sakes, look. You got an auditing cycle going. You've asked the pc an auditing question. Now the pc has to say it is or isn't all right. And he jolly well must have answered that question to his satisfaction. See, it's all just the standard auditing cycle-answers the question to his satisfaction and says to the auditor yes, no, or whatever it is, you see, and the auditor must acknowledge that. And if a present time problem or something pops up with regard to this, the auditor certainly had jolly well better handle it.

See, this is just all auditing, see, going on here. The auditor had better . . . „Oh, you've got a little headache. Now, when did the headache turn on? ... Well, it did? ... All right, fine... Yes ... Uh-hm. All right. All right, how're you doing now? ... All right. Thank you. Thank you very much. Now, is it all right if I assess this list?"

And the pc says, „Yeah, it's all right if you assess the list."

And the auditor says, „Okay. Thank you," and without further ado, turns over to this assessing operation. *Backaty-back, bop, boop, ta-da-dap-pow,* pow, pow, pow, pow, bang, bang, bang, bang, and you'd just be utterly fascinated. The needle stays loose and when you hit the right item, why, it goes klablang. And all is well, and the pc-all of a sudden, you've got the right item, and you ask the pc something about, „Is that it?" you know?

Well now, now watch this one, see. He says, „Is that your item?" you know, or something like that, see. Well now, that's just tossed off as an idle patter or a piece of

courtesy step or something, isn't it? It hasn't any, any real bearing. It's part of the assessment, isn't it?

Oh no, it's not! You started a brand-new auditing cycle. And when you say, „Is that your item?" you have asked an auditing question. And you jolly well better get it completely carried out into its auditing cycle, or the next thing you know, it won't be the pc's item, nothing will repeat on the meter, the pc's in a bunch of withhold, he doesn't cognite on anything-and this is where you throw most of your cognitions. See. That's how they get thrown in the ashcan. That's how pcs feel they aren't cogniting well and that sort of thing.

Well, the auditing question is asked, „Is that your item?" you see, some such thing. And the pc of course is going to take a little while to answer that. Completely aside from the fact that you shouldn't be talking while the TA is moving. Completely aside from that mechanical bit that's thrown in sideways. Pc's item: „Sponduliks. Hmm. Sponduliks. Hmm. Sponduliks. Oh, yeah, yeah. When I was-when I was umpteen, uh-I uh-yeah. And-yeah, yeah, yeah. That's why I left Isabelle! See? Yes! That's right."

And now, now, now, beware auditor, is that an answer to your auditing question? It jolly well isn't. That's a halfway point. Now, the pc will either get around to eventually telling you this-you've just handed the pc a heavy bomb, right in his paws, you see. It takes him a while to get through the circuitry, see. Well look, you're looking for something that's got his mind all circuitried. Why, why be so surprised? Why be so surprised that it takes him a long time to answer this auditing question? You've just put him into the middle of the complete rat race. And he's supposed to see his way through this in a split second, so you can get on assessing, or something, see.

No, he's not going to. You dumped him into the middle of the whirlpool, see? You just said, „Sponduliks. Is that your item?" see?

„No! Sponduliks. *Oh, oh, rrr, rrr, rr, rrrr, rrmmmm,*" grate, grate, grind, grind, the wheels crashing, you know, gears grinding, and so forth. „Oh, yes." Cognition, see? „Well, that's why I left Isabelle, see. Yeah. Yeah. Yeah."

Now, watch it, auditor. That pc hasn't answered that auditing question. Pc's saying, „Yeah. Yeah. Yeah. Yeah." He's just saying, „Yeah." That's how he left . . . „Yeah. Yeah. Yeah. Yeah. Yeah ... Has a lot to do with military training at uh ... Yeah! Yeah. Ha-ha! Yeah, yeah, yeah. That damn sergeant, he used to come out there on the parade ground all the time. He'd keep saying, 'Sponduliks,' you know? No wonder! Hey-hey-hey! Yeah. Yeah. Yeah. Yeah. Yeah. Yeah. Yeah. Yeah, that's my item."

But maybe he forgets to tell you! And after a while, he just sits back with-if you've done a proper assessment and everything is in and rolling like mad, and your good indicator in-he sits back with a grin on his face, and so forth. And that's the end of that, see? And he hasn't said that's his item, you know?

And the auditor now would have an uncomplete-an incomplete cycle of action, unless he got the question answered. The auditor shouldn't say, „I will now repeat the auditing question." I don't think that would quite be in order, since it would now invalidate all his cognitions. So he'd say, „Well, Sponduliks. Is that your item, then?"

„Oh, yeah! Oh, yeah! Hell! I thought you understood that. Yeah, of course it's my item! Yeah, yeah, that's my item. Yes sir!" You see the tone arm start going some more, see? You say, „All right. Sponduliks, that's your item."

Now, the pc hasn't been asked anything, has he? He's not given a command to do anything. So you can say, „Sponduliks, that's your item," without expecting anything else to happen, because nothing else will happen. He'll just sit there. You'll get a great big surge of the needle and that will be that.

But you see-now, I've just given you an example here-that failure to differentiate between the assessment and the auditing messes up the meter, messes up the session and makes the assessment all but impossible. They are two different distinct operations.

And there's a very funny thing about it: Assessment must never interrupt the auditing cycle. But the auditing cycle may at any time interrupt assessment. So therefore, the auditing cycle is the senior operation. Now, that sounds very funny. If we say it's a senior operation, obviously you spend more time on that than you do on anything else. No, listen, the whole of TA action obtained at Class VI is obtained quantitatively. It's the number of items you get in the unit of time that gives you the TA. It's quantitative. You find one item per session and you will get, oddly enough, very little more than the TA action resident in one item. If you want ten times that, why, you find ten times the number of items.

This is just arithmetically arrivable at. It's just-that's it. So therefore, the auditing cycle is senior to it because it can wreck the assessment. Not that it necessarily occupies more time.

Assessment can also wreck an auditing cycle. Pc is saying, „Say, you know, I've just had an inkling here that that goal you're listing for on the list. . or „I think my service facsimile is in actual fact . . . „ and so on and so on.

„Oh, yeah. Oh yeah, okay. Sponduliks, *pa-da-da-da, pa-do-do-do, po-dodo-do, pa-di-di-di-di-du-du waf woo...* „ What the hell's happened to the meter? What's the matter? I've got a dirty needle here. Pc must have missed withhold. „You have a missed withhold? You think something before the session that uh ... Yes, you been up to something between sessions I don't know about?" Maybe it's a listing bypass, or maybe L4 ...

Hell, no! You just mixed up assessing and auditing and put your meter out of operation.

Now, this will come closer home to you when I tell you that if there were two electrical lines leading out to two different objects, and you took those two lines and crossed them, you would get sparks. And that you have two lines going out to two different destinations, a pc and a bank, and when you cross them you get sparks. Very jammy type sparks.

Now, no auditor is so expert that he will *never* get these things mixed up, but let's look at some of the obvious faults that you can get into with this. Now, when you're assessing you customarily use, or might use, „Is………?" See? Let's take a service facsimile list. „Is this list complete?"

Now, all of this actually should be threshed out, threshed out. It has not appeared too much on the research horizon. Because one can get away with saying, „Is it………?"

But you know, there's no-there's nobody home in a bank. There can be appearances of people being there. You can get all kinds of wild things. If you want to mess up a pc good, go into conversation-through the meter-with one of the nine entities of the body. You'll get some of the weirdest responses.

You can give every sign of having animate intelligent beings. The first one of them that emerged, and that was used and so forth, is the file clerk. The old file clerk. You make an impingement on the bank-ask a question and make an impingement-and you'll get some interesting responses. I remember some publisher-lady in charge of publications of vast magnitude, and I was talking to her one day about Dianetics, something of the sort. And she said, „Well, what do you mean, people aren't in present time?" see?

And I said, „Well, they're very often stuck other places, and so forth."

„Oh yes?"

And I said, „All right, when I snap my fingers an age will flash," you see. „When I snap my fingers, an age will flash," see. And I said, „What age occurred to you at that moment?"

She says, „Four."

„All right, where were you when you were four years old?" Turns out, you know, the house burned down, and, „How did you know that?" and, „You must be very magical indeed." Well, of course, you just got the part of the time track that the person was most glued

up in, and so on, and by making an impingement on the bank, why, you got a response. But remember, the response did not really come about from the-asking a question of a little man that sits in a box behind a wicket.

Now, I myself at this particular stage of the game-and I may shift this for various reasons-do ask assessment questions as questions. I've noticed that this bothers the pc more than assertions. But it's easier to do, and I have never considered it a vital bit of stuff, but if you said, instead of, „Is it four?" „Is it five?" „Is it six?"-something of this character, you see, „Is the list complete?" You would say, „The list is complete; the list is incomplete." In other words, you would make your assessment statements and your questions otherwise. It all depends on how much control you've got as an auditor and what the pc understands. But I noticed that I occasionally do run into a cross-and you will too-run into a cross between the pc thinks he's been addressed when actually you've addressed the bank.

Now, you won't get any reaction from the bank if the pc is intervening. So the more you can do to keep the pc from intervening, without putting the pc on a bunch of withholds-one of the cute ways to do it is the pc (well trained) then says, „I am not going to interfere with the auditor or stick my oar in during the assessment." And then, of course, you have a dead meter for the complete assessment. Pcs are very helpful, very often helpful. You say, „Has something been decided, or protested? Has something been decided? That read. What did you decide?"

„Well, that I was just going to sit here and let you address the bank all you wanted to, and I wasn't going to say a word or interfere."

„All right, fine."

Now you do the assessment and of course you get the reactions. So the pc can get between you and the bank. In other words, he can actually throw in an overwhelming postulate or decision of some kind or another that just holds the bank down flat, and you can't address the bank. Therefore, the pc has to sit there with the rudiments in and without a bunch of cooperative - cooperative assistances before you can get any assessment done.

So let's just put it this way: If the pc is in good communication-oddly enough, it works this way; it'll sound the reverse, unless you inspect it carefully-if the pc is in good communication with the auditor, you can then address the bank very easily. That doesn't sound quite right when you look at it the first time. You say, „Well, yeah, be sitting there, jabbering away, talking away, yapping away, cogniting away, knocking the ... having an awful time here keeping my tone arm on its proper position and my needle on Set, the pc keeps cogniting all the time, you know? And he keeps knocking it out."

So, if you're in good communication with the pc, you can be in good communication with the bank. So, the way to put yourself in good communication with the bank is to put yourself in good communication with the pc. So therefore, your auditing cycle must be in; your session rudiments must be in good Condition before you do an assessment. And during the assessment, any communication with the pc that occurs must be completed as an auditing cycle.

This is pretty esoteric, actually; it is pretty esoteric. But it is this important, that you won't be able to assess at all unless you have some inkling of it. Now, the auditors who can assess and get away with it very easily-the auditors who get away with it very easily and assess well-simply are auditors who don't have too much trouble staying in communication with the pc.

So, if you had an auditor who was in relatively poor communication with the pc, then he wouldn't assess well, see. But you wouldn't have to understand this for that to work. But you've left a piece of stuff on accidental. So a day arrives when you're not in good communication with the pc on that day, and you can't assess. Now what happens?

Well, the assessment is up the spout, so you decide that there is something wrong with the case or something has gone wrong and you hastily repair a bunch of things that don't need

repairing. Instead of repairing the communication cycle, you start repairing the work you have done with assessing.

Now, this can be serious enough at R4. It is utterly catastrophic at R6. You throw away the last four goals you found, and throw away a half a dozen other items, and get oh, everything in reverse, and so forth. Well, what's wrong? Why can't you assess? Well, it happens to be a *session* situation. It was your List 1 type situation in the first place.

It wasn't really an ARC break. It was just a gradual mounting up of the pc finding it was impossible to communicate to the auditor. And the impossibility of communicating to the auditor finally wound up to a locked-up meter.

Now, you'll find bypassed charge. There's always bypassed charge to find. You could search any case out and find bypassed charge. I could take anybody at random, just on the one evidence that he was in a body, and find bypassed charge.

So, you can go through this kind of idiocy: You can spend twelve hours or more on a meter locating bank-R6, you see, R4, List 2, 3, (bypassed charge, see)-you could just find it, and find it. Keep plotting it. And then but-but try to clear this question. And this is one for the book. This-because this is a very interesting question on an E-Meter.

You've said, „Well, we've really found the service facsimile which belonged to Uncle Oscar. All right, that's fine. There's a nice fall on that." Oh, it's true, you did, you found the service facsimile that belonged to Uncle Oscar, that's right. And you say that's fine. The pc isn't feeling much better, but you got a good read, and so forth.

Now, after you've done this operation-I don't advise this. This would break your heart, by the way, if you did this as a routine auditing action. This is a research-this is a gimmick-thing that just demonstrates something to you.

You ask on the meter, „Have I misassigned the charge?" „Have I misassigned the charge?" Meters are very good at picking up this kind of thing, see. And you'll get a nice, smooth fall. Yes, it says that you've misassigned the charge. Go back in and try to arrange some more of. . . „The service facsimile was on the left-hand side and really it was in the session of October flumph. And the earlier incident was-really concerned the fact that we had two jumwims in juxtaposition." And now, now you know you've got it, see. Now you know you've got it. You've straightened out the pc, now, you've got it all set, and you've gotten good reads on the meter, and the pc seems to be feeling better.

Now, ask the question, „Have I misassigned the bypassed charge?" And you'll get yourself as good a read as before. And you can frankly keep this up hour after hour after hour-always finding bypassed charge, not making the pc feel any better at all.

What's the meter mean? What actually is the source of that fall? It's that you've misassigned the charge on the basis that you're assigning it to the pc's bank, not to the session.

When you've got a session bypassed charge and you try to cure it by finding deep-seated bank bypassed charges, then this question, „Have I misassigned the bypassed charge?" will read perpetually, until you get ... It's very funny. I mean, I've seen it read for twelve hours. Reads beautifully, doesn't wear out at all. You can even suppress it, and then you find some more bypassed charge that's become unsuppressed by that time. „Have I misassigned the bypassed charge?"

You talk about a heartbreaking proposition, man, you've sweated your head off, see? You've found that the ruddy-rods were on the wrong side of the wumpa-gumps, you know. And you found out that it's really because the person was eighteen months old, not three years old, when this happened. And you have found out it's because his past life wasn't really spent in Afghanistan.

Oh! Now we've cleared it up, see. The pc doesn't feel any better, but we've cleared it up, see. „Have I misassigned the bypassed charge?"-fall. Honest! It just goes on and on and on. And then get-at the end of this run, really clean it up. „Have we misassigned the bypassed

charge by saying it was something in the pc's case when it was really something that happened in the session?" And your bypassed charge read will vanish at that moment. Interesting, isn't it?

Don't think I'm downgrading the bypassed charge. I've seen some mighty explosive bypassed charges practically blow the plugs out of the pc's ears, blow his eardrums out like bullets. Yes, those bypassed charges are very important. But in the presence of a session ARC break, that bypassed charge can be assigned to the pc's bank. And you can always find something to assign it to. And it won't clear up. And the pc doesn't feel any better. And the auditor, out of professional pride or something, never thinks to ask, „Is it a session ARC break?" see? So that your ARC break assessments really should begin with „Is it a session ARC break? Is it an R6 ARC break? Or is it an R4 ARC break?" You see?

Do preassess. And actually it's as crude of „What list do I use to find the bypassed charge on?" see. It's as crude as that. Because you can just mess up the whole perimeter; tear up nearly all of your work. Let us say you've been looking for service facsimiles or something like this. And you've got it all set. You could tear up all that work, invalidate it all, suppress it all, throw it all away, wear yourself out because the pc's getting no better, and so forth. And then find out it's because you began a cycle of action in session, see, and you asked the pc some question. And you didn't accept the pc's answer. And the pc has been parked there ever since.

Present time always appears to be more important than the past. The finger that you smash with the hammer now is much more important to you-infinitely more important to you-than the whole civilization which you lost a hundred trillion years ago.

Well similarly, painful as it is to get two GPMs wrong side to, messed-up as it is to catch some service facsimile (for instance at R4) that the pc wots not of-you said, „Well, a dedicated elephant, you see, that's a dedicated elephant. . ." or „. . . ambrosious toenails," something, you see, and that's your service facsimile."

And pc says, „I guess it is," and so on, so on, „Yeah." And you go on from this and you don't get anyplace and the pc hasn't ever accepted it as his item, see.

You didn't get-it wasn't that it was or wasn't his item, is the point I'm making. It was the fact that he never had a chance to say it was or wasn't. And you go back and you look this over and you find out that's a wrong item, see. And you just tear up the ground, see, trying to straighten that all out, you see, as having been the wrong item and so forth. Hasn't anything to do with whether it's the wrong item or the right item, you see? It's the fact that an auditing cycle began there and he never got a chance to say it was or wasn't his item. And actually, ARC broke at that point.

Do you see? Therefore, you got to be pretty slippy as an auditor to shift your gears from the auditing cycle over into an assessment, and shift your gears from assessment back to auditing again, and know which one you're doing. It's a very, very wise auditor that knows what he's doing. But there is no substitute for it.

Now, 99 percent of your assessment trouble is not assessment trouble at all. It's auditing cycle trouble. Anybody can sit there and read off a list and read a meter. But nobody can sit there and read off a list and find an item on an inoperative meter, sitting across the table from an inoperative preclear. That happens to be impossible. Therefore, you say, the obvious thing to do, „Well, you just better train auditors up to assess better. We will clear up their diction. We will put into the course 'diction' so that auditors can diction better, see. So that they throw their R's in the right place," you see.

And after you got all through, their assessment wouldn't be any better at all, you see? You can just beat your head against a wall trying to straighten up the ability of the auditor to assess. What's wrong with him? The reason he can't assess is he throws his comm cycle out. You see, similarly, just like you can wrap yourself around a telegraph pole trying to find the

R6 bypassed charge when it's session bypassed charge. Similarly, you could do all sorts of things to improve your assessment when that isn't what's wrong with the session.

Now, there can be things that ... You see, now what fouls up all this, and the reason I have to differentiate from this point of view-what gets all this a different look-is the assessment errors can themselves be so catastrophic, so productive of gore on the auditing room floor-bent cans, dented meters ...

I'll put you one in, by the way, sideways: Never have a steel-heavy steel-auditing electrode. Just never use them! Never use them. Refuse to use them at R6, and so forth. Refuse to use them as a pc. Refuse to use them as an auditor. You want something light. Something light. I have seen an auditing can go thirty-five feet in a nontrajectory course. I'd never have anything that if it hit me in the face would do me any damage as an auditor.

That's the first method of studying the handling of ARC breaks. That's the first step. The first step is not how to handle an auditing cycle.

I've really seen them go up in smoke, man. Pc can't help it.

So, assessment can produce some of the most flaming ARC breaks, that it totally obscures the fact that there might be another source of ARC breaks. You see, one is-one is viewing the spectacular. Who's going over here and look at this flower bed with these pink flowers in it, you see, when there's skyrockets going up in the air going bang! you see. But unfortunately that little pink flower bed over along the side there is very often the reason why you've got so many rockets going up in the air. You made a misassessment because the pc was out of communication in the first place.

But that isn't the sole reason for it. Now, with-now, let me make this plain to you: With the comm cycle in perfectly, with the auditor and pc in the very best of rapport, with all going along swimmingly, the good indicators can go out faster than a stopwatch could measure it. Everything can go out and go down the drain on a bad assessment.

I'll give you an idea. The pc sitting there, and the auditor's calling off skwumperjacks and piddleboofs and so forth. And he's going on down the list, and he gets down to the bottom of the list and nothing's read. So he says to the pc, „Please continue the list. What batterboof would cuppawup?" And the pc gives him a few more.

And maybe the auditor's got his head down looking at the piece of paper, and so doesn't watch the first-you can't have your eye on the pc all the time-doesn't see the first dawning crashes of what's happening here. And your first intimation is the rising strident tone of the pc talking about something you *weren't* talking about a moment or two ago, you see? You might even have, as your first warning, two cans flying through the air, see, or being thrown down, or something of the sort.

Because the pc can be took quick. It's particularly true on goals. Goals of course have many times the power of items. But items, man, I've seen an item drive a pc straight up, over the crest and into a sad effect in less time than I could possibly catch up the reins anyplace. You know, the reins are just dragging along the road, and you're just trying to pick them up, pick them up, pick them up, and you just can't get them picked up.

Well, there's two sources of the ARC break. The most violent of them, of course, is you bypassed the pc's item on the list. You've just gone down past skutterwups and marked it out. And this doesn't catch up until you ask the pc to continue the list. Well, that's purely bypassed charge in the bank. That wasn't anything else going wrong. You'll find now the auditing cycle goes wrong. You'll find everything goes wrong. Assessment becomes impossible. And usually the only thing the pc will sit still for is some kind of an assessment on the bypassed charge. The pc will usually sit still for that.

You're very foolish to argue with a pc or do anything with a pc but try to locate the bypassed charge in an ARC break. You must not audit during an ARC break. You must know that too. I mean, it's absolutely deadly to audit during an ARC break. You mustn't address

remarks to the pc. You mustn't ask the pc anything. You mustn't ask the pc for his considerations of anything. You just must not. That's all auditing.

„Well, what do you think this ARC break's...“ Well, take a pistol and blow your brains out, man. „Well, what have been your considerations in this session with...“ Oh, what the hell? Strychnine is quicker. Yeah, I see from your faces that you didn't realize in that last one I meant exactly what I said-that you never, never, never audit in the presence of an ARC break. And I meant just that. You never ask the pc a single question. Nor do you acknowledge anything the pc says. You don't do a ... You see, it's one of these all propositions, see. *You do not audit during an ARC break.* What is auditing? Auditing is the process of asking a question that the pc can answer. You see, just the standard definition-you just must not audit during an ARC break.

Now, somebody sooner or later is going to take that, that you mustn't assess either! That's all you do. *You assess.* If you're so confused you don't know which end you're standing on-and that's very easy. Because I frankly have sat drop-jawed looking at the meter, trying to figure out *what happened* because there didn't seem to be any obvious source for an ARC break here. See what I mean? But nothing that we had been doing would have provoked this particular ARC break. Trying rapidly to go through my skull trying to find out if I have filed away any bits and pieces of missing good indicators or something in the session that something dropped someplace. Something has gone. Something has gone awry. Something has happened here, and so forth.

And I tell you, you look awful silly sitting at a meter with your jaw dropped. And it doesn't promote the pc's morale at all to have a silent auditor sitting in front of him. So if you find yourself confused, you use the one thing that will give you control of the situation. You take a break. That requires no answer. Doesn't even require the pc to take a break. He doesn't even have to follow your orders. He very often doesn't. He just sits in the chair and fumes!

And if you find you're not immediately and smoothly and gracefully going into gear here, and shuffling the right assessment down-it's all assessment from here on, it's not to the pc, any part of it. „Is this a session ARC break? Is this a R6 ARC break? A bypassed charge from R6? Bypassed charge from the session?“ That's all metered stuff. You don't care what the pc says. „Yes, it was! I told you a while ago, goddamn it! I told you that you didn't acknowledge that communic ... !“ That's all, had nothing to do-nothing to do with anything. Nothing to do with it at all. You're just going to get in trouble with that, so you leave it alone.

Long experience has taught me that you cannot communicate with somebody who is out of communication.

No, you find yourself in any kind of a state of mind or any kind of guesswork is going on here whereby you immediately-don't directly and immediately reach for the sheet and start your ARC break assessment, in spite of any action taking place that flaming ARC break is going on and the only thing you can do is assess. And all you do is assess, and you do not audit. And if you find yourself in a condition of confusion as an auditor as to what you should do, or what it's all about, or burning under the collar because of all the mean, vicious things this pc is saying or anything else, your response of course is just take a break and go walk in the room or go out in the hall. And don't keep talking to the pc, don't stay near the pc, see? See, you're just going to aggravate that ARC break. And just go out and figure out what the hell went on.

And all of a sudden, in your state of shock-because the auditor very often gets into a state of shock about something like this. It happens quick. He's all in-he's interiorized into what he's doing. The next thing you know he's looking at an ARC break. What happened? „Oh! Well, let me see now. I was doing a list, and I asked the pc to extend the list. Yes. Yes. That's what was going on. Now, let's see, and then ... There was no ARC break before this last list. No, there was no ARC break before the last list. Must be this list. All right. Now, there's only three things can be wrong with a list. It's from a wrong source, I have bypassed

the item on the list or the list is incomplete. And any one of the three will produce an ARC break. All right, that's probable. That's probable, what it is."

All right. Sail back on into the session, you can tell the pc something, you can inform the pc. Say, „I'm going to do this assessment now"-not „May I do this assessment now?" That's an auditing question, see? „I'm going to do this assessment now. All right. Pick up the cans. All right. Are we listing from a wrong source? Have I bypassed your item on the list? Is the list incomplete?" None of the three of them read. Take a break.

Don't stay in there arguing with that pc, man. You're just put ... It's about as safe an action as pouring kerosene on a fire to get it out, see. And you say, „Oh, I better do a full assessment. Session ARC break, R6 ARC-session ARC break. I don't remember anything happening," you know, to yourself All right. Here's the session, and so on. And so-and-so, and so-and-so, and so-and-so, and so-and-so, and so-and-so. . . „An earlier reality has been-an earlier break in reality has been restimulated. The bypassed charge here is an earlier break in reality has been restimulated." That's easy to see.

„Oh, yes. That session last Tuesday."

Recognize at that point that communication and auditing is now possible. Don't keep pushing at it; say „All right. Okay. Feel better now?"

„Yeah, I feel all right, now, I'm sorry I yelled at you so loud, and so forth."

„All right. Good. Now, I've got to ask one more question: Is there anything wrong with this list we're doing?"

„No, there's nothing wrong with the list at all."

Go on, null the list, find the pc's item on it and that's it. You're left stonied by these things sometimes. The most obvious thing staring you in the face. Eventually you'll find out there *was* a reason for it. At the end of the session, something like that, he may say-or a month later, you might possibly remember offhand-that the item that you were listing for was the same item that he had ARC broken on two weeks before, you see. Or there-that item was on the list. The wrong item, that he'd been given as a wrong item two weeks before-that had caused an ARC break two weeks before-had reappeared on the list you were nulling. And you had just re-called the item, which restimulated the earlier ARC break and break of reality, don't you see? And he momentarily thought of telling you „That is the same item," but then didn't want to interrupt you and instead just went into a complete ARC break-just went out of control, just that fast, see. See, they're very, very tortuous and complicated, these things. That's the way you handle them. That's the way you handle these things.

Handling of ARC breaks has to do with assessment. The meter won't read during an ARC break on anything except what is causing the ARC break. It is fortunate that a meter will read on that. Because the meter is shut off during an ARC break on all fronts, except the thing which is causing the ARC break. And the meter will read on that. Fortunately.

Otherwise you've got a dead meter during an ARC break, because the pc won't take any communication from you. He's protecting his bank from you, he's doing everything under God's green earth there. And you don't get through, you won't get anything through on your meter. But oddly enough, the reason for the ARC break is sitting right on top and it will read.

Then if the ARC break isn't totally cured, and you've found some bypassed charge for the ARC break, then you'd better suspect first that there is another source of ARC break-there's another bypassed charge here-and that it very well may be a session break is sitting on top of the other break. See, you've found a bank case break, you see, and then you've found a-everything didn't go all wonderful at once: Then you'd better suspect either you've found the wrong ease charge or it's a session charge or something. You've not selected out the thing right, in the first place.

You will find, when you get very experienced on this, that there is *always* a reason and that you can always keep going till you'll find it. But a lot of times, early on, you will simply

despair of this. You will say, „Ah, well, I couldn't figure out a reason on it. Can't get the meter to read on anything."

I just saw an auditor doing this the other night. And all of a sudden, „Is there an incomplete auditing cycle in this session?" The meter all-practically came apart at its pins, from being a totally dead still needle, see? *Bzzzz!* We're in action. Indicated it's the bypassed charge, that was the end of the ARC break.

The auditor doesn't ever, in doing an ARC break assessment, doesn't ever audit, even to this extent, „Is that the ARC break?" What are you doing'.? You're doing R2H. R2H is not ARC break assessment. R2H is a process which uses the auditing cycle to assist in the location of bypassed charge. And it's all done by auditing cycle.

There are two ways of doing R2H. One is with auditing cycle only. You use a list, but you ask the pc, is it this, is it that, is it the other thing. And the other one is, you just do a straight piece of assessment.

You'll find the most successful of these-if R2H were being done in the hands of the relatively unskilled, auditor-the most successful is to keep the communication cycle in all the time. And do no assessment of any kind whatsoever with R2H. Don't assess with it. Say, „All right. On that upset you had with Norma there, do you think that was a breakdown in affinity?" And the pc says, „Well yeah, it could have been, I don't think so."

„Well, all right. Was it a breakdown in reality?"

„No, I don't think so."

„Was it a breakdown in communication?"

„Well ... I don't know, I don't know."

„Well, well, all right. Was it caused by an earlier breakdown in affinity?"

See? You're asking the same questions, you see. You eventually get down, you find out it was an earlier breakdown of communication had been restimulated. Pc, oh, he remembers this, he tells you all about it, and the ARC break's gone. That's not assessment. That's a process.

Now, you could do R2H with an assessment. You could sit back and you could go, „Putter-putter-pow, wa-da-da-da, affinity, reality, communication, earlier affinity, or earlier communication. Well, that reads. All right. I've got here something that reads." And you start throwing in your auditing cycle again. But you're asking the auditor to shift his gears from assessment over, and you'll find out that they're not too successful at it early on, see? Best thing to do is just stay in communication with the pc and do just auditing cycle. Because that's the one that can go out the easiest, so stay with it.

So R2H has nothing to do with this. But you'd-in an ARC break, in a real, honest-to-God ARC break, where you're working one-not working past ARC breaks as you are in R2H, you *never* audit. Right, that's never, man! That's spelled *N-E-V-E-R,* and it's capital N, capital E, capital V, capital E, capital R. It is underscored. And then underscored, under the whole thing, you have the wavy line that means italics. You don't audit. Don't audit during an ARC break. You'll find that your trouble in handling ARC breaks, inevitably and invariable, is because you are trying to audit during the presence of an ARC break. And you just must not do it.

If you do it very much you'll drive the pc into a sad effect. Pretty grim. The pc is still trying to make this point. Something has gone wrong. The pc is still trying to get control of himself He's still-he can't answer up sensibly. He feels that life is going *bzing,* and he feels himself disintegrating, you know. And now you're giving the additional burden of having to handle a communication, and so forth. And he will ... It doesn't matter whether he's talking or not talking, he's not in communication, that's for sure. And you'll find out that he'll go right by the boards, just as slick and neat as you can be, if you talk to him on an auditing cycle or try to tell him anything or try to reason anything with him or try to get anything out of him or make any sense out of what he's saying, and so forth. It can only be done as an assessment.

After you've located and indicated the bypassed charge-you see, you've just made these two statements to the pc. You've located it on the meter. And you indicate it to the pc that that was the bypassed charge. All right, having done so, you'll see the ARC break evaporate. The ARC breaks evaporate. You can, of course, return to auditing. But you never audit as long as there's an ARC break in progress.

Now, if you get the precision then-that's just an example of this-if you get the precision with which you split assessment and auditing and get how they never encroach on each other's borderlines, you'll be able to assess like blazes. And you'll be able to audit like blazes.

Now, everything from IV on up in the classes depends on accurate assessment. Everything depends on that. And an auditor therefore must be able to assess accurately. If he is having any trouble assessing, it's because he isn't differentiating between auditing and assessing, and doing one and then the other. Even though he seems to be doing both of them at the same time.

I told you earlier, doing both of them at the same time is a joke. It's a similarity. You-it looks like you're doing it both at the same time, but by God, don't ever do it both at the same time. You assess when you assess; you audit when you audit.

And this can become completely catastrophic-I'll show you how important it is-when the pc gets into an ARC break, and you try to audit during an assessment. That's absolutely impossible. You'll practically destroy the pc trying to go on auditing in the teeth of an ARC break.

Therefore, you have to know what is auditing. And this is a very good subject for drilling. You take the materials within the last tape and this one, and you take the subject material-break it down into its definitions. And say, „What is this action? What is the Definition of this action? What is auditing?" Lot of auditors, you just have to drive it home, drive it home, drive it home. They've still got a reservation, you see? They've still got a reservation. See, they still feel that.

Well, just asking the pc this wouldn't be auditing, you see or they've got a disagreement with it or something of the sort, when as a matter of fact, it's absolutes, practically-about as obtainable as absolutes can get. You just don't cross them. Auditing is auditing, and whenever you enter in on any part of the auditing cycle-you ask the pc a question, you have started an auditing cycle. Now, you must get an answer to the question and so forth. Of course it must be the kind of a question that the pc can answer. All of these other ramifications that had to do with the auditing cycle, all build up in there.

If you do any part of these things, then of course you're auditing. It's that exclamatory.

And assessing is straight from the auditor to the bank and the meter is simply reacting to the impingement on the bank. The auditor's impingement on the bank. And an auditor can control the bank, as a matter of fact. Auditor can control the pc's bank much better than the pc can. And he gets the impingement on the bank and he's getting the reaction on his meter. Now of course, the think of the pc can also react on the meter, and other things can react on the meter. But hit-assessing is simply the auditor's impingement on the bank and its response on the meter so he can select out the most charged response. And that's all assessing consists of.

Now, an auditor has to know these operations completely, and has to really, really know it. Not just, you know, say well, of course auditing's so-and-so, and it's just defined as *brrrrr,* and assessing is so-and-so, and just define *it-brr.*

No, you have to -you have to know those so well that you're not in any disagreement with them of any kind whatsoever. This is this, and that is that, and you can do A or you can do B, or you can do B and A. And you sometimes have to stop A in order to do B. But you never let assessing chop up the comm cycle of auditing. But they are two precise, different operations. And being two precise, different operations an auditor, to be successful in the accomplishment of either one, actually, has to understand utterly.

Now, at Class VI level, you'll find occasionally, somebody starting in at this level will make the mistake of 100 percent assessment. It's so easy to do a 100 percent assessment. They just assess, assess, assess. It's all assessment, see. And they can get tone arm action with assessment, and all of a sudden, why the case packs up.

Well, they don't complete their auditing cycles, you see? They-see, there's no auditing present in the session. You can actually go to a point of practically deleting all auditing from a (quote) „auditing session," and expect it to be an auditing session, and expect to get along easily and everybody to be happy about it, whereas that's impossible.

So there's two different operations here, and they're each themselves, until an auditor can differentiate them-plingo, *plingo,* as precise, chop, bang-these are ... Well, it's like a drill, like this, you see: The coach says, *„Bow-wo-wop.* All right, what action is that?"

„Well, that's a so-and-so, and so forth, see. That's auditing."

„Bwr-wrw. What action is that?"

„All right, well, that's an assessing action." And so forth.

Don't you get the idea? So he's-divide it up so he can get himself doing these things, one and then the other, and not get them all balled up. And you'll find out it all goes smooth as glass. It's quite amazing that unless you have this piece of data, a great many auditors would have so much trouble assessing that they never find a right level. They never find a right item. They never find a right goal. And they simply wind up believing that it all doesn't quite work, see?

Of course, they get the service facsimile, and they've had it. Because the service facsimile was actually a protest of the pc of an incomplete auditing cycle which was begun halfway through the assessment of the list, in which the auditor didn't pay any attention to the answer to. And he got that as a protest on the very next item he read, which read beautifully and big. And we're auditing this big tough guy, you see. We're auditing this big tough guy on a service facsimile of „knitting needles." And it just doesn't quite hang together and his case doesn't make any progress and we wonder why, see.

The only reason why is a misassessment. And the reason for a misassessment was a failure to differentiate between these two different operations.

Okay?

Audience: Okay.

Thank you.