

Modern Auditing Types

(In-Sessionness)

A lecture given by L. Ron Hubbard
on the 21 April 1959

Thank you.

Now we're really going to get down to business on modern auditing types with the historical and the ethics out of the road.

First of these types is the Book Auditor's type of auditing. And he does it this way; he opens up the book, any book, chooses a command at random, looks at the pc who is probably walking about the room or lying down on a couch or eating dinner and says, "Think a thought you dare not think. No, no, no, no, no, that's wrong, that's wrong, that's wrong here. It says, 'think a thought.' Yeah, that's it. Think a thought. Think a thought. Think a thought. Think a..."

And the pc says, "Who, me?"

And he'd say, "Yeah, you. It says here in the book. Uh – I guess it says that here in the book. Yeah, that's right."

And the fellow says, "What's that mean?"

"Well," he says, "it's just think a thought. Go ahead. Think a thought."

And the fellow says, "Well, what do you expect me to do, just think a thought?"

And the fellow says, "Yeah. Think a thought."

And the fellow, "Well, I don't know how to do that."

"Well, you'd better – you better just do it, you understand? Just do it. Go on, just do it, do it, do it! You know, just do it."

Well, that type of auditing is, nevertheless, a type of auditing. Scoff at it all you want to, it is a type of auditing.

It has a cousin called coffee-shop auditing – that's a cousin to it. Couple of Scientologists or a Scientologist and a friend are sitting down – social gathering or something like that and Scientologist says, "I just thought of something. If you got the idea of putting a wall there a few times, why, this would be – this would probably cure the backache which you've been complaining about this evening. So, all right now, you put that wall there and you put that

wall there and you put that wall there." And the fellow does it, and the process is never flattened. And if this happens in the middle of an intensive, why, the staff auditor or the professional is very peeved the next time he picks up the pc because he becomes aware of something's intervened. But, nevertheless, this is – this is an auditing type. It is done carelessly, poorly, badly but it does happen. And we're not in the business of simply ignoring all those things we don't like or that are ridiculous – it does happen.

And it has a name. Now, note there that we said book auditing. see. that's book auditing. Book Auditor doesn't know his business, doesn't have his drills, doesn't have any of these things but he's trying. And I'll tell you something – it's better than none. And coffee-shop auditing – that's its name – it's had a name here for nine years. It's bad, it gets in people's road, it's very upsetting and so forth, but it sure cured an awful lot of headaches and backaches and made people able to go on with the party, you understand? And it is done. See? So, therefore, it has to be recognized as something that happens.

Now, the next type of auditing is called the assist. And we get into the first, you might say, practical application that looks something like a session. Now, you're going to look at this and you're going to say, "Well then, auditing doesn't require a session." And I'm going to tell you that's sure right. It's only a good professional who makes sure that a session is in progress. You got that?

Auditing is just something that happens. And good auditing, by traditional definition, is something you can get away with or have gotten away with. Auditing is what you get away with. You understand? You'll every once in a while get some kind of a fluky result. It won't be from person to person, you'll suddenly get a fluky result by running something that is a bit offbeat but that you just seemed to think that was necessary at that time to do something about it. And you did get a result. Then you get very surprised when you don't get a result with the same approach on the next pc and so forth, but you got away with it, so it was auditing, right? It was auditing and it did do something. If you didn't get away with it why they say, "Well, that's just bad auditing and it's no good," and so forth. But it – they only said it was no good if you didn't get away with it. Got that? It's – that's a guiding rule, I'm not now being sarcastic at all – good auditing is what you can get away with, always.

I'll give you an example. Pc is dancing around in the middle of the room yelping and so forth, just dropped a coal scuttle on his foot or something like that, and jumping up and down and yelping and swearing and carrying on at a vast rate and his foot's swelling up and so forth. Well, of course, the rudiments demand, in a professional session, you see – the rudiments at once are necessary. Aren't there [they]? Like: Find the auditor and find the pc and find the room and "Do you have a present time problem?" and "What is your goal?" "What is your goal for this session?"

Well, I have been known to say, "Sit down! Touch the floor with your foot."

"Thw-yow-yow-yow-yow."

"That foot, that floor, come on, come on, come on now, come on."

"Thw-yow-yow-yow-yow."

"Come on, let's do it! Do it!"

"Yayayah."

"Do it!"

"Well, all right."

Certainly didn't seem to be very much ARC or anything else but it was tremendously effective. And you found out that the process of the assist, of spotting the environment and so forth also ran out the duress of getting him into session. That was probably the last thing to run out.

So on an assist we kind of do away with some of the niceties. The basic rule of an assist is to do it, get it done. Now an assist has been as ridiculous as this: Boy lying unconscious, having been hit by a car. Auditor leans down over him, he can't seem to be able to get in contact with him. Very sure that the kid's passing in his chips, that's going to be the end of that, apparently something like a fractured skull and so forth.

Auditor saying, "All right, go to the beginning or the incident and re-experience it straight through to the end." Kid's unconscious – dying. "All right, thank you. Go to the beginning of the incident, re-experience it right straight through to the end. That's fine. Fine. Thank you." (Letting a little time elapse.) "All right. Go to the beginning of the incident, now just get the moment there of the first instant you were aware of the car. That's right. Get that now? Go right straight through to the end of the incident." And the kid – waking up, waking up, waking up, waking up, sitting up, squaring around – suddenly looking at the auditor, say, "Yes, well I'm doing it. Ahuuuhuh! Well." And being then carted away for some sort of a regular session. That's an assist.

An assist doesn't have many rules connected with it. It is getting a person to handle an immediate condition. Now, that condition doesn't have to be accidental, it doesn't have to be an accident, you see. It doesn't have to be a big emergency but it's just an assist. Come home and find the wife can't do anything about supper, bad headache, bad headache, bad headache, bad headache. Well, give her an assist. Get the idea?

Husband comes home. You want to go to the show. He says, oh, he's so tired, he wahg-wa-duuu-duuu... He's giving a lot of – "to go to the show-I-wa-wa-oogh dog tired, worn out..." Well, you happen to know his – his activity consists of outflowing, outflowing, outflowing, outflowing. See? So you give him an assist. You say, "Well, get the idea of inflowing," you know, any old kind of an assist that remedies the immediate situation. Course, you get him to get the idea of inflowing – inflowing paper, inflowing ink, inflowing anything the fellow's doing. If he's a fellow that delivers coal all day, why, you'd have him inflow coal. Next thing you know, he isn't tired. Just reverse the flow. It isn't necessarily true that it's inflow that fixes him up. It's the reverse flow that fixes him up.

Let's say he's handling complaints – he's handling complaints. Some department store has been smart enough to hire him to handle their complaints. He's a Scientologist, something like that. So all day long he gets complaints, complaints, complaints, you know, coming in on him, coming in on him, coming in. Ah! Reverse the flow. So you'd say, "Well, get the idea of complaining. Just complain to all those people. Get a big mob of people out there and complain to them." He'd brighten up and go to the show. Got the idea?

Athletic coaches, when they see this happen, ordinarily don't believe it. They have to see it several times before they really are alert to it. Athletic coach – favorite player sitting in – down, out of the game, turned ankle. You go over to the favorite player and say, "What's the matter?"

Fellow says, "I got a – ankle. I'm out today."

You say, "Okay. Touch the ground with that foot. Touch the bench with the foot. Touch your other foot with that foot. Touch that blade of grass with that foot. Touch that helmet over there with that foot." You know? "Stand up and touch the top of the bench. All right. Touch my foot with your foot." You know, just touch, touch, touch, get him to touch something, reach, reach, reach, reach, reach, reach, reach. Just – just using pure principles, see.

All of a sudden the fellow says, "Ow!" he says.

You say, "What's the matter?"

"Oh, a terrible pain.

"Well, that's fine, do it some more."

"Well, I don't know, I shouldn't ought to, I've got a terrible..."

"Touch the helmet with your foot. Yeah, good. Touch the ground with your foot," and so on.

And the guy says, "Yeah. That's pretty good now, that's all right. That's all right. That's all right."

And he goes running up and down limbering up and the coach says, "What happened?"

Comes over and says to the guy, "What's happened?"

"Well," the fellow says, "I don't know. A fellow talked to me and my foot's okay now."

"Well, do you think you could get in the game?"

"Well, yeah."

"Get in there. Get in there." Pure magic.

At a motorcycle race, one time, I took a guy that had just been splattered practically half all over the boards in front of the observers' stand and so forth. He was just shaken up, nothing was broken. I just got him to splatter himself over the boards enough times till he was surfeit. He didn't feel then that he had to splatter himself over the boards. He got on his bike in the next race. Everybody's very amazed when something like this happens.

Well, an assist is a type of auditing – has no real beginning, has no real end. The best thing to do whenever you give anybody an assist is to hand them your card after you've finished because they may want to see you again. And it's the wrong thing to do to walk up to somebody, give him an assist and then disappear into the blue forevermore. They get superstitious about it – they're superstitious about it. Years later they're still telling their grandchildren, "One day God came to see me."

So, it's what you get away with. And assists are normally based on either communication with the injured part or with the environment or location of the scene and location of present time. You know, "Where did you get hurt?" "Where are you now?" "Where did you get hurt?" "Where are you now?" "Point to where you got hurt." "Point to where you are now." You know, that sort of thing, sorting out the locations or Remedy of Havingness in some fashion or another. Those are basic assists and it is a type of auditing.

Now we get into the type of auditing that you would do – about on the lowest-scale case that you were engaged in on a session where you had a real session, you were going to go ahead with the session, and about the first thing you should define a session as is: a planned period of time in which auditing takes place. And the planned time has a great deal to do with the existence of a session. If you tell somebody that you're going to audit them, that they get well, you're still planning time. It's a bad thing to do but you're still planning time, you see. If you tell somebody, "Well, we're going to audit you two hours now and then we're going to knock off." you've still planned time.

The most serious ARC break is to upset this time planning. That's about the most serious ARC break because, as you'll read in Dianetic Axioms, the single source of human aberration or single source of aberration is time and that's right. Everything moves, finally, into time as a single source of aberration. Time is the easiest thing to fail to differentiate. So that if you can get a person to differentiate time directly you were doing a great deal. For instance, I took somebody once and made him pat the wall five times and differentiate between these two pats, and three years later I was talking to this same pc and he said – this was just a class demonstration of differentiation of time, you see, differentiation between one pat and another pat. I got him to differentiate amongst these pats and about three years later he tells me that was the best session he ever had! Sounds weird but – planning of time.

Now, if you're late for an appointed session or if you run less than an appointed session or you run more than an appointed session you can in any of those, get into more trouble than most anything else.

You could stand the pc on his head during an appointed time period for half of that time period and he wouldn't find as much fault with you as only getting one hour and forty-five minutes when you promised him two. You get the idea? Now being late for a session is your time factor flying out. Overrunning a session – you can't seem to end the session.

That's what, by the way, the auditor when he's moving up to professional status has the most trouble with, is getting one to end. And it drives a pc right deep in the cave to "Can't get the session ended" – had comm bridge. For instance, you say, "Well, we'll just do this – we'll do this four more times and then we'll quit." And at four more times a sudden tremendous comm lag has developed which the auditor feels he mustn't neglect, you see? So he says, "Well, we'll do it four more times." Now we're in trouble, see because time – timing of the session is out.

So, the first element of a session and the first element, you might say, of formal auditing when it really starts to be auditing as an auditing type is timing the sessions. That is, we're going to audit this fellow twenty-five hours and we're going to audit him between one and

three, afternoon weekdays until we finally have delivered that much. You know, get the idea? In other words, we're planning time.

Now, this type of auditing is not a type in itself but is connected with what we would more or less call formal auditing. Now, your formal auditing announces the time. Tone 40 auditing takes it into consideration. You're going to run this person one hour and fifteen minutes or something like that and then you're going to quit. Well, you didn't even tell the pc that you knew the pc heard you, that you were going to run it that long. Nevertheless, you did plan the time. So that if you're making lists of the things, after assist actually comes Tone 40-type auditing.

Now, this is intentional auditing, it is auditing by intention, it is auditing as a superior being sort of, it is auditing people in deep coma, it is auditing people in a psychotic state, it's auditing practically without agreement as far as you can tell and yet you establish all the agreements in order to begin it. You don't hit or miss this. Now we don't mix this up with assists. That's an old error that is made by lots of professionals. They'll use Tone 40 auditing as an assist. And it's something that requires professional handling. They take their children, for instance, and audit them for fifteen minutes on Tone 40, you know, and so on.

Kids in Scientology families get assisted to death. They never get a regular session, they just never do. Nobody sits down and says to them, "Now, I'm going to audit you every day between the hours of five forty-five and six o'clock. And I'm going to audit you for fifteen minutes, each day of the week except Saturday and Sunday."

Kid's saying, "Gog!" and he doesn't understand half of the words and so forth.

You'd just go right on and make all of the arrangements, you see. "And we're going to run a process on you that, square it around – square you around on some of these things and I think you won't feel too bad about it. I hope you have some sort of a goal. What would you like to get out of auditing?"

And the kid says, "*Dah.*"

And you say, "That's good, that's good enough for me." It doesn't matter, you see. You go through all of the motions. You go through all of the motions and you carry practically totally all by yourself the total session. You got the idea?

And that's one of the characteristics of Tone 40 auditing. It is a planned session in terms of time. The conditions of a session are observed except that the pc is not necessarily in-session and interested in his own case. You might say at this lower level the auditor is carrying the whole weight of the arrangements, the auditing, even the responses, everything, you see? You might say the auditor's in-session and interested, and the pc 90 percent of the time isn't. You see that?

Now, this demands nothing of the pc except he be within reach. That's the only thing it demands. And that he cannot escape. That's all that demands of a pc. So this is a type of session, isn't it? So immediately you'd see that it adjusts to many types of cases. Many, many types of cases: the psychotic, the unconscious case, the severely injured case, the deaf-blind case, the... You see, anybody who wouldn't be gotten into session and isn't cooperating, you see, falls in this category.

Now what's the definition for in-session of the pc? Definition for in-session of the pc is very simple: he is able to tell his auditor – able or willing to tell his auditor anything and is interested in his own case. See, those two conditions are necessary for the pc to be in-session.

But Tone 40 auditing doesn't require that the pc be (quote) in-session (unquote). See, it doesn't require that. It certainly requires, however, that the auditor is in-session which is to say he's interested in the pc and is doing something with proper intention and with proper technique.

Now, it's quite amazing – quite amazing that this Tone 40 auditing works at all. It's quite amazing. In the first place, I should tell you that it violates, apparently, one of the primary tenets of sanity: the pc is certainly at effect, isn't he? But it's the auditor that's in-session. Well, the pc would evidently be upscale if he were even at effect. So there are worse places to be than at effect. And the pc is ordinarily in those worse places. See, he's just lost.

Now, Tone 40 auditing depends totally for its efficacy as far as we can tell at this time on... There might be much more to learn about this. This is an interesting subject. It has absorbed a great deal of study and so forth. It's empirical in its actions, it's not necessarily theoretical. Why does Tone 40 auditing work? Well, one, it at least lets the pc be at effect instead of nowhere. Two, it brings order which permits disorder to fly off. Its regularity and duplication actually brings order to a case so disorder tends to fly off of various kinds of disorder. Whether they're somatics, that's just – that's a disorder, a pain. A somatic, you know, isn't just a pain, it's a sensation or it's a feelingness. You say "somatic," you normally mean a feelingness, a pain, a numbness or a sensationness that the person does not believe to be totally desirable to life as far as he would admit to.

All right now, this – have I left you adrift there for a moment on somatic? Somatics are a very hard thing to grade but we merely mean it as relatively undesirable body sensation. Pc says he doesn't want it as a sensation, therefore, it's a somatic. You got the idea?

He says, "I have a somatic in my head." Now, you don't know whether his head hurts.

You say, "Does your head have a pain in it?" We don't know if he's ever felt a pain, don't you see? You see? And if we said a somatic is a pain and so forth and this fellow says he has a pain – pain is something he read about but he has never experienced. One fine day he has a whopping, horrendous pain, he tells you this is something brand-new.

I had a pc one time turn on a slight feeling of apathy and considered this a somatic and was talking about this somatic. And we eventually found out it's the first thing he'd ever felt as far as he could remember. Quite interesting, wasn't it? So it was the first thing he'd ever felt and he considered it a somatic. Somebody else who was observing it, thought the pc hurt somewhere.

No, the pc didn't hurt somewhere. The pc was aware of this sensation and considered it undesirable; therefore, it was a somatic. We finally isolated that it was nowhere too, by the way. A somatic that was nowhere. So evidently somatics can be nowhere before they become somewhere.

Well now, people in this condition, if they are put at a known effect-point, you see, from a known source – you're undoing unknown source, unknown effect-point. You are mak-

ing him at least aware of another being, therefore bringing about reality. Or in CCH 2: You're making him aware of an environment. CCH 3: You're making them aware of mimicry and exact duplication in which they're participating in some fashion. And CCH 4: We're of course making them aware of a series of planned actions. Now, these things all come under the heading of order or they all come under the heading of intention to have a more regularized activity. They're all done with tremendous control.

Now, Tone 40 auditing is itself. There isn't a type of auditing which is somewhat Tone 40, got the idea? No, no, no such auditing. Somebody thinks that there's some such auditing, he simply can't do Tone 40 auditing, he doesn't understand other types. I mean, those are hard words but Tone 40 is itself and it is done as itself. And you start sailing into somebody on Tone 40 auditing, maybe your ideas about disliking to invade privacy, your ideas about battling somebody around to this degree, your ideas about interfering with somebody's motions to this degree, all do disservice to the session. The only thing you could do wrong with Tone 40 auditing is not to audit Tone 40. Pc says something; we ignore it. Pc does something; we consider it extraneous to the session. Pc performs the auditing command; that's fine, that's all. But we're dealing almost totally with intention and the verbal commands are extraneous.

Now in CCH 3 and 4 we have explanations. The auditor explains things and so forth. Well, that's fine, that's all right. But in CCH 1 and 2 he doesn't have to explain a thing.

But the explanation of what he is doing has nothing to do with it. You could get almost anything to do some kind of an action, like Hand Space Mimicry. For instance, I've taken a little baby, no explanation, simply taken his hand and taken my hand and gone through the motion and made him contribute to the motion and so forth and after a while he considered this was a ball. And we got so we were doing it with two hands and so forth and it was all fine. And he'd get a little bit baffled every once in a while and we'd introduce a little more space into it and then he'd consider this was all right, and so on. And we had a whole session going there with Hand Space Mimicry that had no explanation connected with it.

You can do the same thing with a book. You could run Book Mimicry on a Hottentot that couldn't speak a word of English. So these things are independent of language, independent of explanation and that is the characteristic of it and certainly independent of – your pc will swear – human kindness. Now, there's no cruelty involved to it, there's simply good, solid, smashing regularity. One is never moved aside on this. Some auditors can do this and some auditors can't. The auditors who can't, however, are not being unable because of any mysterious factor. All you'd have to do is stand back and look at one of them that can't and you will find that his ability to be regular, his ability to be precise, his ability to be sharp in these – timing and so forth is all very poor. He's being very sloppy. Nevertheless, he can put up an appearance of Tone 40 auditing if – but anybody who knows his business could stand off and see why he isn't getting results.

Every once in a while you ask somebody that can't do it, "Where do you think the commands – come on, let's – let's level now, let's – let's be honest. Where do you think those commands are really winding up? Those commands you're giving, where's – where's that intention really going?"

"Well, I didn't want to mention it to the Instructor but, actually, it's just back of my left ear. That's where the commands are really addressed to."

"Well, you're supposed to put them in the pc's head – right square in the middle of his head."

"I know, but I keep running into ridges whenever I do that and..." Get the idea? He's ducking and dodging. Well, this imprecision, of course, gets him no results.

If you ever become as lofty a personage as the Director of Processing or something like that, you're going to have somebody somewhere turn up as a staff auditor and in high glee you're going to say, "Well, all this fellow needs – this fellow's walking in saying, 'Dah-dah-dah' – all this fellow needs is a little CCH 1, 2, 3 and 4. Now get at it, you know." You're going to say that and you'll find when you get the graph at the end of the week, that the pc is just as bad off as he was before. You're going to look at this auditor more closely then and you will find that there's something awful wrong with the way he's running CCHs. It's sloppy, it's imprecise, his intention isn't getting out, you get the idea? It shows up directly and immediately on the graph.

Now you take another – another auditor and you gave him this to run on a pc that was going, "Da-da-da" and he got nice results.

The only trouble with CCH 1, 2, 3, 4 and Tone 40 auditing is they take a long time, it's always a long, long look. "Oh," you say, "oh, we got immediate results on this case and that case." Oh yeah, well, the case wasn't in bad shape, you got immediate results. But how long would it take to make a spinning psycho that knew she was Jeanne d'Arc – hm? – that was absolutely certain that there were horses all through the room and was very, very sure that you were a brickbat? How long would it take? Well, I'll tell you the maximal time that it's been carried out on a spinning psycho: six hundred hours! And all of a sudden – all of a sudden after six hundred hours, person cognited that the condition was the condition of a brother who had died. The condition the pc was in was the condition of a brother, cognited on the valence flip – flipped valence, came out of the insane valence and been all right ever since. Six hundred hours!

Now, somebody starts talking to you about the CCHs and you say, "Oh, well, we'll just..." A lot of auditors bury the – their own reputation under optimism to some pc and say, "Oh well, it'll only take – it'll only take five, six hours, nothing like this. It's all right. Nothing to it – five, six hours." Twenty hours, thirty hours later, they're still grinding away and the pc is making slow progress, slow progress, slow progress – is getting someplace but no great rapidity. These are not rapid processes for low-scale cases. So don't ever consider them rapid.

Now, you can make a person who is pretty bad off – certainly a person who might have been classified in the nineteenth century as a neurotic – you can make that person pretty snapped up these days with Overt-Withhold Straightwire, with other processes. There's no reason to grind on the upper case but you still have no answer to the very insane, no answer to the unconscious coma case, no answer to any case that won't go into session that you can't agree with, except the CCHs. You do have an answer, see? So, therefore, that is a necessary tool – that's a necessary knowledge. Only a professional would be expected to know these things. And unfortunately if you cannot do them well you don't win. So you have to be able to

do these well even though you may use them very little. You understand? It's not something you drop out of your – your tool kit simply because you don't employ it very often.

All right. When we look over this auditing type we are prone to believe that it might slop over into some other auditing type or there might be split types. No, there are only pure types, the way we look at it. This type is quite pure. And formal auditing is your next type. Now, formal auditing requires... You see – by the way, there's a – an Auditor Code break, you might say, in Tone 40 auditing in that staying in two-way communication with the pc this is – this might be called an Auditor Code break if you're not staying in two-way communication with the pc if you think two-way communication is talking. Two-way communication can be manual or by contact, don't you see? Communication is just communication, it's not talking. Now, formal auditing, however, requires that the pc be in-session. Now, Tone 40 auditing only required the auditor to be in-session but formal auditing requires the pc is in-session.

Therefore, the way you undertake formal auditing... Now we're in real professional, easy to look at, understand, auditing. See? I mean, this is what most people think professional auditing would be – formal auditing. And your pc must be in-session. That is to say, he must be able to talk with his auditor, communicate anything to his auditor in one fashion or another and must be interested in his own case. So, formal auditing is then entered, first and foremost, by trying to promote these two goals.

You might do formal auditing and you are doing formal auditing, simply achieving in-sessionness on the part of the pc. That's all you're doing. Maybe you go on for days and days and days and days and maybe three, four weeks, to be very, very extreme, doing nothing but bringing the pc into communication. Now, you say somebody that's a very detached, spinny, neurotic sort of a case and so forth, why do anything else? Why do any kind of a technique or any auditing with a person who is very bad off yet can talk – you can communicate with him to some degree – why do anything but try to get them in-session, because anything you do before you get him in-session will fall on fallow ground. It doesn't do you a bit of good to run a process on such a person until you get them in-session.

Now, we're – we're just talking vis-a-vis, just amongst ourselves here and I'll just give you the straight – the straight dope on it. Why try to audit a person who isn't in-session? Not by formal auditing! You've got physical contact auditing that has to do with solid objects and the CCHs and that's about all you could audit on anybody who was not in-session, as far as you were concerned.

Now, this in-sessionness is something that you accept, ordinarily, as being an automatic debt that is paid to you. This the pc owes you. He could talk to you about anything and he should be in his own – interested in his own case. That's a debt and he always pays up, doesn't he? Oh, no, he doesn't! Grreah! This point is that point on which an auditor can be most fooled. I wish that you would never run as long as twenty-five hours to find out the pc was never in-session. I just wish you could catch it before then. But I will tell you, you occasionally do catch it at twenty-five hours if you're doing routine and regular graphs on pcs. There's been no change. Well, I don't care what other peculiarities, particularities we pick up to account for this no-changingness. First and foremost the guy wasn't in-session the girl

wasn't in-session. That was it! Was not freely talking to his or her auditor – was not interested in own case.

You finally find – you scare it out, maybe at thirty hours deep of auditing, you know, and the person said, "Well, I – I hope Joe will be satisfied."

You say, "You hope Joe will be satisfied about what?" You just happened to catch it, you heard that before, you know.

"Well, after he forced me to come down here and spend my life's earnings getting audited by you, I just hope he's satisfied now when he realizes that there aren't any results."

Yaaaaaaaah.

Well, certainly, this pc was not leveling with you. This pc was not giving all, right? So Mr. Pc or Miss Pc was not in-session – withholding something from the auditor.

Now, this is so bad that auditing a criminal becomes an impossibility in absence of a knowledge of that fact and his crimes. You get no place auditing a criminal unless he has told you that he is and has admitted to you his crimes. It just gets no place. You beware this pc that doesn't want you to tell anybody else his or her secrets because they're still kind of on a border of not quite being in-session and kind of being in-session. You know? Being out, being in, not sure. You got that?

Now, of course, I suppose we could say we all do things and have things that we don't want the world to know about. But isn't it remarkable that everybody when he comes up scale doesn't give a tinker's damn! I told you when we were talking about the Auditor's Code that that was for the people. That was for the people in the street. Keep the secrets of our patients. Well, do it – perfectly all right but I assure you that a – that a person cannot be injured except by those things he is withholding and after a person no longer has to withhold these things, they don't hurt him.

Oh, the whole of the therapy reputation of the Roman Catholic Church when they finally ran out of relics actually depended on somebody bouncing up to the old confession box and bending the ear of the Papa. That's right. They could jump up there and say, "Well, raped a couple of girls last night, Father, and here's a couple of shillings or pence or drachmae," or something of the sort and "hope it's all square with the church now."

"Oh, God bless you, my son," the old boy said and pocketed the bucks. That's a calloused look but that was about all they were doing. They provided somebody to communicate with you didn't have to hold anything from. Then the Catholic church used to in its old bad days write all this down, turn it over to the Inquisition and torture the fellow later. But this was quite an espionage system that they had worked up on this. Nevertheless, there was that.

When that system itself broke down they didn't have anything more. Well, what had they done? They'd merely established the rudiments, the most rudimentary rudiments of a session. They'd gone no further, they'd gone no place at all. They merely got the pc to start talking and they developed, for heaven's sakes, a reputation for curing people. Now boy, that's really something when you come to think about it.

Well, I can tell you the reverse. That you're not going to cure a person in formal auditing of anything if they can't tell you everything. So a good pro working with a pc, particularly,

establishes as easily and smoothly and with no jars as he can in-sessionness. He wants that person able to talk to the auditor about anything and he wants that person, particularly, to be interested in his own Case. Out of this we have such technical things as an impingement of finger snaps, date flash, anything like this, impingement. Something has got to impinge auditing on the person, see, there's something to which he alerts. He suddenly is interested, something interests him suddenly. There's probably, I don't know, a hundred thousand words could be written about impingements, ways and means to get somebody interested in his own case. You get the idea?

Just looking at him casually, you do these things all the time. You might as well recognize that you... This fellow – this fellow doesn't quite want to be audited or something of the sort. Well, all you have to do is get him interested in his own case. You say, "Well, you keep worrying about your little boy. Did it ever occur to you that if you might change your attitude toward your little boy that he might change?" Well, that's kind of a blunt way to put it, you know. This fellow's always interested, he wants to be audited the little – you know the little boy, he wants to be audited. There's nothing wrong with the little boy, there's plenty wrong with this guy.

You just ask him something like that. And he says, "Me – audit me?" Well, you're right on the borderline of getting him interested in his own case. Got the idea?

Well, this doesn't mean introversion. Introversion means can't be interested in anybody else's case. That's a – that's a high extremity, you see? Just like extroversion – can't be interested in own case, always interested in somebody else's case. These are obsessive inflow, obsessive outflow. They're way low on the scale. Nothing wrong with a fellow being interested in his own case. It's fantastic, why shouldn't he be interested in his own case? Here he has – here he has – oh, I don't know how many trillions of years of total amnesia.

Well, you just walk up to somebody if you don't believe this, say, "Where were you at – at 4 o'clock in the afternoon of May the 21st, 1204 AD.? Where were you? Come on, come on, come on, come on, where are you – where were you? Come on." And you know, the guy stands there and looks at you like a stupid... He can't remember.

You ask some people, you say, "Where were you July the 31st, 1958 at 4:02 in the afternoon? Oh, come on, come on, come on, what's the matter, your mem – slipping?" Well, if an individual suddenly realizes that he doesn't remember, he gets interested in his own case. He says, "I wonder why I don't remember that? Hm!"

I remember one book designer in a book company that was busy publishing a book on Dianetics. She was sitting there and she was so pure, she was so sane, she had what you might call deified insanity all mocked up as sanity, you see, and she just made a cult out of her total sanity. Never did anything wrong, always acted carefully and cautiously, always did the same thing, never did anything offbeat, was always careful. Tell you, "I get along just fine because I'm always careful what I do, and I never do anything..." Got the impression of somebody walking through life on eggshells, you know, and unable to let one crack, you know?

And I said, "When I snap my fingers a number will flash."

She said, "Why?"

"Just because I said so. When I snap my fingers a number will flash."

She says, "Four."

I said, "What happened to you when you were four?" This is just a wild shot. Usually, they give the year they're stuck in, you know, the age. "What happened to you when you were four?"

"What happened to me when I was four"? Ho-ho-ho, that's nonsense nothing happened to me when I was four." Walked across the street to the other side of the street she was leaving the office, "Four, four, four, oh, oh, yes – (sniff, sniff, sniff) That's when my father died!"

Next time I saw her, about two or three days later, she says, "But why did I say four? Why did I say four? Are you inferring that I was stuck at the age of four?"

I said, "I didn't infer anything, you're the one that told me four."

She says, "That's right, but why did I say four?"

Well, it isn't that you created a mystery about her own case. It's about time she started worrying about herself! Walking through life not getting anything done, not doing anything, crumpling up at every little zephyr that blew her way and so on. Probably gave her more psychotherapy with a finger snap than... I think she'd had about twelve or thirteen years of psychoanalysis before then. I probably gave her more psychotherapy, you might say, with a finger snap than she had had in all that time, you got the idea? She never before got inter – had gotten interested in her own case, she was always being interested in some other person's actions or something of this sort, totally, obsessively out-looking, you see? Self, not to blame for anything, causes nothing, only, only put upon, see? If any action of self entered into it, it was being totally put upon. Got the idea? Well, that person isn't interested in their own case except as they're a victim.

So in final analysis, in getting a person in-session you can always talk to them about being a victim. "Have you ever been a victim?" is the way you can start the conversation. Or "How do you define betrayal?" That is a very good one. Or "Do you know of any instances of injustice?" That's another one. "Have you ever harbored notions of revenge?" There's all sorts of leading questions, all of course, pulled straight out of the anatomy of thinkingness and just your general rule of the thumb work. "Have you ever tried to make nothing out of something?" It's not something they usually add up to and respond to at once.

Now that's formal. You take up the person, you take up the case, you start the session, you end the session, you use comm bridges. You do all of the things you're supposed to do, you keep in communication with the pc. The pc originates, why, you answer the origin, you understand and acknowledge the origination. You take up various things the pc wants taken up in passing while getting your job done, too. In other words, this is a give and take exchange and because it requires so much judgment and because it requires so much skill, it is totally a professional activity and don't ever think it would be otherwise. It is really something to do all of these things. You have to know your subject matter just standing on your head, just boom!

Individual says, "I see a bright, purple light shining in front of my face. Now all the time I see this bright, purple light." Well, now, what are you going to do in this session, are

you going to run engrams? Or are you trying to get Straightwire done? Or are you trying to get the pc to talk to you? Or what are you trying to do? All of those things monitor whether or not you ask him anything about this purple light or say, "Ah so, so – well, that's – that's good. Thank you. Thank you. Now, we were talking about your mother... Now..." Rapidly, rapidly. All you have to do is ask him, "What does the purple light look like?" You're now going to run engrams.

Now it's some phenomenon you don't understand, the pc doesn't understand. Gradually, however, your understanding of these things – you've run into them often enough, you've become acquainted with them in all ways, shapes, forms and guises. Somebody says, "There's a purple light in the far distance. You say, "Is that so? Thank you very much." And go on to something else or if you want to go into that, you wouldn't go into it in the first place, why? You'll recognize it for what it is. It's the – what they call the Gates of Mars. It's the between-lives implant station. It sheds a purple light everywhere and you've just stuck him in the exteriorization plus point of an engram by just asking him about this. Get the idea?

He's not even gotten into the engram. You've gotten into the between-lives implant stage where you certainly don't want the pc. Got the idea? But you learn these things by experience and study and listening to what the pcs say and acknowledging it, subjective realities and other things. This is a tremendous amount of stuff you learn, characteristics of whole track and this and that and the other thing.

Now, what you're learning here is not necessarily all these bits and pieces and bric-a-bracs. What you're learning here is more on the order of formal auditing is formal auditing and this is the way it is done, this is exactly what formal auditing looks like. We're not trying to give you vast amounts of experience in formal auditing but we're setting you up so that you can do it. You can set up a good apparency of it.

But when you see professional skill and you – public thinks of it as professional skill being exerted in an auditing session and there's communication going on between the auditor and pc and so on, that's formal auditing and it is itself and it isn't anything else. It's not some sloppy version of formal auditing and it doesn't mean that one's intentions are totally thrown aside because it isn't Tone 40 anymore. One still gets his intentions executed.

Not bang into the head of the pc but he says to the pc, "Now recall a time when you" – he's been stupid, you see, he did something stupid, the auditor did – he says, "Recall a time when you hit your brother over the head with a club," because he's sure this has happened. And he's had it! Now he's got to get the pc to recall a time when the pc... Well, of course, if the pc never hit his brother over the head with a club in this life, it's going to take some difficult remembering to get it done. But your intention of getting done what you start out to do is carried forward.

Now, you open sessions and you end sessions. You start out with the rudiments and the rudiments are very simple. The rudiments are: Find the auditor, find the pc, find the room or find the auditor; find the room, find the pc. I don't care which way you look at this, this way. Find out if there is a PT problem. Establish a goal for the session. Discover, also, if there's any reason – this is just – you would just do this for in-session, it's not written down – find out if there's some reason why you can't audit this pc just now. It almost comes under the

questioning of PT problems. You find out what you can about the conditions of the session, you make those conditions more optimum, you get the auditing done that you think should be done. And you end that session, bang, on the exact instant that it's supposed to be ended.

Of course, staff auditors sometimes go too far on this. They pride themselves on being able to end a session standing straight up at the exact moment the session should end. You'd be amazed. You can always tell somebody who is brand-new on staff because he comes dragging in ten, fifteen, twenty minutes late, dragging his report soggily behind him. He sits down, takes his place at the conference – if there is one, you see, and everybody looks at him. And they don't need any further information than that to tell them they're dealing with somebody brand-new. They've all had their sessions ended promptly at whatever the time was. Let's say it was 3:15, pang! 3:15, that's end of session, bang!

Now, some staff auditors keep up their reputation. The pc says, "Well, let's see, now I recall, that was in the last century." Clock says 3:15, so the auditor says, "End of session." That's just a little extreme.

Usually, the way they do it is they start slowing the session down about twenty minutes ahead of time. And they slow it down and slow it down and bring it right on out to a sharp, on-the-button conclusion.

Now, that's formal auditing, that's finding out all about the pc and that's finding out all about his case. And that's running what's necessary to audit the case. And you run engrams with this and parts of engrams on this. And this is the most auditing you'll be using – most of the auditing you will do will be under this heading of formal auditing. Your Tone 40 auditing is going to be used only when you run into a case that can't be put into session. And you use Tone 40 auditing actually to put him into session and then you go into formal auditing.

Now, there's one more type of auditing and this is a brand-new type. I invented this especially for knuckleheads and then, by golly, it became a very important type of auditing later. By the way, this was invented about the second week of the 5th London ACC. The Instructors – there were bits of enamel getting under feet where they had ground their teeth over about a half-dozen auditors who just couldn't audit for beans. And I got tired of walking on this and I told them, "Well, do this. Just set them up there and don't let them do anything but utter the auditing command." And they – this was a good idea, hargh! And they wanted to go on – go for broke right then and just run it that way, you see? And they – their instinct was very good. We didn't have it planned that way, I wanted to see if we could get around it and do it some other way.

Actually, what we learned was quite beneficial to what we then learned in the 21st American. It was simply this: that if an auditor is not sure he can get a result – you get what I told you about despair, so on, the last lecture – if he's not sure of it, he goes over into automatic destructiveness. His insecurity in getting a result, his anxiety causes him to make mistakes, so you can't let him have enough latitude to make those mistakes and you run him muzzled.

Or the person is so uninformed, has studied so little, has so faint a grip on auditing that you don't let him dare open his yeeep.

In other words, if an auditor is so far in despair that he's not going to do anything but ARC break the pc or if he is so unschooled that he's going to make mistakes, we have a set of straps and net called muzzled auditing. And this is a very, very important type of auditing and is something that will mean, actually, the broad dissemination of Scientology at large. This is a tremendous development, this muzzled auditing.

Muzzled auditing is simply described. You do not go into any other communication with the pc than the auditing command and an acknowledgment thereof. And if the pc originates, you might let a fellow go so far as to nod. See? You might possibly nod or something. But if he originates something that's incomprehensible, you hold your hand back for the Instructor. That's muzzled auditing.

Now, where you have a large group of people with an ununiform ability, you just cut it all back to muzzled auditing and get it very heavily 8-Ced and well instructed and you've got a result. But muzzled auditing omits handling the pc's origin and it omits, "I'll repeat the auditing command." It omits anything but the auditor giving the auditing command and acknowledging it. It does not include starting sessions. That's started by the Instructor or the Supervisor. It does not include ending sessions, that's ended by the Supervisor. Does not include taking up anything with the pc and it wins, very broadly. But, remember, it's the Supervisor who runs it and it couldn't happen without a Supervisor present. So it is, you might say, a subordinate-type of extended – or extended-type of auditing to formal auditing, because formal auditing still has to be done over a whole group of people who are doing muzzled auditing. You see? There still has to be somebody there who can engage in formal auditing. So, again it is simply an appendage to format auditing. Nevertheless, it is a pure type of auditing.

And husbands and wives who ARC break each other in session and so on should never use anything else but muzzled auditing on each other. And anybody who's having any trouble in a duo cross-audit team or might run into any trouble, has no business using anything but muzzled auditing.

So therefore, this is a very important type of auditing because it extends auditing into zones that formerly could not be entered. And it also possibly means clearing for the millions. That's a very important type.

I have covered now all the types of auditing that I know about that are pure types. If you find another one, see your Instructor.

Thank you.