

AUDITOR'S ADDITIVES, LISTS AND CASE SUPERVISION

Class VIII #15 - 6810C11: Transcript of Taped Lecture by L. Ron Hubbard.

[*applause*] Well I forgot my notes. [*laughter*] Which lecture number is this? [*Fifteen.*] Lecture number fifteen, and what is the date? [*11th October*] Eleventh of October. That brought you up to present time. [*laughter*] Eleven October AD 18.

The subject of my lecture this evening is "auditors talk too much". It's impolite, but it's the first discovery I made about auditors when I was first training auditors back in the late '40s. I did train a few, experimentally, and along a line, and I found out they all had one frailty. They said too much.

Now, when a C/S gets a session that looks nearly perfect, and he gets it, and he says, "Great", and then a couple of days later the pc falls on his head, something has obviously happened in the session which wasn't recorded. The most frequent thing that happened in the session is an auditor additive of comment, or attitude, which is additive to the business of auditing.

Now it isn't necessarily slight. The additive can be fantastic. I'll give you an exact, direct example; this is exact and direct. The auditor asking for ARC breaks, not noted in the report form, but the auditor asking for ARC breaks says, "Now, if you knew anything was wrong you wouldn't hold it from me, would you? You wouldn't refuse to tell me, would you? Now you've ... you're giving me the straight dope? ... That F/N's" – an ARC break needle. What you see on the auditing report is ARCU, CDEI, something like this. He was getting an ARC break and apparently indicated the thing. And then that craziness ensued. That isn't in the report.

A C/S is actually at the mercy of the auditor attitude and additive, because the attitude itself is also an additive. When you look at an auditing session, and since my lecture yesterday actually you're to be congratulated on the Org VIII; you floated nineteen out of twenty one to the examiner, which is fantastic. So, thank you. [*Applause.*] That's very well done. [*laughter*]

Now. The business of the smooth TR is simply to get it across to the pc, and keep the pc interested in his own Bank and his own case. So therefore, the auditor who would say ... see the pc's looking for an ARC break. All of a sudden he shatters with this, "Well now, you wouldn't hold anything from me would you? You ... you're really telling me the ... " He hasn't got the foggiest notion, don't you see? The auditor as a personality isn't there. *Bang!* All of a sudden the personality intrudes. What does the pc try to do? He sort of tries to try to hold it off. To stop it. And he parks himself to that degree in the session. Do you see that?

Alright. Now, let's take another one. Let's take another one. Pc says, this is also an actual. On the auditor's report it reads, "What do you do to make others wrong?" pc says he doesn't do anything. F/N. But the pc, an hour or two later, and the following day, was found to be fantastically upset. Really fabulously upset. After an auditing session the pc is upset. What the devil is this? He's supposed to run his service facsimile, supposed to have gotten a bunch of F/Ns. What's he doing all upset? Well somebody could say, "Well, the technology doesn't work." You know? *Hmm.* Look, the technology works, but somebody just worked too damn well. What actually transpired in that brief period between writing down a question about making others wrong and what is noted as "Pc says he doesn't have any" was something on this order. "You say you don't have any? Ah,

come on. Come off of it! Come off of it! Come off of it! People have hundred of these things! What do you do?" [laughter] An ARC broke needle.

How would you like to have that blow up in your face in a session? Totally unexpected. Totally unreasonable. Now when it goes so far as just this. The pc has a cognition. He says, "You know, I don't think I have that problem anymore." You know? He's looking at this. He thinks that's great, you know? It just F/Ned, and so forth, and the auditor says, "Oh that's great, boy, that's great! Glad to hear it. Boy, that's really with it!" (whistles). It said F/N there, the cognition is written here, but what happened right afterwards? See?

See, what it is, is a distraction. A sudden distraction. And a session is supposed to smooth out the pc. What happens to the pc if enturbulance is run into it? So what an auditor says just before the session, during the session, and right after the session, in those three immediate periods, which are additive to the actual business of the session, are all additives of a highly useless, derogatory, backwards nature. They're all for the birds.

An auditor who has to be *interesting*, who has to think he has to persuade the pc, who does this, who does that, actually is building up on top of the top of standard tech a bunch of additives which prevent it from working. That line of action has the C/S at its mercy, because it isn't recorded in the report. You can get a report, which apparently looks ok, and from that standpoint, and if you've not sending people to the examiner you've just about had it. Then what you get, you hear from the doctor, or you hear from somebody else, or you hear from the family, or hear from the registrar, "Jukes was here last week. And when he came in he said he was signing up for *fa fa fa fow*, and you know, he hasn't been back. What's the matter?" You look at the session. There's nothing in the session that indicates anything. Why? See, he came to get smoothed out and got roughed up. Well what roughed him up? He put his intention ... attention inside. You know? He looked inward, and somebody forced his attention forcefully outward. And just about the time he started to look inside, somebody flipped his attention outward. So, he quote "goes out of session". That is the commonest source of out-of-sessionness.

Now a rough TR is one thing that tends to. But it is not actually as near a session destroyer as the additives, the comments. Why comment? See, why comment? Now some auditors think to be agreeable they have to laugh with the pc. I never do. Pc is not aware of me anyhow. He wouldn't know whether I was laughing with him or not laughing with him. Besides, I haven't got anything to laugh about. It's his joke. [Laughter.] I've had pcs chortle and burble, and giggle and cognite from one end of the session to the other while I was sitting there not with any expression on my face. Now it's rather difficult to assume a no-expression. You do have a face. [laughter]

The next point of evaluation, you have somebody who is ill-intentioned in some fashion or another on the examiner line. Pc goes to the examiner, and the examiner looks them over and says, "Oh my God. What happened to you?" [laughter] Pc's feeling great. Actually maybe the examiner has a very bad case of myopia, and he's trying to see what pc it is. Something like this. And the examiner squints and looks at the pc ... [laughter] And the pc thinks there's something wrong with him. And it kills the float. So there is a subject called no-expression. There is a subject. But this is normally what you will find back of the false auditing report. It is the auditor additive.

Now there's another thing an auditor can do, God help us. There is another thing he can do. Is to fail to give the next command. In other words, he's not there at all. Now this can also be deadly. When you have somebody who's very green auditing, he is liable to

chicken. Get scared. And he sees he's put the pc down the track in some fashion or another, doesn't quite know what he's doing. All of a sudden the pc's face turns red, or something like this, and he goes ... He freezes. Now when he does that the pc then has to extrovert, take control of the situation, and somehow or another come out of it. But he's been put into it by another being, and he has to come out of it by himself. So he actually doesn't make it. To that degree he doesn't make it. So it hangs him up on the track.

Now all of these actions act to hang the pc up on the track. The additives, the comments, and on the other hand, the failure to state. The pc comes into session, the auditor all of a sudden forgets what he's supposed to ask for, and sits there and looks at the pc, and tries to look in his papers. He doesn't put in any R-factor. He doesn't say, "I've got to see here what I'm supposed to do", because it'd be too derogatory of his attitude, or something, and he might sit there for a minute or two without saying anything, racking his wits out. The pc goes half way around the bend because he's expecting something to happen that doesn't happen.

Or, right in the middle of a crucial situation the auditor fails to follow the same patter that he has just followed. Engram one, pattern correct, engram two, he blows it. He tells him to go earlier and then in locating the incident, his patter blows up. He forgets to ask four, well he forgets to ask for the date. Forgets to ask what it is. What does he see? Forgets to ask for the duration. And then just says, "Go through it." Now that would be a maddening situation. Do you see? There's an infinite number of varieties by which an omission could also rough up a pc. So auditing, along with Standard Tech, is that thin, narrow path through being there enough to get the session done, and not being there enough to put on a vaudeville show. Do you see? This is the one thing that is usually hardest to teach.

If I were running an activity where I was very suspicious, and I could be more suspicious of sessions than I am sometimes. My level of trust is too good. But I would actually put it on a slow-freight tape recorder, which is a voice actuated tape recorder. So that the entirety of the session would run off on tape. Something of this nature, then it could be checked back. Now I wouldn't necessarily put this on as a constant action. But if I was get— ... if I had one pc, if I just had one pc fall on his head after he was audited, and I got a report in which seemed to be a well done report, and the pc promptly fell on his head and so forth, I would be thinking in terms of listening to that session. I would then want a spy system, you know, where a microphone can be tapped, or I would want that. Now these, these spy systems can be escaped. It's a simple matter. Just never use the auditing room that's bugged. Yes, it's happened. Three auditing rooms had microphones in them so that sessions and auditors could be checked, and then they were never used. Nobody ever seemed to give a session in those rooms.

Well at once one should have become very wary, because it so happened at that particular moment the sessions were very, very, very additive. The reports looked great and the sessions looked like a clown show at the circus. A lot of *yik yak* going on. Several cases messed up, and so on. It was by auditor additive. So it isn't slight.

Now, one of the ways an auditor additive can occur is with C/S. An auditor who is auditing his own pc, he doesn't have a C/S around, and you will occasionally be in that position, is already breaking down on C/S. In the first place, he has talked to the pc. In the second place he knows the auditor. *[laughter]* So his C/S is busted on two counts. But there *is* a thin way to get away with it.

And that is merely to make a rigid rule never to C/S during a session. Never, never C/S during a session. Write up your C/S before the session; follow your C/S rigorously and religiously.

When you get to the end of the C/S, end the session. Your next C/S, write it up dispassionately as though you had nothing whatsoever to do with it. Even cuss yourself out. But if you hold that, you hold that as a very, a very sound, rigid principle, you won't get auditor additives into your session, which is to C/S at the same time auditing is occurring. Because nothing can be more confusing, and it can lead you into an immediate and direct Q & A. You excuse the Q & A on the basis that you've changed the C/S. Do you follow? And gradually these two things merge, until you become almost educated in Q & A. "We'll just audit the pc on what he needs right now. Let's see." And you sit down.

Now the pc himself is distracting. He's somebody to hold on a line. And if you want to deliver all your sessions into the hands of the pc, why then just never C/S them. So before the session, if you were doing this sort of thing, before the session you would look over the folder, and you would write up your C/S, as a good C/S. That's what we're gonna do. When you go into the session that's the C/S you execute. And when you're all done with the session, with that C/S done, and you write up another C/S before the next session. And you just win. You just win, win, win. You'd just be absolutely fascinated.

It gets this kind of an oddity. Somebody comes in and says, "Would you audit me?" And you say, "Yes. Just a minute. Where's your folder? I'll get your folder. Yes, come back in fifteen or twenty minutes, and I'll give you a session." Get the guy's folder from wherever it is, go through the thing, figure it out, write down your C/S from the folder. Deliver your session. Now the one, the one type of session that isn't true in, is when it isn't a session, it's an assist.

Somebody comes bunging up to you, and they just got the railroad rail run through their brisket or something of this sort. You had better know the C/S for assists so well that you simply go into that and don't do anything else. If it's very handy, the spot where he was hurt, you're going to do a contact. If it's not very handy, you're going to do a touch assist. If he is at all auditable you are going to run him through the engram of the incident. If it gets heavy and sticks you're going to go to the earlier incident. Earlier similar incident. That's all the C/S'ing there is.

As far as Ruds are concerned, you could make some little gesture at trying to put in the Ruds, but you don't have to fly anything. You understand? Because he's got the PTP. You're looking at it. He's actually in the rudiments. Now you ordinarily wouldn't run a rudiment with an engram. But ordinarily a guy like that isn't in a position to run the engram on. You can do the contact assist, you can do the touch assist, there's very often on a severe one there's got to be some medical patch up of some kind or another. Now when he comes back, remember this is not an assist, this is a session, now you're going to fly the Ruds, and you're going to run the engram of injury, or earlier similar.

Now somebody's just lost their brother, or something of this sort, and they come in to you crying, and they've got to rush off to the funeral or the hospital or something like that. I assure you there is so little you can do about it that the more you try to do about it the worse off you's-a-gonna be. Let them handle what they've got to handle, when they come back, formal session, secondary. Earlier similar, secondary. Those are the actions which you take. If you don't take the two actions which I've just given you, a lot of guys are going to hang up. You'll see people going around in grief. Very upset. You ask them, and

somebody, somebody ran recall it or something. Keyed it out. They didn't erase it. And it keeps keying back in again.

You see this guy all bunged up, and you say, "What's the matter? What's the matter?" "Well" he says, "*about two or three months ago I broke my leg.*" And you say, "Anybody ever run the engram?" "Yes. *I had a touch assist.*" It's actually the formal ... Entirely different things.

So that there is a formal auditing side of this, and the C/S for that is very exact. You go in, you do just that. You do what you're supposed to do at the moment of emergency. You don't have to fly the Ruds. Contact assist, or it's a touch assist if the objects and so forth aren't available. You bring 'em around any way you can. You have them tended to by the plumbers. Give 'em a shot of morphine, anything like that if they're in agony. And then when they have progressed and they are not in a state of physical shock, why they can stand up to run an engram. But by that time they can also stand up to flying their Ruds. Do you follow?

So later on, when you run the engram or the secondary, you're not doing an assist. That's just a session. Do you get the difference between these two things? So an assist, you can handle the apparent PTP that is in front of you without a C/S, if you always know what the C/S for it is. And I've just given it.

Now. If you want to commit professional suicide it's to badger, badger around with somebody without a set-up C/S or a case study in front of you, because you're liable to run into some very tiger-ish situations. I'll give you an idea. You say, "Well he just mentioned this, they just mentioned their brother's death." Something like this. "They just mentioned their brother's death. But this secondary's never been run. I'll run it." *Ahhh*. How, how, what were you doing? Well, you say it's ok because it F/Ned, and I'll just add in, and I'll run this secondary here, and ... You don't know if that case is gonna ... going to fly or not on this subject. You don't know anything about it. Let's take a look at this.

Now I'll give you a few little tips of one kind or another. In doing C/Ses, in doing a C/S, you should be far more careful to set up the case to be audited than an auditor ordinarily would be.

You look for places to take charge off of this case. Let's shave this case down. You look for symptoms and signs of a very overcharged, or special-type case. Somebody carts you in a six inch thick review folder. *Ahhhh!* Resistive case. You don't immediately say he's been badly audited for the last two years. Because the law of averages are that some time during the last two years he has run into an auditor who could audit, and if he'd run into an auditor that could audit he wouldn't have it six inches thick, it'd only be three inches thick. Do you get the idea?

So obviously, if all this period of time nobody's been able really to pack up this case and figure out what it is all about, why in that length of time if nobody has, there's something very, very, very peculiar. And the thing that is peculiar, this you have to keep in mind. The thing that is peculiar is Standard Tech is out on it.

There was a dear old lady. I think she even wore, you've heard me speak of this old lady before. She even wore the little bonnet, with the flower, off the top of a long stem. And when she walked, the bonnet flower bobbed. *[laughter]* She was the most precise, prim, proper little old lady you ever saw in your life, and nobody could get to first base on her case.

I think her tone arm was a dirty tone arm. [laughter] And nobody'd ever been able to pick any withholds or overts off of her. What we used was the exaggerated overt. Which is perfectly valid. It works. It's perfectly valid. Somebody won't give you up his overts, and so forth, you... It's a rather harsh, but perfectly valid, way of pulling an overt. You multiply the overt. What you are trying to get them to confess to is so much more horrible than what they are, than what they have – are guilty of, do you see, that you can actually make up a list for the auditor. "Have the pc questioned on the following points. Murder, Bank robbery, desertion, child slaughter [laughter], bigamy." See?

You can put down a list like that. Horrible. The little old lady said, no, she wasn't guilty of any of those crimes. All she'd ever done was commit adultery on her husband for the last forty years. With all of his friends. [laughter] And it blew the case sky wide and handsome, and it rolled beautifully. What was wrong with the case? The Ruds were out. That was all. But this was one of the most resistive cases in a whole area. It was a famous case. Ruds out. And so they go. So they are.

And in your C/Sing, in your C/Sing you want to get some kind of an estimate of how, how tough is this cookie? You can write up, you can write up and broaden, enormously, the seven types of cases. They ought to be called, by the way, *special cases* to your pcs. People like to be "special cases", not "resistive cases". [laughter] But you can write a very, very long assessment sheet out of those seven resistive cases. Furthermore, you can assess it sectionally.

You notice the first time it was ever assessed, the former therapy read once and then went out. And *out of valence* was the item. Well now you could have another assessment done, or you could just grab the brass ring as you went by and assume also that there's former therapy, and your next action is former therapy. Run the engrams of former therapy, you already got the assessment out of it, see? It fell on the first one.

Now, if you wanted to be more positive about it, you could take a whole assessment sheet of just former therapy. You see that it read once. Now you can broaden this. It slashed once and then went out, so there's something there. Now we can broaden, and we can list any kind of a former therapy that we can think of. And we could shake out of the hamper the exact type of former therapy it was. Now that would be important, because you see some former therapies are engrams, and some former therapies can be rehabbed.

Now in hypnotism and yoga, and several other analogous practices and so forth, there is a rehab available. Furthermore, drug therapy, under sedation for a long period of time and so forth, is very often rehabbable. So, that's already on the list, drugs. But it might not come up under the heading of former therapy. People, this person says, "Well I never took drugs. I was just under morphine for seven years in the general hospital. [laughter] We see this all the time. So you could do an expansion. You could do an expansion. And what I told you earlier, in session you have got, in a session, only to touch the corner of something and you can slide in on it. It's as though the Bank flew little, tiny flags out to the side. And you can see these little flags. And your job is to try to find one of these little flags and slide in on it.

Now, you saw, for instance, the guy, the guy has sciatica, or something of this sort. And this, you're not trying to cure his sciatica, it's just an index of case. What the hell's he doing with sciatica, whatever it is? What's he doing with this? He's a Grade III release. He shouldn't have a psychosomatic illness. You get the idea? I mean, that's your think. "Hey,

this guy's been audited. He shouldn't be doing that." There's something goofy out, here, some place.

Alright, let's see if we can pinpoint this. Now all you're really doing is looking for an area of charge. You're not trying to process against a significance. You just want to discharge this case. When this case is sufficiently discharged you couldn't care less about the flat feet of humanoids. That's why I'm very insulted when the ... the medicos, and so forth, say, "You're busy healing." Nobody's interested in healing bodies. But you take a fellow who is, who is ill in some quarter or another, I can assure you that there's a great deal of charge available in that area. Do you see? The case is heavily charged. It's aberrated in some fashion. So your job is, how do you discharge this case as a case supervisor?

Now your first and foremost way to charge the case is send him up through the Grades. That's your first and foremost way to charge a case. Next Grade. He's made the Grade, good, send him onto the next Grade. Great. Now let's say he has had these Grades, according to his record, and he's still got *lumbosis*. Now you should get curious at this point as to what this is all about. Because what it is, actually, is that a Grade is out some place, or a rud is out some place.

Now, theoretically you could put in the Ruds ahead of the sessions. You could also put them ahead of a major action or an engram in life, you could also put them in at the beginning of track. You could do all sorts of weird things with rudiments. But it is a very, very touchy situation, I assure you, to start running back Ruds which are not limited in the command. Now you could put the Ruds in for the last session, if you said the last session. You could even put the Ruds in, in the last few sessions, by saying "Lately". See? "Have you been ... Lately, have you been audited over an ARC break?" Lately. Otherwise, you're liable to dive clear back to the beginning of track or ... You can actually earlier similar, when you start putting in Ruds earlier, you can actually do an earlier similar, clear on back to God help us. Now you could say the date of the engram is 1862, and you could say, "Just prior to that incident, what rudiment was out?" Now you're stuck with it, because you're gonna have to say earlier similar. Earlier similar, earlier similar, earlier similar, and oh my God, you're going to have to start running this case on nothing but a rudiment, clear back to the beginning of track. The case you're running it on is in no shape to pick up an ARC break ahead of Incident 1. He's never even heard of a body thetan.

You see why ... why it's one of these things like R2-12. You hardly dare trust it to anybody's hands because it works so fast. But it isn't, this isn't a matter of trust. It's simply a matter of the second you start putting in Ruds on earlier similar, you're liable to get a rud hung.

Now the only thing you can do with it is earlier similar. You start putting Ruds that far back and you're getting the whole track PTP, the whole track ARC break, and this is going to be run on a case which isn't prepared to run anything like that. And the case'll fall on its head, just sure as hell. A case runs just below the level of the ... its available reality. The current reality of the case demonstrates how much charge you can get off the case. What is the current reality of the case? Now a person who is at ... low down in the lower Grades, and so on, he maybe has many, many things wrong with him, but he has no reality on, of any kind whatsoever. It wouldn't even read on the meter. Do you follow? So your safest C/S is on something that will read. And therefore you take the assessment.

You can actually have some fellow who is going around on crutches and you say, "What is wrong with you?" And he could tell you, "*I've got an ear ache.*" And you could say, "Well then, something wrong with your legs or something like that?" "*Oh well, that. Yeah that's,*

that's just nothing. It's the ear bothers me." Well if he never got well physiologically, and after something or other, there's obviously some terrific charge on the case or body that is holding it that far out of line, and your task as case supervisor is, is it available? Well it's only available if he has some awareness of it. And the way you measure his awareness is with a meter. Now you can look all the way through a folder, find an awful lot of blunders, and have somebody try to put these blunders to right. Particularly on somebody who wasn't trained. You try to put these blunders to rights. You know them, you've seen them in the folder.

You order foolishly, as a C/S, to go through all of the person's earlier Grades, and do all of the auditing, and point out all of the overruns and BPC in all of the earlier Grades, and you're liable to find the auditor you're C/Sing for in a sudden fire fight with the pc, under the heading of invalidation. The guy thought his lower Grades were great. So that is why you take these little assessments. Just let me teach you that.

You can see what's wrong. Is it real to the pc? The way you measure whether or not it is real to the pc, is not what is the most wrong, but what is the most real to the pc. And so you write up an assessment. Now you know very, very, very well that this guy goes out and wrecks cars. This seems to be the thing he does. This is a life manifestation. Now you, from your viewpoint, are very foolish if you're trying to, going to get him over wrecking cars. If that's the goal you set as a C/S, why to hell with it. But the symptom of wrecking cars shows you there's something very obsessed about this fellow someplace. And it's no magical one button.

It's just some kind of charge, and it'll eventually come off in one way or the other. But it shows the case is very, very heavily charged, because he seems to talk a lot in his sessions about cars, and wrecks, and you know, it just seems to be coming up. Well, let's do an assessment. Let's write up ... so you'd write up an assessment like, "Cars, drivers, policemen, highways." Just get a whole bunch of ... "Motors, speed" you know? "Rest." Anything you care to put together, and then have your auditor assess this and then he assesses it very nicely, and he comes out with one that is reading.

Now that is not what is the most wrong with him. It is what he has got the best reality on. Now you could do an L1 on it, you could prep check it, you probably could even find an engram chain on it. More rarely, if it indicated as such, you might be able to find a secondary chain on the subject. There's a lot of things that you can do with this.

Now you've got his item. Now you've got this item. And this item doesn't mean ... It's just an assessed item, it's from your list, it isn't the make or break of the case, but it does show you a zone or area of available charge, which when bled off the case will leave the case less charged up, and with a higher level of reality. And the reality and awareness of the case increases in direct proportion to the amount of charge off.

Now the case supervisor's trying to solve things like this when the case doesn't seem to be able to do what is asked of him. He doesn't seem to be able to do these things. He's ... Well it's represented by a high TA. Somebody has been audited up through the Grades.

Here's a typical case supervisor problem. And you'll go *ahh* when you see this one. See? Something like this. A guy is a, if he's a Grade III, lower Grade III, his TA is at 5, and he doesn't much like auditors. And he's come in for a session. Now what's this? What's this? What the hell is his TA doing up there? Well, your first action, of course, is to take his folder, if you can get your hands on it, and you take his folder and you go back to a point where the case was running well and the TA was not extreme. Now you can come forward from that point and you can find some clue as to what went on. It isn't necessarily,

however, an auditing overrun. It isn't always auditing to blame. The guy got married twice – without getting divorced. *[laughter]* So that you in actual fact now, in coming forward from that point, it could be as corny as this.

You found out that he didn't have any trouble getting F/Ns last January. But so help me Pete right now, wow! This is stuck McGluck, man. He's parked at high 6. And no parachute.

What're you going to do with him? Well you know, you can run one of these lists which isn't a Listing question, but which will give you an item. Now when you use a question like this it's a borderline thing. It might list to one item. But it also might not, because it isn't a proper Listing question. But you can still do it, and it won't damage the pc any, providing somebody doesn't try to horse around with it. So the auditor that does it has to understand that it's not a one item list; that he's not supposed to do anything with this thing. He's just trying to find out what reads. What happened since January the twenty eighth, which is the date of the session in which it read. What's happened since January the twenty eighth date? And he tells you this and he tells you that, and he tells you something else, and tells you something else, and all of a sudden something reads.

Without even discussing the matter of overrun, a prep check on the thing might very well knock the TA down. But you certainly have got to set this case up. This case has done something since then. Something has happened, and if you don't set the case up you'd better damn well not run [OT] IV.

And this is where your expertise comes in. This is where your expertise ... Now expertise is very standard. There's nothing much to it. The only thing you're really trying to do is find an area where charge can be removed from the case, and remove it. Now you obviously have to remove it with a process the pc can do.

Now, all of a sudden, we find this guy, and we do an assessment of seven cases, or we do this or that, or ... On lower Grade pcs like that, the common action is a Green Form with itsa, similar itsa; Lists forbidden. And it runs down, and it finds zones and areas, and before it F/Ns, however, you're liable to find another zone or area which wouldn't F/N, because the process is not ... not beefy enough. And you find some interesting things have gone on.

Now it gives you another zone. Because anything down toward that F/N, before that F/N, if it's on another subject on the Green Form, which leads to it, is of course C/S bait. Do you see? Now you could do an itsa, you could do an itsa, earlier similar itsa on a Green Form, carry it on down the form. The thing doesn't go F/N all the way through the form. You say, "Oh my God! Now what do we do? Because we have just run out of ammunition. Well your first thought is the form was badly done. Very badly done. And your second thought, that it was badly done on the first page. So therefore you look over all this carefully, and you could now establish a little assessment that can be done, which re-establishes your suspicion. And it's little items that come off the Green Form. You can have these assessed. Which one of these was out? Which one didn't the auditor get? *Ha ha*. You can cross play this. Do you see what I mean? And one of the most fantastic things is somebody with some, some withhold like drugs. Drugs can shoot the TA up. The guy got up to Grade III, and then all of a sudden, for some reason or another, he met some of his old pals that he used to have trips with and he's busy ... He used to smoke with them a lot, and so on. And just talking to these birds. He doesn't take it up again. He'll tell you quite truthfully, "No, I didn't do any." But just talking to these characters keyed in ... He keyed himself in. Of course, obviously it's a rehab action.

So, I'm just telling you the various categories of entrance. And it isn't very tricky. It isn't very tricky, because the law which governs it is, is you find an area of charge on which the pc has reality, and audit it with a simple action.

Now, you can find an area of charge on which the pc has reality, and get it audited with a simple action. And now you can find, and there is another area of charge where the pc has reality, and audit it with a simple action. All of a sudden the case is sitting there with an F/N.

That was all you were looking for in the first place. You say, "Run Grade IV." And we were not interested in all the tortures of the damned he was going through as to whether or not he was going to tell the auditor. We aren't interested in the depth of the ARC break he had with his cat. These things are not of interest. The actual interest in the matter, first and foremost and right straight across the line, is simply and only that you mustn't start a major action without flying the needle. And this is gonna be one of your big problems. You don't think so. But this is gonna be your major sup— case supervisor problem, because it'll be to you, with great urgency and emergency, that all cases are brought. You immediately get nothing but the tough cases. The easy cases are wrecked independent of your interference. *[Laughter.]* Right away you've got rough cases. "Yes, what about this folder, what about this folder?" A foot and a half thick. And Grade 0. *[laughter]*

And you follow the same formula, go back to find a time that the case was running well. Try to find out what happened to the case from that time forward. Do some simple action that will establish it further and get charge off. And your whole action is find a simple action on which the person has reality. Has something on which the person has reality, perform a simple auditing action on it and get charge off. If that didn't work, then you try to do it forward, if that didn't work, you wanna find some action, some sphere where the pc has reality, perform some simple action which gets charge off the case, and then see if you can push it. Do you understand? It's just a case – a case of *bmp*, *pow*. It's a case of hunt and punch actually.

Now it's not very hunt and punch, because you're using standard actions to do all this, and you must keep firmly in mind this one thing. Is ... it's the case that's variable, not the technology you're applying. And man, these cases have got an infinity of complexities. Infinite complexities. What people can do, and how they can get messed up, and what thinks can get cross-wise in them, probably couldn't be computed on an IBM computer:

Now it looks so big, and so complex, that you could confuse the postulates and stuck ideas and incidents and experiences of the individual, with the very simple actions you have to work with. You see? They look so simple. They're so easy. And ... your most progress you're going to get on the case is the next Grade. If the case is to be put on the next Grade, you've got to be able to fly the needle, with GIs. *[laughter]*

If the pc is in such a state that the needle won't fly, there is something wrong. There is something out along the line of Standard Tech. He really didn't get as far as he got. Or something weird has happened in his life to key him in upside down and backwards. And it is your job as a C/S simply to see that no new next Grade or section is started on him unless the needle flies easily.

Now I will go further than that in the OT sections. I will monkey around with a case until it blows out of its head. Let's hunt and punch around with the case, until he finally exteriorizes.

Now what am I doing? I'm just hunting and punching around. He's gone, that ... Now actually I could get him up to VII and make him do VII and VIII, and all of that is great and

so on, but he actually should have blown out of his head at about V. See? He should've blown out of his head at V or VI, and if he hasn't blown out of his head at V or VI then there's an earlier section out.

Now there's probably an ... We can't go back and put the case ready to fly and then do the earlier section, 'cause it's done. Now what are we going to do? See? Well it did get him a little bit further, and so on. But I would be, I would hunt and punch around until I took enough charge off the case. Start taking it off directly. An assessment of exteriorization, death, release, beating it, doing a bunk, leaving, responsibility, possessions, bodies. Do an assessment. All of a sudden, *pongo!* Death. This individual's got being out of his head associated with death.

Now look at the number of things you could do with this. Obviously can't get out of his head for some reason best known to somebody. He's still got something, or somebody or himself, has got some kind of a stuck death. So you could actually run a chain of engrams of death. I mean, elementary. Now you can vary that. It's how can you bypass the F/N? You could key it out by recall, you could run the overt, you could run the motivator. Usually run by key out the recall, run the overt series to F/N. See? Recall to F/N, overt series would then be the last action. See? Recall to F/N, motivator to F/N, overt to F/N. There's three F/Ns available on the same material. Then see how he's doing.

Well, let's see, we get a report something like this. "We assessed out death, and when I tried to run a death the pc said he, actually he went back down the track, TA 1.2, and wasn't able to find anything. And however he felt good about it. But actually there weren't very many good indicators in at the end of the session."

Now what's that told you? What you know now, huh? What you know? You know that the knuckle-headed auditor didn't make a correct assessment. That's what you know. You had your nice little list, and all of a sudden he gave you an item that was in some fashion forced to read. The one that would have read is the one on which the pc had the greatest reality, and he obviously didn't have very much reality on this because he couldn't get back and run anything. Do you follow? That's your think. So you know you've got a mis-assessment.

We had one the other day. Damnedest fire fight you ever cared to see. Ran something like this ... "I gave the pc the first command and told her what we were going to run, and she said, 'You know, I didn't understand that at the time it was assessed'. And so, I told her what it meant, and then I said I didn't think we should run it. But she said that it was alright to run it, and so we did." And it's one of those "Do not send to find for whom the bell tolls." An assessment because of non-comprehension. Which gives you a clue that your assessment should be checked. Now if you give, now let me teach you a little bit of piece about assessment. If you assess something, and then send it to the C/S, and then the C/S says to run something on it, when you start to clear the command, if you find out that he didn't know the item is your face red. Because you assessed against a misunderstood. The pc couldn't have even dimly been in session or interested in what was going on, because all he hung up on and read was the fact that he didn't understand you. So it must have been a very corny assessment indeed.

The thing to do in such a instance would be to quick like a bunny, get the misunderstood off, reassess it. Almost cruelly on the basis. "Now are there any other ... " When you've finished the assessment, "Are there any other words on this assessment you didn't understand?" You know? Stick it back in the folder and send it back to the C/S. You know, it's an "Is my face red?" type of submission.

But that is the correct action, not to run it. Because look at the mechanics I'm trying to teach you here. The reality of the pc is totally violated. A pc that doesn't understand what some very simple word means. Well actually, you're actually auditing then in a zone or sphere of "What was that?" Is that in the ... is that in the direction of reality? It's in the direction of total unreality. So you wouldn't *dare* audit such a thing. It'd be horror beyond horror. You wouldn't dare audit such a thing.

Now you say, therefore, there ought to be some sort of a drill on which we go over the whole list, and take up each one of the words on the list before we assess it, in order to clear if on the list there are any misunderstandings. No. Instead of that – we don't inspect before the fact any where along the line – we ask the person, we can ask the person before we run it. Now the reason why you don't hang up pcs and give them the assessment is, they walk off and self-audit it.

You've given him the item, you've given him the item "dog chains". You didn't do anything about it, and then you finally say, "That's your item. Your item is dog chains." So you get it mixed up with Listing & Nulling. Then the pc goes out of session saying, "Dog chains, dog chains, dog chains. Yes." They come back the next session, it's overrun already, and then you overrun it. See? You set yourself up to fall on your head.

If you trust the auditor completely, and if you're not having any assessment trouble, and auditors can do the assessment, the actual act of C/S is, "Assessed list *fow fow*, or assess the following items, take what reads and... ", prep check it, list one it, do what you're gonna do with it. Find an engram about it, you know, whatever you're going to say about it. See? Now the proper auditing action is after the assessment is done you do the action at once. And then the person says they don't understand that. 'Cause you try to clear it with them at that time, which is proper auditing procedure. You've got to clear the auditing command. And they say, "Yeah, well I meant to tell you I didn't know what that means." You say, "Thank you very much. Thank you. We'll clarify what that means. Yes, that means *boaga boo*, so *fwa fwa fwa*, that's something you lead a dog around on. That's it. Yes. Now we're going to do an assessment." (*Click, click, click, click.*) Assess it out again, and you find it now comes out entirely different. Not the other one that read, because what you were getting were latent reads on top of the misunderstood. Now you'll get the one on which he's getting a reality. So your assessment is always assessed against the pc's reality. And the only reason you do an assessment at all is to get close to where the pc's reality on the situation is.

You can look in a six inch thick folder, and you can find it in this six inch thick folder there are eight thousand nine hundred and sixty two auditing errors. Now, question is, I've already given you an example of this. You start patching up the List, but he didn't have any reality on the List being wrong. It's also something a trained auditor has to do to patch up a List. He's got to be very skilled on the Laws of Listing & Nulling to patch up a List, otherwise he'll dog breakfast the List, again.

So your safest action, I then showed you, is assess a list. "Auditors, auditing, sessions, reviews"; you know, any word that you could think of in regard to this. Then you assess it. Now you've got the pc's greatest reality. Now you run that on, and you'll find that the pc gets some charge off and it starts straightening out.

Now how many times could you do this? Well I don't know. It's almost an infinity of times. It's not a limited action. Now the funny part of it is, that limited actions only occur in the presence of out TRs. Almost any action becomes a limited action in the presence of bad TRs. Bad TRs, auditor additives, auditor omissions, and so on, add up as nice as you

please. You limit the processes. And you can audit a guy so badly, believe it or not, that the simplest process in the book won't work, this ...

Now I've suddenly given you a no-comm bridge and changed to an entirely different subject. But it is related to this. Because I've been telling you how to C/S and so forth. Now I'm going to tell you something else about it. I started in to tell you that the C/S is a bit at the mercy of the additives or omissions or the rotten TRs, and so forth, of the auditor who is auditing for him. And that might have left you in a slight puzzlement; exactly what is the extent? No, you're not puzzled about it because you have a reality on it. You think you understand it. I got news for you, you don't. This one you have to learn.

This is very upper level material. This is level VII and VIII section material. So therefore, you go trying to teach somebody this and you're gonna wrap him around a telegraph pole if he isn't already up the sections. So I give you warning. What you want to do is pong it into people's heads that they mustn't add, they mustn't do omissions, and they've got to have good TRs.

Now I want to give you the reasons back of this. The reasons back of this. It is under the heading of the anatomy of an overrun. The anatomy of overrun is a very interesting anatomy. You would say, "Well, it's been run too long, so it goes up. That's great. That's very simple. But that is the overall mechanic of the thing and the overall appearance, and the overall datum. What in actual fact happens? Why is an overrun an overrun?

Well I can give it to you just one, two. At some time or another the pc decided to stop it, and from that point on it is getting overrun. And that is all an overrun is. Let's take a series of engrams. The individual ... you're running engrams on the track. It goes more solid, you have to get earlier similar. Why do you have to get earlier similar? Because you're running down a chain of incidents where he has already got the consideration that it's already gone on too damn long. You've got to go back and get the incident where he first decided it had better stop. You don't in actual fact get the first incident on the chain. It isn't there.

The first experience he had in this particular line of country he didn't stop. It was alright for lions to jump on him. He didn't mind it. Thought, "What the hell?" So the lion jumped on him and chomped up a body, well he just mocked up another body. To hell with it. A body, easy come, easy go. So what. *[laughter]*

After a while he start deciding bodies are very important and lions shouldn't do that, and so on, so he decides to stop lions from jumping on him. And now we have a chain of animals leaping upon bodies which goes on for years and years and eons and eons, and we start tracing this thing back. And it goes into the millions and tens of millions, and hundreds of millions of years ago. How the hell did you ever get a chain like that? Well it's running back to somewhere in the vicinity of the original stop.

It's "This type of action must cease". That's what he has determined. This type of action must cease. And that is the point which you have to get out of it. And that is why in the materials of III, you get my instruction to get the *stop* out. And in ninety percent of the time if you don't take the *stop* out of III, it is already a bit late on the chain, and it won't blow. Other incidents and actions have happened before that.

So wherever we look on the track we find this is true. And that is the datum which compares to all the other datums, and is the datum which makes engrams stick, makes them go more solid, which makes things overrun.

Alright. Now let's take the rudiments. Now this is very interesting. In actual fact it is impossible to put in the rudiments too often. That's theoretically. It's theoretically

impossible to put the Ruds in too often. There is no limit on the number of times you can put in somebody's rudiments. Yet, you will look in a folder and you will sometimes see this. ARC break, up TA. Overrun, down TA. Well how the hell could that happen?

Now let me give you an exact way it could happen. At fifteen minutes before lunch the auditor starts a two hour session. He just has time to get in the Ruds. He gets these Ruds in laboriously, they go to lunch. And he comes back from lunch, he sits down, and puts in the Ruds. Ah, but the pc expected a major action. So he stops the auditor putting in the Ruds. And up goes the TA.

There's a folder kicking around which runs like this. It's actually criminal. It's fly each rud to F/N, and then; and it gives about six more instructions; so some time just before supper the fellows flew each rud to F/N on a pc who does an awful lot of itsa-ing. Alright. Just before supper, flew each rud to F/N. Took a long time. He might have known the pc – it always takes a long time to fly a rud on this pc. The pc's gabby. Took a break, went to supper, came back, and once more flew each separate rudiment. Didn't even just check 'em. Flew each separate rudiment. Even then it took quite a while to push the TA up, but eventually the TA went up to 4.25 on putting in rudiments. Oh, what two things happened?

Now the pc could have had all the work she'd done to get rudiments in invalidated while waiting for something major to happen in the session, or the pc simply was trying to stop him from putting in the Ruds. Or the pc's invalidated, or the pc's trying to stop. The pc invalidated, TA goes down; trying to stop, TA goes up.

So the C/S knows at once whether or not the pc was overwhelmed by invalidation in some fashion, or knows whether he was so rough and crude and dull in his action or was doing something so stupid, the pc was trying to stop him. Pc trying to stop him, TA goes up; TA goes down, invalidation and overwhelm. You got that? *[laughter]*

Now in the first place, what the hell makes one of these chains? You're already aware that you're mocking everything up. How come this damn chain can stay there? That's curious, isn't it? Well, it's out of VIII. Actually it's the exercise of permeation for control. Control by permeation. And if you want chairs to tip over, and that sort of thing, without having a hand laid on 'em, of course you'll permeate them and tip them over.

So let us take now this guy who had the lion jump on him. And he's got a long chain of being destroyed by lions, fighting lions, shooting lions, and you can ... he's Clear, for God's sakes. And you start dredging around and all of a sudden you find this wild chain, having to do with lions.

Well let me tell you the exact circumstances of how that chain came into being. It used to matter, it used to ... didn't matter a damn. And then one fine day he decided he was tired of getting bodies mucked up, or lions mucked up, or something. And so, as the lion leaped through the air he permeated the lion, he permeated his environment to control it in order to stop the lion.

This is very successful. You can stop things this way like a bomb. There's no trick in this. It's done by permeation. And, you're just everywhere at once. You know? *Ppfff!* Well it freezes, or it does something else. Or it goes off in the other direction, don't you see? You can make it do what you please.

Alright, that was great. That was great. And then one day a lion jumped on him. The frequency, the length of the track, permits the un– the most unlikely incidents to repeat. You see there's – there's sufficient variation that he finally will get on one of these points *again*, somewhere up the track. So anyhow, the lion jumped on him, he permeated the

lion stopping him from jumping, and at that moment a lion jumped on his back that he hadn't noticed. This caused a dispersal.

He thought he had the environment under control, and there was a piece of the environment he didn't have under control. Which causes him to shift his attention from this lion to that lion. So this lion hits him. And he loses a body anyway.

Now on that failure chain he will have already got the basic of stopping lions from jumping on him, and now you get a *can't stop lions* chain. Now the damn fool will keep on going through this permeation act long after it doesn't work. And it gives him a chain of pictures. (Quote) (unquote) "pictures". They're very funny looking pictures, they're very thin pictures. They're mostly energy, frozen. Do you see the mechanics? But it takes a distraction to put him into a chain of loses. And after a while he doesn't permeate things, but he still does permeate things, and he can't understand why, after he walks out of the room he has a picture of a phonograph.

Do you see? Well, that failed, so he doesn't take responsibility for the action any more, but a thetan can permeate anything anyhow. And it's often a surprise to me that things in my vicinity don't move. But my body will move, my hands will move, but that doesn't move. That's 'cause I'm holding it still while my hand moves. A thetan is very clever. See? And you have to be careful what you permeate.

There are many things you shouldn't permeate, obviously. You had better stop permeating. [laughter] I suppose somebody who has done that, and so forth, has a whole chain of invisible pictures. [laughter] Refraining from permeating.

But regardless of all of that, I'm telling you this mechanic, which is simply a mechanic, the mechanics of handling things, because it was a distraction which gave him his first lose on stopping. Up to that time he didn't care whether he stopped things or not. Now he becomes frantic about stopping. And it was ... took a distraction like, he stopped, he permeated the lion in front, and turned him around in the air and sent him somewhere else. Right at the same time the lion ... he was going to do this, you see? Right at the same time the lion hit him from the rear. So, he starts for this lion, stops this lion, and he gets this lion, but he hasn't got this lion under control, and he gets so confused he doesn't know what the hell lion he's trying to control, and it's by distraction. And you'll find then that *distraction* is an interesting point to handle in the pc. It's handled just by discharging the case. But an engram which has got distraction in it, if you were really gonna run this thing out come hell or high water, regardless of how late it was on the chain, would really hang you up. Boy, you really could sweat as an auditor trying to run out this engram which has distraction on it. Do you see?

He almost, he was running the car into a tree when another car hit him in the side. [laughter] Brother, you try to unwind that engram and you're generally going to have a ball. It's going to take earlier similar, earlier similar, earlier similar, earlier similar, earlier similar, earlier similar, do you see? Why? Because it's got the failure point has been dramatized in it, which is the distraction in it. Do you see? It's a whole chain of distractions. And to get down to the earliest distraction is sometimes a bit of a trick. There's too many conflicting forces to rationalize. Do you see this?

Now we come right back to what I was talking to you about in the first place. What do you think about a distractive auditor in a session? [audience mumblings, oohs and arrs] That's interesting, isn't it? If that was his first point of failure to permeate, and if it's dramatized on him at the same time he's trying to introspect and handle his Bank, and he's been distracted in some peculiar fashion by some idiocy. Actually his tolerance of

distraction is fairly high. He isn't scared to death. But interjected comments, evaluations, invalidations, the auditor not taking care of the environment, a gale of wind starts coming in through the window and the auditor doesn't go over and close it, you know? Any one of these things which causes a distraction in the session, doesn't necessarily ruin the pc, because there isn't anything really violent happening with the pc. But it sure sort of hangs him with a session. And he can't get on with it. The reason he can't get on with it is because it's got the element of distraction. The unpredictability. And there is where the importance of TRs begins.

Now have you got the whole mechanism? [Yes] I suppose the auditor not saying anything is, he was counting by that time on a lion tamer to reach out with a noose and grab the lion, and the lion tamer one time didn't grab out with the noose and grab the lion, and it was an omission, so omission becomes distractive too. He expects something to happen and it doesn't happen. It's plus or minus side of the ledger.

Do you see then the essence of smoothness, of predictability of doing what the auditor is supposed to do in the session? Not adding to it, not subtracting from it, and carrying on with the actions necessary to resolve the case? Now part of the actions necessary to resolve a case are the auditor auditing him.

Now I'll give you another little piece of this. It's the auditor plus the pc, versus the pc's Bank makes it possible then to audit pieces of the pc's Bank. So therefore, for you to do an assessment of what the pc should go off and audit, is bonkers.

Let's look at this again. You do an assessment on a list which you now give to the pc, and you tell him to go off to his solo session, or something, and do this L1 on *wuf wuf*. You assessed it. Now his reality then is always increased in the presence of an auditor. His reality on his Bank is increased in the presence of the auditor, because he's got that much more attention he can put on his Bank, right? So therefore the assessment will go deeper than he himself, all by himself, has reality on.

This gives you three or four phenomena which sometimes make you very curious as to what happened. A pc walks out of session and says something entirely different happened. If you look on an examiner's report sometime, this pc maybe has been audited for half an hour, and the pc comes out and tells the examiner, "All we did was assess a list." Trinity God, the person lists ... Yeah, we assessed a list, but there were about fifteen other actions present before the list was assessed.

Well, what was being done before that – this is a negative gain. What was done before is no longer important to the pc. It's erased, they're gone. Not important. Pc doesn't comment on it. But the list hasn't been run yet. Furthermore, it's been assessed by the auditor, so the second the pc walked out of session, if the pc was given the item, the pc's liable to walk out of that session overwhelmed. 'Cause he got the item and it was actually not the reality level of the pc. It was the reality level of the auditor plus pc. The pc, safeguarded, was able to confront the Bank enough to inspect what was going on. But the pc all by himself couldn't. You got that?

So it enters into this equation. So there are many roles the auditor plays in auditing which he really doesn't really suspect. He actually increases the reality of the pc during the session. The pc can become much more aware of his own Bank. The pc's pictures in running engrams are liable to be far brighter, go brighter, when the auditor is auditing him. Then some auditor or other, I do a C/S for him. The C/S is to run some engrams. I intend it to be audited on him, and so on. And he goes off and audits himself like, wow. You see I already have given him a C/Sed action so it isn't likely that he'll run into this on his own

volition. I'm already undercutting his reality to some slight degree by making sure that it's correct, but nevertheless that it's pushing the case a bit. And that's supposed to handle the situation. Well, it's audited.

He goes and audits it on himself, he wraps himself around a telegraph pole. Do you see why? So, the auditor can be a definite liability to the session by additives, or subtractives from the session. He can actually provide sufficient distraction to key in or hang up the pc in the session. He can make an unlimited process actually appear limited, because the pc is busy trying to stop his doing it, which then gives you the whole phenomena of overrun, because the pc has already decided it's overrun. I think Ruds are overrun, TA up. See? Now a pc isn't aware he's doing this. He's operating, however, to do this.

Or, on the other hand, the auditor in there pitching, sitting there just doing his job routinely, nothing very magical about it. He says what he has to say, he's got his TRs are in, he gives the auditing command, he gets them executed, he follows through and does his job right straight on through, actually has enormously increased the reality of the pc as he moves on up the line, and so has permitted him to confront parts of the Bank and handle it that he never under God's green Earth all by himself would be permitted to do. So there's a very plus and there's a very minus to the situation. And there's a lot to be gained and a lot to be lost all on the same subject.

Have you got a better idea of what sessioning is about? [*Yes sir*]

Alright. Very good.

Thank you very much. [*applause*]
