THE ITSA MAKER LINE

A lecture given on
16 October 1963

How are you today?

Audience: Fine. Good.

Good. We have the 16th of October AD 13, don't we? Is that the date?

Female voice: 17th.

What's the date?

Audience: 16th.

All right. All right, you're outvoted. One motion we don't have to table. Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

Well, we have a lot of material, but the material you were most fascinated with was the examination of the communication cycle and the recognition that there was another communication line in it you hadn't really been aware of. Several auditors so far have been very, very delighted indeed, and I think several pcs already have been. And there will be a great many more pcs who will be delighted with this before we get through. I better give you a bit of a talk about that, in spite of the fact that I haven't hit on a final name for this line - we'll call it the itsa maker. Now, that possibly is not the most applicable name.

Let's take a look at this thing. This line is actually the line which you are guiding as an auditor and which sorts out the various things in the case, and which then reports - which then gets the material, you might say, that is reported to the auditor as itsa. Actually, the itsa itself occurs at the end of this line, not at the auditor. So actually, it's the itsa communication line that goes from the pc back to the auditor. That is the itsa communication line.

Itsa is a commodity. It's a commodity. It's actually the identification of isness - and, of course, time can enter into it and you will get wasness. Now, you get all types of variations, all tone scales and everything else fit into this commodity called itsa. You could ask for "failed decisions." Well, the pc says "itsa," see - he says "it's a failed decision," don't you see. It's a this, and it's a that, and it's something else, but you could even have a failure to identify. You could ask pcs for failures to identify. Now, if you were going to ask a pc for a failure to identify, you of course are on the borderline between a confusion and an itsa. See? That's the borderline in between there.

Times when you didn't find out something. Now, you'd be surprised that occasionally you'll get a little TA action on this. But you will also stir up enough overrestimulation to mess things up gorgeously. Now, the commodity called itsa is so simple - recognizing it can have tremendous variety - it is nevertheless tremendously simple as a commodity. There is nothing much to this commodity. You walk in the room and you look around to see what's there, you see. Well, it's a chair, it's a student, it's a ceiling, it's a floor, don't you see. That's itsa for the room. And that's all there is to it.

Now, until the itsa is recognized, it's only potential itsa. There is something there to be itsaed. Now, where you get in a lot of trouble as an auditor is you think you have a potential itsa where there's in actual fact a nothingness, and you're trying to get the pc to itsa a nothingness. This is the way you go about it. Let me show you just some of the problems that an auditor runs into with this.

He says to the pc - he says, "What's going on?" or "What's happening. You see?

And the pc says, "I'm just sitting here looking at a picture of a statue." You got that now, see. That's the situation.

Now, the auditor says, "What is happening" or "What is going on?" in some version or another. Now, the degree that the auditor can vary this, buries it from view of what he's actually doing, see.

The pc has told him what was being - what was there, see. He said "itsa." "Sitting here looking at a picture of a statue," see. Simple.

Now the auditor says, "What else is there? What are you doing.? What else are you doing How are you doing it?" and so on. "What decisions are you making about this?" You get this?

Well, the pc isn't doing anything else, isn't making any decisions about the statue and in actual fact there is exactly nothing else going on. Now, this is the commonest method by which an auditor refutes itsa.

Now, on a meter you call it "cleaning a clean." And you'd be very reprehensible at somebody who's saying, "On this blank has anything been invalidated?" And the meter is just absolutely sleek, see. "Oh, what was that? What was that? What was that? Wha - wha - wha - wha - what was that? What was that?" You know, you didn't get a read, see.

And you can count on the pc ARC breaking very shortly. "Oh, that. There isn't anything else. There's nothing else been invalidated." Protest, s - - - ?

"Well, I'll ask the question again. On blank has anything been invalidated. Oh, that reads. That reads. That reads. What was that? What was that? Wha - what was that? That reads." Well, yeah, there's something there now because he protested the fact that a clean, clean was, so he protested the Invalidate button, so now the Invalidate button now reads on Protest. You got the idea?

Now, out of this idiocy can get some of the most tangled situations. See, he cleaned a clean on the meter and the pc protested the cleaning of the clean, which made Invalidate read as a button. So now Invalidate reads, so now the auditor demands to know what is there. The auditor now becomes certain there is something there, don't you see. Reading on the meter, isn't it? And out of this, they can go wandering all over bayous and byroads and up in balloons and so forth, and it just goes to pieces from there - all of which proceeds from cleaning a clean. You've probably seen this happen - you may have had it happen to you. It's a what - a very common error. Any auditor will do it sooner or later - he'll accidentally clean a clean. He just wants to be sure, you see. "Anything else been suppressed there?" you know. He's had a clean read, and he wishes to God he never said so, but of course Suppress can suppress its own read. So you're left in a bit of a quandary - and the pc said, "No, there's nothing else."

"Ah, ah - well, I see a read there now." Protest read or something like this sort of thing. Pc looks and gives four or five more answers - each one of which is protest, do you see. So the button keeps reading, reading, reading.

Finally, the pc says, "Yeah, but there isn't anything else here!" See, he's getting up into an ARC break situation. What's he being asked for? He's being asked to identify nonexistent itsa.

Now, this is the same trick as this: You take a wide, empty room. And you - this is brainwashing stuff, see - and you say to the person as you bring him in the door, "Describe to me the elephant in the middle of the room."

And the fellow says, "There isn't any elephant in the middle of the room."

"Oh, uh, uh, uh, uh, uh, uh, uh, uh - oh, no, no, no, no, no. Let's look carefully. Look carefully. Now, look all around the floor and see if you can't see those footprints and so forth. Now, you'll - you'll get - you'll get it after a while. You'll get this elephant after a while there."

1 swear if you kept it up, you could make the guy practically mock up an elephant in the middle of the room, don't you see. But the guy would be very overwhelmed and very ARC broken. What you're trying to do is tell him that something exists which doesn't exist. Now, perhaps that is - aside from the definitions of it - the source of - or failure to understand the definitions and so forth of itsa - probably the

source of the greatest difficulty is cleaning cleans. You've seen it happen on a meter, you've seen yourself get in trouble occasionally, too, cleaning it on the meter. Well, similarly, you can clean it without a meter. You can say, "What are you looking at?"

And the person says, "I'm sitting here looking at a statue."

"Oh, all right, good. Now what kind of a statue?" This is barely admissible, see, because that one might lay an egg, too.

"Well, it's just a statue kind of a statue." You see?

"Yes, but what does it look like?"

"Well, it looks like a statue."

"Um, all right. Uhm. Wha - what else are you doing there?"

"Oh, I'm not doing anything else. I'm just sitting here looking at this - or was sitting here looking at this statue - until I was so crudely interrupted."

"All right. Well, now who might have made the statue?"

"Well, I don't know."

"What time period do you suppose it's in?"

"Uh, sometime I guess."

"Well, where - where - where is this statue located? Where is this statue located now? Where's it located?" and so forth.

"Well, I don't know. Just here."

Well, the amount of tone arm action you're going to get out of that is horrible because, actually, there's nothing else to itsa, don't you see? The auditor is creating new things to itsa which aren't there. The pc was just sitting there looking at a statue and actually probably was just looking at a vague blur, and he couldn't tell whether it was female or a male or anything else. He didn't know where it was located. He knew nothing about it except he was just struck by the fact that he saw this thing, and he assumed it was a statue and so he was sitting there looking at a statue. The auditor comes along and says, "What are you doing?" you know?

And he says, "I'm sitting here looking at a statue." Now that is the itsa - and the way to really foul the pc up - and this is something you as an auditor just have to get straightened out yourselves, see - the way to foul the pc up, then, is to demand more than the pc's got. And you're not going to get itsa; you're not going to get itsa by demanding more than the pc's got because there's nothing else there to itsa! There simply isn't anything to itsa. You have got the itsa. But by asking again, you deny the fact that it has been itsaed. Now there's the real hook in all this.

You say - you've said in effect when you say, "What else" - oh, you could say, "What else are you looking at?" without disturbing the pc too much. He says, "I'm sitting here looking at a statue."

And the auditor says, "Well, what else are you seeing?" There would be a good example, see: "What else are you seeing?" Well, maybe he isn't seeing anything else. You see, this would be your thing - but you have in effect said, "I have not accepted what you have said." So now the itsa comm line is cut - as different from cutting the pc's itsa, see. You have not permitted the itsa particle to travel on that comm line.

You have not only cut the - you have not only refuted the itsa - you see, the itsa isn't cut - it's refuted. You say it doesn't exist. "You haven't said anything. You haven't said anything because I want to now know much more about it than you have said. So therefore, you haven't said anything." This is what you're saying. So you also cut the itsa comm line. See, you've not just blunted out the itsa but you've cut the itsa comm line and the pc will ARC break eventually under this kind of treatment accordingly.

So that then it appears to you that by cutting the comm line, you have caused an ARC break. So then you specialize in not cutting the comm line, and go on asking the pc ridiculous questions which knock the itsa in the head. Now you see how you could get fouled up on this? And your pc would ARC break like mad and be very upset about this and that and about his auditing and not getting any TA action and no gains and all this sort of thing, you see. Basically, no TA action. And the auditor could be quite certain what's wrong, you see, that he is inadvertently cutting the pc's comm line to the auditor in some fashion.

And so now, compound the felony by developing a new system which overcomes this - because he actually hasn't got the trouble in the first place, see. He's got a new system he's going to develop to cure this old error, and he's going to say all the time, "Have I interrupted anything you were saying.?" Well, this is not germane to it, so would only compound the ARC break. See? He hasn't interrupted anything, so again he has cleaned a clean. In other words, he's put his finger on the wrong error. You see that?

This kind of a situation could develop: Auditor says the whatsit, see. The auditor says, "What's happening" or "What are you doing."

And the pc says, "Well, I'm just sitting here looking at a statue."

"Oh? What's the - what else is in view there as you're looking at the statue? What else are you looking at there in the statue?" He isn't looking at anything else - there isn't anything else there, don't you see?

So the pc says, "Well, uh, mm - mm, uh, mm, uh, uh, uh, uh, uh. I'm just

looking at the statue."

Auditor sees a dirty needle, knows that a cut comm line turns on a dirty needle. Now says, "In some way have I cut your communication line?" Hell, no - he's forced the communication line, not cut it. Not only that, but he's invalidated - the sensation is that the - what the pc has said has been invalidated.

You would be surprised how well something runs when you say to a pc, "What's happening?" or "What are you doing?"

The pc says - said, "I'm sitting here looking at a statue."

Now the auditor who doesn't have an eye cocked on his meter at this moment ... You know, an auditor should be walleyed - one eye on the pc and one eye on the meter. And notices - and you can, you actually can get nicely walleyed. You look at this thing out of the corner of your eye - you can see what's happening to a meter even while you're apparently looking straight at the pc. As a matter of fact, it drives my pc nuts sometimes when she gets all tangled up in something or other, she'll notice something like this and growl about it, you know. "But you didn't see that on the meter!" Well, of course, I have seen that on the meter. It looks to the pc like this, you see. Pc absolutely certain that you aren't looking at the meter. Not so. Not so at all. I've seen everything that meter has done, see.

I tell you how you do it - I tell you how you do it: You take the iris, you see, and it has an inner reflective quality, see. And you actually look at the reflection of the meter on the inside of the iris. That's actually the way you do it. Anyway. Joke. But you actually can see this.

Now, you've got to establish - what are you trying to do? Well, actually, you're trying to get tone arm action, see - that's what you're trying to do. Because that is the most visible action of success. If you've done everything else successfully you get tone arm action; so you say, well, what are you trying to do? You're trying to get tone arm action. Don't say, "I'm trying to clear somebody, I'm trying to heal somebody's broken leg, or I'm trying to do this or trying to do that." Scientology Levels I, II and III,

you're trying to get tone arm action. The significance of how you get tone arm action - oh, bleaaaah! No matter what you do with a pc, it's all got to be done thoroughly at Level IV. You understand that?

You can destimulate and put present time back where it belongs and dust the case off and let the case live, don't you see? You can do very remarkable things at Levels I, II and III - don't make a mistake. And on Level IV, you're going to find all the somatics again. It isn't that you haven't blown charge off the case at large - yes, you have at Levels I, II and III, but a lot of it was destimulated charge. You make it possible for somebody actually to run IV at Levels I, II and III. But the significances are the pc's actual GPMs, the pc's RIs, the terminals and oppterms, and that whole chain of actual goals back to time immemorial contains every possible reason why the pc is batty, except one. Except one. How did he get so batty that he started doing this in the first place? Well, actually, that's merely a decision. It's just a sort of "How do you make matter," see. Well, he easily comes out of that.

You want to know why the pc has pictures? He's probably got some GPM to make pictures, you see. You want to know why the - why the pc is getting less powerful? Well, he has some GPM to be less powerful. I mean that's a - see? That's - you want to know why the pc is terrified of height? Well, he's got an RI or a GPM to make him terrified of height, don't you see? I mean anything wrong - or if the guy has a broken leg, why, you're going to have - you're going to have some RI someplace or another that tells him to break his leg. You get the idea? I mean, the - they're - all the explanations are there. There's no sense in looking for explanations anyplace else on a case. You understand?

And that's very discouraging - but amongst us pros we can - I mean its very discouraging to the pc after he's just gotten rid of this and he feels fine about it and all is going along well, to actually realize that back on the track the real reason is still resident. But if we didn't recognize that as auditors, we would not be honest with our own technology because we know that to be true. He's got stuff back on the track, don't you see?

Now, you've got to put a case in shape so the case will sit there and run this high - powered stuff at Level IV, and Level IV is the Scientologist level. You can talk all you want to about how easy it is perhaps to run raw meat and all that sort of thing. It is - it is too. But remember this at Levels I, II and III: It practically takes an educated pc and a very well educated auditor to run Level IV, and the pc wouldn't know what to do with it if he got there. So you've got two different brands of action going on here, see. You've got three gradients of one brand - Scientology I, II and III - and you've got another brand of stuff. And that other brand of stuff depends utterly on skill at I, II and III. But Level IV is the Scientologist level.

I don't think after looking it over for a long, long time, is I frankly don't think in spite of this - I know this is quite a revolutionary statement but this is actually based merely on observation - is I don't think, it's my own opinion after all the evidence is in, that anybody will make OT except a trained auditor. Now, that's the only - the only person I know of In the first place, his confront is up to this stuff. In the second place, he knows what to do. In the third place, you're dealing with things that a pc would have to be educated into the nomenclature of before he could even run the process.

How are you going to communicate to a pc "actual GPM." Well, you could say actual Goals Problem Mass. What's that going to communicate? These are totally unknown factors. These are - these are factors adrift in the whirlwind, you see. Nobody's ever heard of these things before. And as far as somebody being able to become conscious of and concerned without his confront as an auditor rising, without an understanding of the various put-togethers of these things - plooey! I just don't think it can happen, see. I think that's the basic barrier on the track. The basic barriers to development of mental science.

If you specialized 100 percent on a total effect and total result by reason of a mental science - see, total; that was your goal - and you were not going to make a fully trained pro out of everybody you were going to do it to, see. At the same time, if you had - if you had a body of professionals over here which were barring out everybody else from becoming professionals - the same modus operandi that the medicos use, that the psychiatrists try to use, other people try to use, you know. They say, "Us educated people," see. And "We hold the holy sepulcher," you know, and "Worship Saint Pavlov." This kind of stuff, do you see?

All right, they bar all these fellows out, and then these other fellows that are supposed to be the fellows who have the effect created on them, don't YOU see - they're the patients or they're the recipient of the technology - and then all of these birds who are the pros, you see, they have all the know - how. And these other fellows over here, why, they're the recipients of the know - how, but they don't get any of the know - how and so forth. And I think that's a very effective system from ever - for ever keeping anybody from getting anything, or getting anywhere.

So your Scientology Levels I, II and III - particularly Levels I and II - are very adaptable to handling far in excess any requirement that the public at large has for a psychotherapy. It's wildly in excess! You just learn a few of these things I'm trying to teach you, and you'll find it's just wildly in excess. Staff Auditor here is having a ball on this stuff. I mean, case - oh, poof! Nothing to that, see.

Got to remember, he's saying the raw meat case - there's nothing to what? Making the case feel better. Making the case feel happier. Curing the lumbosis. Getting the case over this. Getting the case over that. Yeah. Ah, but there's a different mission which mental science could fulfill. Entirely different mission, which is a total sweep - up of the total case. How tough and how educated and how understanding do you think a pc has to be in order to stand up to the number of randomities which can occur at Level IV, because, don't kid yourself, they can occur!

Well, let me tell you: In two or three instances now, people have been carefully audited in HGCs at this particular level, and in two or three of those cases, even though they had a GPM or two cleaned up, they got a couple of RIs out of place. A couple of RIs out of place - you ought to have ten goals out of place sometimes. Ten GPMs smeared around backwards - you'd know what a creak was, man! "Well, we had a couple of RIs out of place so we had an awful ARC break. And we want our money back from the organization." Oh, slap my wrist!

They're going to run into that continually, so why - why say it doesn't exist? We could be hopeful and say well, wouldn't it be nice if it didn't exist? But actually what you have for the first time is really a body of pros who, by the nature of the technology as far as I can survey the technology, have a level of technology applicable to them who were possessors of a level of technology which is applicable to the general public in the fields of mental and physical healing!

Now, this is a riches that you probably hadn't really totally looked at. When you finally get through and get it all summed up - summed up, the characters that are going to make it are Scientologists, as other people aren't going to make it.

I know I've done the research vanguard on this as a pc, because it would have killed anybody else - but I personally can't see anybody going through one - tenth of what I've gone through in the last two weeks, see. What, on the general public level? Oh, no. I can see you characters going through it, see.

Seen doors go out of plumb and out of plane and walking down floors which are suddenly tipping like the deck of a rolling ship. Somebody skipped a GPM or two on you, you know. They - they went for some ... Everybody got brilliant at this particular point, and you had a GPM called "to catch catfish," you see. And they did a goal oppose list for the next earlier GPM. And they got "to be a horse." And the pc said brightly, "Oh, that's the next goal. Yes. ëTo catch catfish' opposes ëto be a horse.'"

And the auditor says, "Well, I don't know if quite true." See - reasonable. You know it's, "I don't know if it would be quite true. It's uh - I guess it would be all right. Well, we'll go ahead and find the items in it, you see."

And the next thing you know, why, corners of the room are going at forty - five degree angles to the pc and their chin is over here a foot and a half from the bottom of their face, you see. And if a doctor would examine them at that moment, they'd say, "An advanced ease of coronary thrombosis, you see." The pc's heart is leaping, you see - air bubbles coming out of his bloodstream. Like these divers in fish tanks, you know. Good.

Well, actually, that takes an awful level of understanding. That takes an awful level of determined push - ahead. It takes a terrific amount of education to know what's happening to you. You'd say, "Well,

huehhh!! there's something wrong in the bank. I didn't feel like this on Tuesday. Let's see, what in the name of common sense were we doing on Tuesday? Prrooo! Didn't feel like the - what did we do on Monday? Hrrooooh."

And finally after a few sessions of wrestling around and it gets worse, and it gets horrible, and now you've got half the bank found in the wrong GPM, you see, why - auditor gets enough Suppress off, and the pc gets enough momentary itsa on the bank and between the two of them, why, they suddenly find out that "to be a horse" - "to be a horse" was an actual goal but not an actual GPM, and that "to catch catfish" goal oppose list is not complete, and that they haven't got a GPM that they've been running items out of That, in addition to jumping a couple of goals, you see. They didn't jump a couple of goals - they just missed them all, see.

Then all of a sudden - snap, snap, pop, tick, bang! - and no coronary thrombosis and the room is all level, and you meet the guy that afternoon and he's saying, "Yabbledee - yabbledee - yabbledee - yabble. Everything's fine. Everything is fine," and so on. He hasn't even found the next goal yet. They just found out why, you see. He's fine. Everything's fine.

And you say, "Well, how about that . . ." You can just see now some medical attendant in some organization who wasn't in the know, you know. He'd be coming up there with a little black bag, "Now, Mr. Smith, how is your coronary thrombosis this afternoon?" The pc says, "Coronary thrombosis. What coronary thrombosis? You mean actual goal - osis?"

No. It takes - takes a level of nerve. That's another comment that we can make on this definition of the common people, see. We're talking about a Level I, yeah, common people. But you're talking about - you're talking about way upstairs stuff when you're talking about Level IV. Don't kid yourself, now - don't kid yourself.

All you've got to do is make a bum error on the present time GPM and start running one that ain't it, and your pc's had it and so have you. And - because you won't have a snowball's chance of getting anyplace. The pc will go into the creaks. Half a dozen banks should be there.

Do you know how - how far the mistake can be? Do you know how wide the mistake can be for a present time GPM? How wide that mistake can be? 1 You can get the fourteenth GPM from present time registering as the present time GPM. And then every day or so find a new GPM that's closer to the present time that is now incontrovertibly the present time GPM. No slightest argument about it. Every day, find another one.

And finally discover that when you found that first one that you were sure was it and that checked out on the meter - meter rocket read! Present time GPM? Rocket read, see. Why? Well, actually, you merely found the GPM in which the pc was most firmly stuck. So, of course, it looks like a present time GPM. That looks like present time to him - so of course it registers. Nothing to that. And in addition to that, GPMs are timeless by construction because of the RI balance. They float in time like goals, so of course these 1 GPMs will register as any place. It takes a considerable trick to date one. And after I've dated a GPM, I always say "maybe."

You know, done a terrific job of dating with the greatest care in the world. Everything proved out perfectly that this GPM was at trillions one hundred to trillions ninety - one. Proved it conclusively! Well, I will learn out of that, that probably it is not the present time GPM - maybe. Because these things - these things, of course, are constructed to be instantaneous.

Go back to your early material on GPMs. They're instantaneous. They haven't got any time in them. So of course you can't date them worth a nickel, so of course you can make mistakes of this particular character.

Well, I know one case that has had a GPM that people have been trying - it's perfectly valid GPM - that people have been trying to run items out of now for a couple of years. Sounds like a long time, doesn't it? They haven't found any yet! I think they got the top oppterm once. It's probably - It's probably fifteen, twenty GPMs from present time!

No, it isn't Suzie. I've got - I've got several pcs that don't really know they're on my critical list, you know. But I watch this - I watch this. And I watch people trying to list for something and find something there and so on. There, you can't run it. It's just this: You can't run a GPM that is not the present time GPM! There's only one way that GPMs can be safely programed, and that's find the present time GPM without any doubt whatsoever, and then doubt it, and get its top terminal and oppose it, and run the - now I'm giving you a different kind of programing here - and you run that all the way back to the beginning of track - finding RIs and GPMs in proper sequence - all the way to the beginning of track without skipping a single pair of RIs, without repairing anything and without missing a single goal as you go. Got it? And when you get it all the way back to the beginning of track, and you get the first postulate that the pc ever made - let me call that to your attention; that's prime postulate - when you run this out of the pc, don't be startled if you see the rafters kind of go errrrrwah.

When you got that, then you go back and repair it. Go back and run it all again and find out if there was anything missing. But listen - if you try to repair it before then, you won't make it. I've got the later data on this. You cannot repair a GPM on the run. You just find the RIs for the next GPM you should be in. It's too horrible for words. Or you pull RIs out of implants. Or you pull RIs from elsewhere. You can always repair and find new RIs for a GPM you just completed. So you don't run them from the top to the bottom and then go back to the top and repair them. Because you never go back to the top and repair them. The only thing that happens is you find RIs out of the next one, without the goal. See, it's in a horrible mess. So, of course, you can't take any chances with this thing.

The odd part of it is that if you do it right, it runs off like a well - oiled dream. It is the most invariable process anybody ever heard of! It is just like a Swiss watch. It just runs off perfectly - runs off just exactly according to R4M2. It's just perfect - I mean there's nothing to it! Like falling off a log!

But you make one mistake, and now you have five hundred thousand words required of written material to take care of the repair. You got it? I mean, to do the process itself is very, very easy. You make one mistake and you got complications. It's nothing, for instance, to throw away three sessions, just be cause you made a stupid boob in one. You just can't find out what's happening. It just, "Ooh, bleah, whoo - my God." And you'll find out it is some stupid boob error. And then you get errors and then you lose the error, you know - and then you find what the error was, but then you lose the error - and you find out that wasn't the error but something else was the error. You got the idea?

It can get horrible. But the repairs of it are quite feasible providing they're gone at sensibly. But there is a way to run them. There isn't much to running them. You can run them very rapidly. I find an RI every ten minutes of auditing, routinely - racketa - packeta - packeta - packeta - packet. Takes me about an hour and a half to find a goal on a pc. Next goal. There's nothing much to this but it's a precision line of auditing. And it is no line of auditing to be done by somebody who hasn't got a tremendous grip on auditing itself, and who is still trying to find out which is the tone arm - "Oh, that's the tone arm. No wonder I couldn't find the goals list on the pc. It's kept in the tone arm, isn't it? I've heard You know? You can't do auditing like that.

So you wind up, of course, with Scientology Levels I, II and III, which is your professional address to the situation. You wind up with Level IV. If you think you're going to go out and find goals on the general public, you might as well just forget it. You're not - that's all. Oh, you can find some goals. You can find some implant goals. You could - you could mess around with this. They'd say, "What do you know? This is unbelievable," and so forth.

You might even do something, accidentally. You might even do something. But what you'll pay for it in terms of a pc you can't handle, in terms of a pc who will chicken out, in terms of a pc whose confront and education don't even vaguely compare with what he is doing - do not make it worthwhile. You have now terrific processes at Levels I, II and III, so you'd better learn all there is to know about itsa and what makes itsa and all this, and be able to just sit there cold - knowing nothing much about the pc, you should be able to sit there cold - plug in your E - Meter, give a pc the cans and turn on thirty - five divisions of tone arm in your first two and a half hours on any raw meat pc in any place. Now why can't you?

And it'll be lack of or noncomprehension of some of this data like the itsa maker line, see. What is this line? Well, now you get fouled up as to what this line is and you're not going to get TA divisions. You know what this line is, why, it's like a breeze.

Now, let's get back on that. I was just trying to get your frames of reference in with regard to where this technology fits. Naturally, this same itsa maker is what's banging in at the GPMs. It's the same thing you're controlling in Level IV. But all Level IV is done with formal auditing. You try to do this other type of auditing and you're going to lay an egg. You're going to let the pc itsa his own GPMs? What - how many telegraph poles do you want this pc to be wrapped around? Plenty!

But, if you are doing Level IV without a complete command of the pc's communication cycles and communication lines, you will also wrap him around a telegraph pole.

Now, let me show you some misways of handling this situation. One is just not understand what it is. And the other is have some wild preconceived idea or - even some Scientology datum magnified out of all proportion, magnified out of all proportion to its actual relationship, such as "pcs never answer the auditing command." So there of course, you can never trust this itsa maker line. See? You can never trust it. So therefore, you transpose the itsa maker line over to your meter. So you do nothing but ask the meter what is going on with the pc; never ask the pc. You have now effectively shut off the pc's itsa maker line from aud - from the pc as a thetan to his own bank - that line. That's the itsa maker line, see? And you've cut that line. By doing what? By trying to read it all out from underneath the pc.

Now, the meter actually can operate as a sort of thetan. You and the meter can be a sort of a substitute thetan. You realize that? You got a bank sitting across the table from you, and you by putting in whatsits can kick things that - in the bank that read that the pc isn't perceiving. Well, this is absolutely vital at IV, which is why I've spent some time talking about IV - because all of IV and GPMs are sub - itsa. The itsa maker line playing over the tops of these things sees a bunch of black Alps - but the meter and the auditor can undercut that bank, since they are not influenced by those direct and immediate bumps and the significances in them.

So they can undercut these things and find out what goal it is, because it rocket reads while the pc is still wondering what goal it is. Yes, but you can get too much of that kind of thing too, very, very easily. You can say, "Well, me and the meter know and the pc doesn't know. So therefore, there's no sense in paying any attention to the pc." So we cut his itsa maker. And we find session by session his R-factor drops on his bank. We try to do it all very mechanically. We should do it mechanically, but we do it mechanically by cutting his line. Now, we'd have to have a wild idea of what this line is, in order to pull such goofs as this. We say to the pc, we say, "Well, give me - give me a goal now on this list."

And the pc gives you a goal on the list and so forth, and you're asking the pc, "Is it an actual GPM . . ." - you're asking via the meter, see - "Is it an actual GPM or is it an implant GPM or something. "

And the pc pipes up and he says, "You know, I think this is an implant GPM. I can see the Helatrobus Implant areas. Yeah, I think it's an implant GPM."

Now here's the way to cut the rug right out from underneath the pc, see, is say, "All right. Thank you. Thank you. Is it an actual GPM? Is it an imp . . ."

All right. Here's another way to cut the rug out from underneath the pc: "Oh, I think," he says - you're asking these questions of the meter and the pc answers them, see - and the pc says, "I think it's a - it's an actual - I think it's an implant GPM because I can see the Helatrobus Implant areas. I mean they're right here. I can see them."

And the auditor says, "Oh, all right. Well, is it also an actual GPM?" And the pc says, "I - I don't think so. I really don't think it is." "All right. You mind if I check it on the meter?"

"No, no. Go ahead."

"All right. Is it an implant GPM? Is it an actual GPM? I get a read here also it's an actual GPM. What do you think about that?"

"Well, it could be. Yeah, as a matter of fact, it probably is. Oh, that's what that damn big black mass is floating over there - that's it." You understand?

But we know of the existence of this itsa maker line, you see. We know of the existence of the line between thetan we're auditing and his bank. We know of the existence of that line.

Now watch the first one again. "Is it an actual GPM? Is it an implant GPM?"

Pc says, "You know, I think this is an implant GPM. I can see the Helatrobus Implant grounds here."

"Oh, yes. Well, thank you. Thank you. Is it an actual GPM? An implant GPM?"

Now what, in effect, have you done? What have you in effect done? You've cut the itsa communication line, you have not permitted an itsa to flow on it, you have invalidated the thing that he is looking at and you have Cut his communication line to his own bank. Now, don't sit around afterwards and wonder why you have an ARC break. You know, that's how many lines are Cut by this simple, stupid action.

And yet you say, "It's the most obvious action in the world." And you say, "Well, Level IV is a very mechanical process. And you should do it just bang - bang - bang!" See? And all right, you're doing it bang - bang - bang! What gets in your road? This itsa maker line from the pc to his own bank. That gets in your road terribly! And you've also heard that you mustn't let him wander around on the backtrack because he'll overrestimulate himself and you won't get any tone arm action, see. So every time you find him looking at the backtrack, drop your E - Meter.

See, get his attention - get his attention over on you! And you won't get any TA. You'll just have ARC breaks galore, all the time! So just start inspecting the number of things you could do with a careless action of that particular character. You just refuted what he said, is what it looks like in the first place, but you'll be surprised the nuances that can exist with this sort of thing.

Now, it isn't for you simply to be careful, careful, careful from here on out not to commit these crimes. That is the wrong approach. You just know what it is and know how to handle it. Even a nitroglycerin expert gets so he takes a pint of a - flask of the stuff and shoves it in his hip pocket and goes out for a ride on a rocky road in an old Ford. And he never gets blown up. It's always somebody who wanders in carefully and stumbles over the cork that somebody's left around, see. That's the person that gets blown up, see?

You just move yourself up into the category of the nitroglycerin expert, that's all. You're handling very deadly stuff. All right - know what it is. Examine it. Get familiar with it. And you won't go on being careful all the time not to cut the pc's itsa line - you just won't. And on occasion you may find good reason to do so. You know what's going on.

Now, all sorts of things - things we used to call intuition, an intuitive sense - can suddenly be born in you just like that. You suddenly develop the facility of seeing that the pc is looking at something. You don't just neglect the whole existence of this itsa maker line. You just don't neglect the whole existence of the bank and just keep running it on the meter, running it on the meter, see. You glance up sideways with this walleyed look, one eye on the meter and the other on the pc, you see - with the reflection of the retina, this is done. And you notice - you notice that the pc is introverted. And you will know exactly what he's doing - he's looking at a piece of the bank. So you wont keep wondering if the pc has said everything he wanted to say about something. You'll have developed the facility of taking a look at the pc and see that he's looking at something and leave him alone until he's through looking at it.

And he'll be sitting there - and actually - actually, it's quite visible. The pc's sitting there and he's looking at you and he's rather foggy - eyed most of the time, let us say, since he's somewhat introverted. And you say, "All right, now. Is this your item?" Or "Is that the problem that you were worried about at that

time?" Or whatever the hell it is you're asking him. It doesn't matter, see. And you're saying this to him, "Is that your item?"

And the pc goes sort of, "Uh, yeah. Yeah. I think it is." See?

And you just get so you can tell. You hear me? You just get so you can tell when that inspection is taking place and not go, "Yeaow - yeaow - yeaow! Bark - bark - bark! Eba - eba - eba! Yelp - yelp - yelp, yap - yap - yap - yap - yap - yap - yap!"

Why do I say that? Because some auditors remind me of terriers or something of the sort of thing. What do they do? It's actually just like - if you visualized a piece of string over here from a thetan to his bank - it almost seems to the pc as though the second he starts to put this piece of string down to his bank, the auditor reaches over, grabs the end of it very hastily and puts it out here on the auditor. "This is where it ought to be. Now, what did you think about that? Where's the - why - why aren't you itsaing anything?" Got ahold of the piece of string, see? "Why aren't you itsaing anything Now, I'll put - put your - put this piece of string down on some part of your bank and tell me something about it. No, I'm not going to let it go. You just put it . .

The pc goes, "Oh, my God - what's happening to me?" you see. "What's happening?" Well, what's happening to him is, is the itsa maker line is being carefully held out - carefully pulled out from any possibility of bank inspection - and the pc is being given whatsits. That's the actual situation. It isn't that the pc - it looks to the pc, and he will say, that the auditor is asking whatsits and he's not being permitted to answer. That's what he usually feels is happening and that actually is usually not what is happening. The auditor is perfectly willing to have him answer. But the auditor's putting in whatsits while not permitting the pc to look for the answer in the bank. The auditor's carefully keeping this string from thetan to bank pulled out so that the bank end of the string is over here on top of the E - Meter, or into the session. And of course, your pc's out of session all the time, all the time, all the time. What's the definition of session, see? It's only willing to talk to the auditor. Just willing, you know. Not talking to the auditor. Just willing. And it's really not - and that definition could be revised and made better - it's not just "interested in own case," but "passing this inspection line over his own case" - not passing it over the auditor of the session.

Now, one of the things that you get as an auditor is when you've grabbed this line inadvertently - and oh, count on the fact that you're going to make two or three blunders with this per session when you are a complete expert, see. Actually profess - perfection on this is unobtainable because you're going along at a mad rate and you're trying to push along through and get a goals list finished by the end of the session or you're trying to sort out a service facsimile, little list that you have in front of you, don't you see?

And actually in Level IV - Level IV particularly - your nulling is done "Bark, bark, bark, bark, bark, bark, bark, bark." There are very few auditors can talk as fast as the meter can respond on nulling. You just get it out of your mouth and you're reading the next one, see. There's that tenth - of - a - second pause to let the meter read. Didn't read - that tenth - of - a - second told you so, you've said it very fast and very rapid. Man, I tell you, a good auditor - a good auditor can take a cracking awful big list and just mow it down, man.

And you're going down this list - and all of a sudden, why, the pc says, "Hey! I - I thought of another - I thought of another - I thought of another item. It's ëa cat whisker.' " See? Something like this.

And you're intent on going down the list. And the pc - you don't - you don't really get the pc's lift of his head, you see, and his "going to tell you," see. And if you just missed it entirely, you'd get a hell of an ARC break - but you pick it up just a little bit late, you see. It's just a little bit crude and crummy and you realize you've slid over the last ten nulling items without the pc's attention on the list or something wild - it's usually the last two or three, don't you see. You've goofed it up one way or the other.

Well, no matter how perfect you are, you're going to goof it up sometimes or another. Pc's going to be sitting there and you'd swear he was bright, bushy - tailed, right up in PT, answering the end of session, and then my God! He was examining - he was examining his session goals and you were trying to ask

him about his gains. You've overridden the pc's comm line. It's how adroitly you can wiggle out of what you get into, that is the mark of the expert. It's not staying out of everything.

Most of my auditing is highly swift and effective simply because it is very brassy. I know I can get a pc out of anything I get the pc into. And I know I'm not going to get the pc into any more than I can possibly help. So therefore, it just adds up to a "to hell with it." And I just know the factors I am dealing with and I shift those things round in a session - click, click, click, bing, bang. So this particular pair didn't quite mesh over here in the corner and the pc said, "Rrrrrr." And I'll trace it back to some auditing error I just made two seconds ago and so forth, patch the thing up in a hurry and I'm off and away, see.

One thing I do that I hope you will be able to acquire someday is spot the birth of an ARC break upwards to an hour and a half before it happens. Please develop that facility. Know - don't be so reasonable!

The pc is sort of saying, "Well, I don't know ... Well, you kept looking at the meter. And so on and so on. I don't really know whether this item was less yeaow - nya - wha - wha - wha - whaf..." And you start to see some of this kind of stuff and you all of a sudden - not be unnecessarily cautious - but you suddenly recognize it for what it is. You've chopped up this auditing comm cycle somehow or another. Somewhere it is missing. Somewhere something has gone wrong. Something has goofed somewhere, and right then - spot it and pick it up right now, without nulling fifteen more new additional lists, you see, and holding up the pc for the next five sessions, you know. Get that quick. Recognize an ARC broken pc. And recognize how slightly an ARC break registers when it is actually beginning to form and pick it up then - don't ARC break the pc in order to find out.

Well, there are several ways to do that. One of them is not ARC break pcs. As I've just told you, that is next to impossible. Your own auditing enthusiasms will cause you to ARC break pcs. My God! I pulled one the other day you would have gotten an infraction sheet for and so on. I saw very clearly that on a list an item had rocket read and blown down which was not the right item. It was the very exact item which the pc was madly listing for, and the pc was actually tending to go into a strain on an overlist of trying to get this item on the list - and I said, "You just put this item down on the list just before this. Could it be it?"

And the pc said, "Why yes, I guess so. Put it on the list," and immediately was a little bit nattery about the pen scratching. And I took the item right back off the list and put it back on the other list and continued the pc and we got another one - and the item that was on that list, if accepted, would have missed two RIs. It came up two lists later as the right item. And the one which was the right item was very resistant. It was one of these - well, I'll say - tell you what the item was - torture. Very resistant item. You'd call the thing and it wouldn't - wouldn't fire. It'd start to fire. It - every once in a while you find some kind of a goofball situation like this. And you call it and it - blhblhblh - it doesn't quite fire. And it won't let go. And it goes, ssshhhk! It looks like it's up against springs. And ordinarily you say that's - that's not the right item - it's slightly misworded or something. In this particular case, after we'd listed enough charge off, the pc continued to assert that was the item and suddenly I called it, and it fired like mad and blew down. In other words, it had to be unburdened a bit by listing before the thing fired.

This is a very peculiar thing. Happens the tops of GPMs are very hard to run. They don't fire well and so on - the tone arm tends to stay high. You get four pairs deep into a GPM and it's running just like a river of hot butter, see - there's nothing to it. Those first few sometimes are quite resistant. So, what's the auditor trying to do? The auditor's trying to be too confounded helpful, and it was helpful to a point of actually evaluating and putting an item on the pc's list for him. Well, that's absolutely forbidden, see - absolutely forbidden. And yet there I sat with my big, blue eyes wide open and wanted to help the pc so bad that I just called attention to the fact that we'd had a firing, blowing down item on the previous list - k - k - k - k - k - k - k.

Now, that ARC break could have gone into considerable proportions. But recognizing that the ARC break had succeeded after an auditing action, see - immediately after the auditing action - picked the item up and put it right back where it came from. The ARC break went - pheeeew - that was that. It didn't even get a chance to form, see. See, there was just that beginning of the critical cycle, beginning of attention on the auditor. Now, this is not important, and I'm not talking to you about ARC breaks or beefs. I'm allowed a good, big, juicy mistake every thousand hours of auditing. That's - I insist on being allowed that. But the

point I'm making is here - is apparently it was a wrong item that was causing the ARC break. Actually, that really wasn't the beginning of the ARC break. That pc was very introverted inspecting the bank.

Now, let's look at this inspection line. Exactly what happened to the pc's line from pc to bank, see? Just look at that line. Lets see how mucked up things got from the standpoint of that line. This line being invisible to the auditor, don't you see, you've got to synthesize what's going on and you'll rapidly learn how to do that if you realize that it's simply a line scanning over things in the bank. It isn't just a unit area, by the way - think, think, thinking. You know that. It's an actual line. It's between this bright spot called a thetan, the real beingness of the being - whether its parked in his head or he's extravagantly detached on a reverse flow exteriorization - we don't care where he is. He is looking from that bright spot. He is that bright spot - and he is looking at a thing! He is looking at a thing! It's as - it's as real as a pencil, don't you see.

And the bank is all laid out geographically, and it has numbers - a finite number of things in it as far as types of things in it - a finite number. And that line is stretched from where he is to one of those things. Well, what happened when I said, "This item appeared on two lists back"? What happened to the itsa maker line? The line from the pc to his own bank. What did I do with that line? Apparently, I picked up the line and put it on the auditor - took it off the bank suddenly and put it on the auditor. Now that was a sudden change or shift of attention, wasn't it? Well, we call it a shift of attention - actually, it was a sudden shift of the target of this line. Here's the line deeply engrossed in inspecting the bank, see. All of a sudden, auditor picks that line up and puts it over on the auditor and then moves it back two lists ago in the GPM just done two lists ago. Here's two shifts of attention - sudden shifts of attention - and then puts it over here someplace to recognize that an item has been missed because, of course, this other item was being suggested as a substitute for the right item. So there must have been a realization of that - but by this time the pc must have been pretty confused. So the pc, then, in defense of this confusion, picks up the inspection line - puts it on the auditor and says, "Your pen is making too much noise." See that?

What can be itsaed around here with certainty? Something about the auditor can be itsaed with certainty because the auditor has inhibited anything that should have been itsaed, being itsaed. You got it?

Now, there's probably a dozen different ways that an auditor can accomplish these things. There are probably thousands of different ways - we probably haven't dreamed them all up. If you don't learn this well, we give you the assignment of finding out how many ways each one of the communication auditing cycle lines can be cut by a new Academy student. I think you will find out they run probably thousands per line - they're probably fantastic numbers. It's easy to find out how to handle them right. That's the easier part of it. How many ways can they be cut? Enormous numbers.

You can refute, you can invalidate the itsa - the thing being itsaed - you can refute the communication line on which it is traveling. Like, "Don't talk to me now because I am busy writing your auditor's report." This is done in various ways. "Don't talk to me now because I'm busy trying to keep track of the auditor's reports." It's a - it can come about as a very studious action: a sort of a little tiny frown at the pc and then an enormously industrious writing, you see, of one character or another and reading over the meter and the pc's going on talking. Don't look at the pc and keep on doing this and so forth. Eventually, the pc begins to realize that you're not really writing anything that has anything to do with him and accommodatingly follows the auditor's order.

And the pc nearly always follows the auditor's orders one way or the other. You would be surprised how obedient pcs are. The bank is 100 percent under the control of any auditor at any time. And the pc - the greatest percentage of the time - is doing exactly what the auditor apparently wants. But get that "apparently." Now, the auditor can say, "Put your attention on the ceiling and point to the floor." Now, the pc will do what the au - what he thinks the auditor apparently wants. Now, if the gesture is more forceful than the voice, the pc will look at the floor. You say, "Look at the ceiling." And the pc - the A greater than B, B greater than A, don't you see - will have a tendency to, "Well, he's saying look at the ceiling but he wants me to look at the floor," see. He gets confused doing this, but he obeys - he obeys, you might say, the most forceful apparent order.

Auditors' main goofs are made up in giving apparent orders that he doesn't intend to give. He doesn't intend to give these orders at all. For instance, you would never tell a pc, "Now stop inspecting your bank

and put it on the E - Meter." That would be idiotic because there'd be no itsa and there'd be no TA if you asked this thing. And yet what is this apparent order? What's the apparent order there? "Take your attention off your bank and put it on the E - Meter," see - that's the apparent order.

The pc will nearly always follow an apparent order. Now, the bank is very idiotic and is always under the auditor's orders and will do what the auditor says. Therefore, it takes the auditor's whatsit and guidance of the pc's inspection line of the bank, you see - the itsa maker line - it takes both of those activities in order to get a bank inspected, see. So the auditor and the pc have got to be working very close together, and if the auditor cuts this line - this is going back to The Original Thesis, explaining some of the things in there, see - now, if the auditor cuts this line from the pc to his bank, of course, he's now apparently brought the bank in on top of the pc and done other things which are undesirable. But he usually is giving orders he doesn't intend to give. Nobody is going to argue with the goodwill or the good heart of an auditor. The only thing I ever find any fault with is occasional knuckleheadedness. That knuckleheadedness can be pretty gorgeous. I just gave you an example of it. And yet any auditor is suddenly liable to this sort of thing.

Well, I'll give you another example. I'll have to run out all of this invalidation of my auditing after this lecture. But I did this inadvertently the other day in a session - don't think you won't. This wouldn't happen to you once in a blue, blue, blue moon that the pc can hear the pencil squeaking.

That's why you use a special type of pencil that doesn't squeak.

So I'm busy writing the list, and the ball-point ran out of ink. This wouldn't happen to you again in a long time, see. Ball-points do run out of ink, and you always have a spare ball-point around, don't you? So I hastily reached over to where the other ball-point was handy and picked it up, and at this moment there wouldn't have been any slightest squawk, you see, there wasn't a tremble in the session, see. And I picked up the other ball-point, brought it over here, and it had just enough ink in it to write one more item. We still didn't have too much randomity going in the session, you see. Auditor beginning to sweat just a little bit about this time. I laid aside this ball-point, but the other ball-point was over on another table barely within the auditor's reach - a different color ball-point, see. Barely within - but there was a ball-point over there - over the top of a pile of paper. So as not to disturb the pc's attention, very carefully reached over to pick up this ball-point and I said, "Well, I'm going to win after all on this," you see. And had to stretch just a little bit out of the auditing chair, and went out of the auditing chair. Happen to you once in a blue moon. I don't think I've done a goof like that for ages and ages. Concatenation of silly circumstances, one on top of the other.

And what do you think happened to the pc's itsa line? Well, the pc's whole motion was not to ARC break, but to keep the auditor from falling out of the chair. And got a motion and locked up a bunch of effort in the middle of the session, you know, of trying to pick the auditor up when the auditor went down. It took a couple of minutes to undo all this and we went on going at a - at a rate because I recognized that something had happened there that had to be undone.

All right. That's a very unsmooth but unlooked - for happenstance. Well, if I can do them, man, so can you. So the thing to know how to do is pick it up at once, straighten it out at once, and get the show on the road again without any more nonsense. Because, frankly, anything is liable to happen to you in an auditing session.

An auditor who feels absolutely serene and secure that all is going to go well from here on out - or if an auditor has allergies to anxieties or unpredictable circumstances occurring in a session - he ought to go to an old ladies' home or something and retire, because it's going to happen. The things that have happened to auditors - some guy's halfway through a screaming grief charge of one kind or another and somebody hears him down the block and the relatives come up screaming up to the door, pounding on the door, trying to get in to find out how Bill is being murdered or Joe is being shot or something, see. This has happened, happened, happened.

Now, how does an auditor keep his aplomb, handle the situation, repair the shift of attention of the pc - what does he do? How many things can he do to straighten it out? Well, actually, there's a lot of things he can do to straighten it out. In the first place, he audits smoothly so that when he does audit, he gets lots of

TA. Got that? That's a marvelous cushion on which to operate, see. When something does happen - when it bothers the pc, but not otherwise - you know, occasionally a water tank can fall off the roof and come right down through the shingles, and the pc says, "Oh," and goes on and saying, "and then I - then I - then I said to Agnes. . ." See? You'll learn this - this goes all the way up to Level IV. Don't you ever fool with a case that is running nicely, see. Case is running like a well - oiled dream, you've got the PT going - you're going down the line. The only trouble that's going to occur from there on is actually goofs you make. Case is running fine - don't patch up a case. Don't patch up a case that's running well.

Case you want to patch up is a ease that isn't running well, and you only patch it up when it isn't running well. So if the roof has fallen in or the auditor has reached out of his chair for a pencil that was out of reach and fallen on the floor, the first thing you must learn to observe is: Did it move the itsa maker line all that much? Did it affect or influence the pc? That's the first thing you learn, because if it didn't you're not going to repair it. Because, look, your effort to repair something that did not upset the pc can itself disturb the itsa maker line and all other communication lines to such a degree that you can cause an ARC break. Because what are you doing'.? You're cleaning a clean. You're handling an ARC break that didn't occur. "How did you feel about the water tank falling off of the roof and coming down through the shingles and so forth?"

"Oh, did it?"

Do you realize it might be a considerable mistake to ask the pc how he felt about the water tank falling through the roof ?

Many auditors are so conscience - stricken - there is nothing like having no conscience to be an auditor, see. Because an auditor gets so conscience - stricken sometimes, he gets so worried - well, I've gotten worried, you've gotten worried about cases you were running - but gets so worried, it causes the pc in - to go into just a spin of worry. Gets so worried about the case that he's putting in a whatsit - a whatsit all the time on the pc. He's ask - the pc's saying, "Well, what's wrong? What's wrong? What's wrong'.? What's wrong. What's wrong What's wrong?" The pc isn't doing an itsa. The pc doesn't have his communication line into his own bank, everything. He's got a communication line from where he is to where the auditor is, wondering, "What does the auditor think is wrong? What does the auditor think is wrong?" He's trying to itsa the auditor's confusions or banks. Well, that isn't what the pc's for. That isn't what the pc's supposed be doing, don't you see? So it goes this nonsensically. If the pc's itsa maker line from the thetan to the bank is there and is functioning and your TA is moving, if a fire engine comes through the front window and it didn't seem to interrupt the session as far as you could tell - not by asking the pc but just by casual observation - you simply ask the next auditing question, because case repair also interrupts various sections and portions of the auditing cycle.

In other words, there's no substitute for auditing but auditing. And you only repair auditing when it isn't occurring. If you haven't got any auditing occurring, you better find out how you're going to get some auditing occurring. You can't get any auditing occurring, well, repair the case and get some auditing occurring. But it's in more or less that order, not the order of "there sits a case, let's repair it."

"Now let's see. I know this ease - this case had Georgie Burns for, you see, an auditor in 1958, and I've been audited by Georgie, and uh - huh - huh - huh - huh. And Georgie has this horrible habit of saying, ëYip' all the time in the session. Every time she acknowledges she also says, ëYip.' And I know that was very annoying to my pc, so the first thing to do is to repair Georgie Burns's auditing in 1958." All this without any investigation of the case at all. Well, that's repairing the case before you've got - before you find anything is wrong with the ease, you see.

And you only repair cases when something's wrong with them. The case is running well with good TA, why move the ease around? That's the way to stop TA. Why? Because you pick up this itsa maker line, move it out of the area it's in and move it into some other area, and you suddenly bog the pc down. You get him into areas he can't itsa or he isn't able to itsa or there's nothing there to itsa or they're all cleaned up or - you get the idea?

So this pc's sitting there - I can see it now, you see - the pc's sitting there happily inspecting his bank and he's running a service facsimile. You're getting about forty, fifty TA divisions per two and a half hours of

session, TA flying beautifully. This explains the pc's fantastic penchant for burning dinners, see. And it's got - it's all going along fine, and all of a sudden, why, some auditing supervisor says - in the HGC or something, says, "Oh, have you taken care of that pc's lumbosis? Well, you know she came in here originally to get her lumbosis fixed up?" And the auditor, being very nice and sweet and obedient about the whole thing, turns around and starts working on the lumbosis at eight TA divisions per session. Lumbosis isn't going to resolve. That's a shift of the whole program of the case. Well, get that as a broad shift - it would be tremendous error, wouldn't it? Now let's move it down to a very short error. Auditor is sitting there, the pc is looking in an introverted fashion at a field of cows, you know. And he says, "Cows. I've seen a cow in this lifetime - cows, cows, yes, cows and so forth and cows and so on. Cows. I wonder what this countryside is like here. Cows - cows..." TA moving, TA starting to move.

The last whatsit the auditor got in on the case, you see - the last whatsit the auditor got on the case was "How would baking bread make others wrong?" And finds out that the pc is inspecting all these cows. He says, "Now, let's get back to what we were talking about there." Getting TA action, see, inspecting cows. "Let's get it back to what we were talking about there, and we were talking about baking bread making others wrong. Baking bread making others wrong. You've got the auditing question now." TA - clank! Dead still. What happened? Well, actually, the auditor thought the pc was probably being non sequitur. Trying to push the pc's attention, see - this line, this itsa maker line - over to baking bread. But he's got TA action, and it was just around the corner that the pc was going to cognite that bread and milk, you see, go hand in glove together. Big cognition's about to occur, and he'd been a ranch cook, see. He'd been a ranch cook but never, never, never had they ever had any milk to make bread with! This is right around the corner. If that attention line is just let go, just that - TA moving, everything's fine. The auditor all of a sudden - one way or the other, by a thousand different mechanisms - suddenly picks up that attention line, puts it on something else, you see? TA - no motion. Why? There's nothing there to make any motion, you see.

This is something like a guy's sweeping a street, see. And you walk up to him and you say, "Give me that broom. All right. Sweep the street."

"Well, you got my broom. You got my broom."

"Well, you don't want that broom down on the pavement. Just - broom's suppose to be over here - be over here on the curb. Now, all right, we've got it here on the curb. Now sweep the street."

"Yeah, but - I got to have my broom. I mean, you know, how can I give you any - huh - huh - huh. How can I sweep the street with you - with the broom - ?" so forth.

"Now, look. Now, look. I know what's best with this broom. I know what's best with this broom. After all, this is street cleaning department property and it must be preserved, and we're supposed to keep it over here on the curb and so forth. Now, sweep the street!"

You can see the nervous wreck that becomes the street cleaner. That's what you're actually doing to a pc. Pick up the pc's attention line one way or the other - grab it, hold on to it and then tell him, "Look at the bank now. Yeah, here, give me that line. Yeah, yeah - let's - let's - let's give me some itsa. Where's your itsa now?"

"Well, I uh - I uh - so forth, and I think it has something to do with this facsimile . . ."

"Oh, oh, bbbzzz - the facsimile - oh ho - ho - ho - ho - no, no, no, we got to look at something else. Now, give me some itsa. Whatsit? Whatsit? Whatsit? Uh - uh - give - give me that line. Give me that - give me that communication line. Now, but don't - don't - don't - don't start moving any attention lines inside your bank now. And give me some itsa, see. Whatsit? Whatsit? Whatsit? Don't look. Whatsit?"

Well, you can figure many ridiculous examples on how an auditor can do this. As soon as you get these things taped, all of a sudden auditing just is - just - it's just very relaxing. And on Level IV, it is very, very industrious, but you're doing an excellent job the whole way of directing the pc's attention. You're getting that line directed because the materials of IV permit that direction. It's a very precise direction. If

it's not precisely directed, God help you. It's something like shooting sixteen - inch guns, you see, without any pointers. Everything gets blown up if you don't point them in the right direction.

But this is the essence of the auditing you were doing, and any real trouble you're having with auditing, there's some misconception of these various communication lines or what you're doing with the pc's itsa maker line or something like this. Tell the guy to itsa something, then not let him look at anything to itsa, he'd go berserk. He itsas something - don't accept it. Say it must be something else. Something like this. Keep this rattledy - bang going up somehow or another - you get no TA and you get no auditing done and everybody goes around the bend.

All right. But I know you're not doing any of the things which I have been remarking. I know we're all agreed that I'm the only one that's making any auditing mistakes lately. So you go ahead and do a good job, huh?

All right. Thank you very much.