

FLATTENING A PROCESS

A lecture given on
19 March 1964

How are you today? Good. Thank you.

What's the date?

Audience: 19th of March.

19 March. 19 March, 14.

All right with you if I begin this lecture now?

What would you like to know about today? Anything you want to know?

Well, in view of the fact that you have no preference, I'll talk to you about auditing. And this is some of the basic know-hows of auditing.

Somewhere along the line, many an auditor lays aside some of his basic information on the subject of auditing. He hides it under his E-Meter, or something of the sort, and starts doing something silly and then wonders all of a sudden why he's having trouble. And it's very interesting how silly some of these things can be.

Now, there was a subject called flattening a process. Now, this has been mostly forgotten. It's even part of the Auditor's Code, but it gets forgotten. It gets forgotten.

And what you need to know about this—what you need to know about this—is that there are two aspects to ending a process. There are two aspects to this thing, and they are both concerned with what are you doing with the process? That's the main question. What are you doing with the process?

Well, what you are doing with it tells you how to end it and how you can end it. And these two things are: you're trying to fix up the PC so he can be audited—that's number one—and number two, you are trying to audit the PC. And they give you two different endings.

Now, you can see at once that number one is basically concerned with rudiments.

“You got a present time problem?”

“Well, yeah, I have a present time problem. So on, so on and so on.”

“All right. Very good. All right.”

“And I—yeah, I did. I had an awful problem and so forth. And well, I guess it was mostly my fault.” Cognition, see? Serves as a cognition.

“All right. Do you have a present time problem?” No, you don't get any read on the meter, you don't anything, and that's the end of that process. What was the process? Well, the process was just doing enough to cure the elsewhere-ness of the PC. Trying to get him into the room.

Now, if you don't know that there are two different directions in processing, then you will seldom have a PC in front of you to be audited. And you will never finish a cycle of action. Let me show you what happens to a cycle of action. You start in a Prepcheck on “gooper feathers,” you see? You start in this Prepcheck on “gooper feathers” (that's the fuzz from peaches). And

you start this thing and you got it going in the session on the twelfth; and you got it going and you got one or two buttons in.

And the PC comes into the next session with a big present time problem about Los Angeles or something. So now you run a process about the present time problem in Los Angeles, and you get a couple of buttons in on that.

But he comes to the session the next time, you see, with an even worse problem, you see, about Seattle. So you audit the problem about Seattle, so forth. Well, that's just because you as an auditor wouldn't know the purpose of your tools.

You got a little hatful of tools that takes out of the road what is getting in your road in trying to complete a cycle of action on your PC. You have no business whatsoever—present time problem, storm, rain, night, income tax, any other catastrophe, see?—you have no business whatsoever permitting any present time catastrophe to get in the road of your auditing.

Well, you've been presented with a little kit and it says on it, "How to get the PC going in a session." And included in that is keying out, knocking out, destimulating, getting rid of the things which have him so distracted that you can't go on. Now, if you never use that kit, you will do nothing but Q and A, you will do nothing but leave unseat cycles of action.

Do you see what happens? You get something started in session A, and the PC comes into session B and he's got a present time problem about something or other, and he's just had a big cognition that what's really wrong with his lumbosis is something or other—so you audit this!

No! No, no, no, please! Please, please, please! What in essence have you done? You have mistaken your tools. Made a complete bust as far as what you're supposed to be doing is concerned.

You got this big set of tools over here, you understand? And they got hydraulic high-pressure drills and dump trucks and all that sort of thing. That's all sitting over here, you see? And you got this little bunch of shiny instruments of some kind or other over here, and they're just supposed to get something out of the road fast, see?

And the PC comes in, "Oh, I had this big cognition about once upon a time in Los Angeles. Wof-wof-wog!" You're halfway through this Prepcheck on gooper feathers, you see? So look! Look—look how idiotic it is. You reach for these dump trucks and hydraulic drills over here to handle this problem about Los Angeles!

Oh man, you know, just sad. It's sad! All you need is this little whisk broom. See? You're supposed to take this problem and this cognition and you're just supposed to take this little whisk broom, the little kit that comes in on top, about half the size of the tool box on the hydraulic drill, see? You're supposed to take this little kit, and you take out the little brush out of it, and you go fat, oft, oft. That's the end of that process, see? And you put that back in again and you say, "All right, now. On the subject of gooper feathers—on gooper feathers, in this lifetime, has anything been . . ." And then we're away. You understand?

So, it's just basically making a mistake in the purpose of the tools. And therefore, this leads an auditor into this kind of nonsense: Well, he's always had trouble—he's always had trouble with his back. So for some reason or other, we're doing a Prepcheck on his back. I don't say this is a good process or a bad process, you see, but we're doing a Prepcheck on his back. And we're going to end this after five minutes on a cognition? Hey! What's this? Now, that is, we have shoved the hydraulic drills and the dump trucks over here, and we've picked up this little tiny kit. And we've got this thing that's bothered him all of his whole lifetime, and we've taken this little brush out of the kit and we've gone flick, flick, and nothing happens, see? So we kind of brush the brush off, see? And we take this other little thing and brush at it and nothing happens. And we say, "Well, auditing doesn't work."

See, you're using the wrong pickax. You see what I mean? Naw. Really, you have to audit a thing proportionately to the amount of trouble it has given the PC

So there are two ways to end a process, and they all depend on what you're trying to do So, we're processing this guy on gooper feathers. Big Prepcheck in progress. It's all compounded with all kinds of oddities, ramifications and cognitions, and it's going on and on and on and on and on. Well now, that is done only with one blunt instrument called a tone arm. And that tells you when it is flat.

And you, frankly, have to unflatten the whole subject before you flatten it. He's got it beautifully suppressed. That's tone arm flattening. And today you only flatten with the tone arm while using dump trucks, hydraulic drills and so forth.

You're handling the big case. You're handling the big stuff of the case. And you handle that by tone arm. And that is how you end the process, and that is the one) way you end the process. And that is auditing with an exclamation point! That's main-session auditing! All done with the TA.

Rudiment-type auditing is simply there to have an undistracted, comfortable PC who is happy about sitting in the chair and getting the main performance on. And that's rudiment-type processing. And what I've seen of your auditor's reports, what I've heard of your auditor's reports, in recent times . . . I may be very unjustly cruel. Maybe I am being cynical and sardonic, professorially "sneeresque," but the truth of the matter is, I think you are using rudiment approach to main-session processing. I think you've gotten it mixed up to the point where you take the main-session process, the big Prepcheck "on . . .," and you're ending it as though it were a rudiment process, as though you were merely trying to get the PC to sit still so he could be audited. How much auditing do you think you're really going to accomplish? You're not going to accomplish very much, because you're using the wrong ending.

So, you take this big thing over here: you're going to get rid of this bad back, you see? And "On a back, has anything been suppressed?" See?

"No, I don't think so," PC says.

I would sit there with my eyes rather wide open, as an auditor. "Does your back bother you or doesn't it?"

"Well, yes, it bothers me."

"Don't you think someplace in your lifetime, somewhere or another in your lifetime, in some place or another, there's a—for instance, did you ever have any accidents with it when you were a kid? Something like that? You ever have anything going on?" You know, a restimulation.

And the guy gives away, "I guess I have! Must have, because I have a bad back now."

"All right, now you let me repeat this question: On a bad back, or on a back—now, listen to me carefully now. Listen to this auditing question. Listen now: On a back, has anything been suppressed? Suppressed? You got that now? Got the question? All right, now go ahead and answer that question. Got it now?" Huh, we're away for the long haul, man.

Now, this is the reverse.

That's the main session. That's the big-show way of getting this thing on the line, see? That's the way of getting it all squared! Now, get this approach. Just get this other, brush-off approach: "Well, you say your back has been troubling you. All right. Is that a present time problem?"

“Uh . . . yes, it is. Heh! Come to think about it, it is!”

“Well, good. You’ve had a cognition. That’s the end of the session.”

Do I make my “pernt?” You got to get in there and sweat!

You’re going to see a lot of auditing by lists. This is moving up. The first auditing by lists we saw was O/W, and so forth, but there are many types of lists that can be designed. And I’ve got this right on the assembly line for HGCs: auditing by list. It’s auditing by list, not ARC Break Assessments by list. But you could use an ARC Break Assessment sheet to audit by list, you see? But you do it differently. It’s handled like old R2H was. Take each point that you get a read on up with the PC, see?

So you take this old O/W, this list of overts, you know? The old Johannesburg—the Joburg Sec Check list.

Well, do you know that by very carefully modulating your voice and making no impingement on the PC—being very careful not to make any impingement on the PC; covering the questions in a sort of a throwaway tone of voice, you see?—“You ever stolen anything?” “Ah, I guess not,” so on. “Well, that’s fine. That’s flat. Nothing to that. All right. Did you ever work under an assumed name? Of course you wouldn’t; I know that, and so on. So we’ve got that. Well, that’s flat.”

“Uh . . . it’s all flat. It’s all flat. It’s all flat. Oh, this fellow’s passed his Prepcheck!”

I’ve seen Herbie here almost, just growing sparks out of his head on the subject of checking out somebody who has been sec checked on that old Joburg list, you see? Keow!

As an auditor you should be able to make an impingement. So the instructor checking the thing out, with that altitude, fixes the person who is being checked out for a clean sheet, you see, with a gimlet eye and says, “Have you ever worked under an assumed name?” Pow! The meter blows up, see?

The poor student says, “Why didn’t that happen to me?” See?

You know, “That’s a flunk! flunk! flunk! Your checksheet is not complete! You’ve got to do this whole case over again,” you know?

“What’s happened to me?” You know? “How come? How come?”

Well, he didn’t bother to restimulate anything to pick up, that was how come!

Well, now, in main-session auditing, that which fits between the start of the body of the session and the end of the body of the session, that sort of stuff is laid in with a club! You purposely restimulate what you are trying to pick up! You don’t want this to end in a hurry, you want this auditing to go on for a while.

Now, this auditing that occurs outside of the body of the session, you know, in the rudiments: that is just “Well, you don’t have a present time problem, do you? Good. Ah, thank you!” That’s the approach you use, then. You restimulate nothing.

“Well, you look pretty good! How are you doing? Ah, you’re doing all right. All right. Is it okay with you if we start the body of the session?”

I know you don’t have that in your Model Session right now, but I’m putting it down here as emphasis, and maybe it ought to be put into Model Session to show you where the “club” fits!

But first, before that starts, you see, that's just "Well. All right. Well, your tone arm is nice and loose here. Tone arm seems to be low, rather. And your needle's nice and loose and everything seems to be okay. Ah, nothing worrying you is it? All right, all right. Good. Good. Good. I'm glad of that. Yeah. All right. Oh, you say you do have a present time problem? What was it about? Ah . . . oh, yeah? Yeah? All right. Yeah? All right. All right. Good. Good. All right. Well, how's the present time problem now? That didn't read. All right.

"Now. Now, is it all right with you if we get to work here on this subject of gooper feathers that we were prepchecking, now? You had any thoughts about this since the last time I audited you there, you know? Have you gone over this in your mind? Any—any improvement at all on the subject of anything? So forth? Oh, you have, huh?"

(Restimulation, see? Getting his mind, getting his main concentration.)

"Oh, you have, huh? Oh, is that so! Yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah. You tell me you used to—telling me you used to have nightmares about this. Did you have a nightmare about it or anything like that last night? Oh, yeah? Yeah? Is that so?"

"Well, let's see. We've gotten along here pretty well down on the subject—we've gotten on to 'suggested' here pretty well. And I think your last answer to this had something to do with . . . What was your last answer to that?"

"Oh, yeah, yeah, yeah. Well, that was on the subject. Yeah. All right. Well, here's the next question on that. Here's the next question on that: On gooper feathers, has anything been suggested? You got that question? All right. Good. Now, on gooper feathers, has anything been suggested?"

All right. And here we go, watching that tone arm. It's just sitting there, taking down the tone arm reads and keeping the PC going. And the PC finally says, "Well, that isn't any more. There—it just that—there isn't any more. I haven't got any more answers to that. I'm protesting the question."

"All right. Is this question being protested? I'm sorry, there's no read there. Ah . . . now, what else might we have run into on this? You might run into something else there that you haven't told me or something like that? Did I miss an answer or something of this sort? Oh, I did miss a 'suggest' answer? Oh, all right. Well, good. Thank you. I'm glad we got that cleared up. And here's your next question: On gooper feathers, has anything been suggested?"

Get the idea? You're just keeping it in there, man! Keeping that in the groove. Keeping that grinding on and on and on, see? Tone arm action. When do you leave it? Needle isn't flashing around anymore and tone arm isn't blowing down on this particular subject—well, let's unload!

Tone arms have tendencies to go very, very quiet. I give you something like a twenty-minute test. That's a little bit cruel on the PC sometimes. An auditor can tell when a tone arm is flat: It isn't moving. Also, when you tend to flatten one of these things the meter starts to look gummy.

You can tell when they're flat. Shift to your next question.

You're trying to cover a subject in the main body of the session, and you are trying to recover a PC for your session in the rudiment approach. So realize that there are two targets for auditing in a session. And that gives you two different endings. You don't want this PC to be dispersed out of what you are already doing, so you put in a rudiment-type approach. "Since the last time I audited you, has anything been suppressed?" Well, you spend fifteen, twenty minutes getting in those "since" BMRs—oh, marvelous! Marvelous! That's good! Now you can start in your main session.

But it is not with the same approach! You're not doing the same thing.

I could be very cruel at this point and say, "Well, I want to congratulate most auditors, because they've gotten up to a point now, to where they are ready to learn how to run the body of a session, having handled rudi—. " That'd be a shade too cruel, wouldn't it? Bitter! Bitter.

But I watch this; I watch this consistently. And I notice that auditors vary in this approach. And they very often start treating body-of-session material as though they're just rudiments. And believe me, they don't do very much for PCs. In fact, they damage PCs. How? By leaving unflat cycles of action.

If you really want to lash a PC around the telegraph pole, man, just start cycle of action after cycle of action and don't flatten any of them. You just get enough cycles of action unflat on your PC and he'll be in a mess.

Let me give you some idea of how to really sock a PC. Let's take Class VI. Not because we have to reach into that zone. Because that is the most brutal area, where things stand up in tremendously bold relief. You make some mistakes in that area and you know it. You get the evidence immediately. The little men in—the ambulance backs up to the door, don't you see? And it's quite embarrassing. The neighbors talk.

You start to sort out goal A, but you don't sort it out; and then you get interested in goal B. but you never bring it to a conclusion. And then you wonder if something is happening with the E-Meter, because you don't seem to be able to get any reads. (In other words, you really can't think of anything to ask the PC that gets a read on it.) So you start asking some questions about the E-Meter. But you really don't clean up the subject of the E-Meter, don't you see? And then you wonder if there's any wrong goals that the person has had that are troubling him, but you really don't find all of those and clean those up.

And believe me, about that time the PC practically goes straight through the bottom of the chair. He will be dealing with a "wog" and he'll be turning on pain. He will be turning on dizziness. The corners of the room will start going out of plumb on him. He can't focus the auditor. The winds of space start blowing his eyeballs into the back of his skull. You know you've done it!

And what happened? It's just incomplete cycle of action followed by an incomplete cycle of action, followed by an incomplete cycle of action, followed by an incomplete cycle of action. You really didn't do anything wrong. You just didn't do anything complete. And that all by itself will wind a PC up in a ball.

Well now, that's a very exaggerated level, but things stand out in such bas-relief at that level that it brought me around to inspecting the lower levels of auditing. And I found out that the lower levels of auditing are peculiarly subject to this, but it's not so dramatic. In other words, it takes a while for it to sneak up. And you don't see it all in twenty minutes of auditing, you see? You see it over a year's worth of auditing. You get lots less action. And the PC is just feeling sort of groggy these days. He just doesn't feel too good, and so forth.

Well, if you were to take almost any PC in the place and say, "Has any process ever been left unflat on you?" and you just ran that as a process . . . Don't Q and A with him and try to flatten any of the processes, just run a process, "Has any process ever been left unflat on you?" And you'll see your PC start brightening up. Somebody who's had quite a lot of auditing, he'll start brightening up. Even though it is not serious on his case, it is quite capable of producing a considerable improvement or result.

He'll give you the considerations concerning it just as a matter of fact of the question. But it's just a repetitive-question process.

Now, what do you think happens when you start a Prepcheck on gooper feathers and shift over to a bad back before gooper feathers are flat? And get into a bad back and then get into this and

get into that. All kinds of oddball things start occurring. The PC's ability to be prepchecked starts blowing up, amongst other things. PC can't be prepchecked easily anymore. The auditing tool starts getting all blunted up and messed up. Oh, I think that's quite remarkable. The tool has been abused.

Now, you can put in bad comm cycle with an auditing tool also, like Prepchecking, and get the tool very badly blunted up. So that you can actually prepcheck Prepchecking. See? Prepchecking. Just put in all the Prepcheck buttons on Prepcheck.

"On Prepchecking . . ." and so forth. You can do this several ways. "On suppress, has anything been suppressed? Has anything been invalidated?" you know? Put in all the buttons on suppress. There are several ways you could go about this. Just as a general subject, put in all the buttons, you see? As each button.

It's quite remarkable. I've seen a case all hung up in a mess on the subject of a goals checkout and so forth, till somebody was suddenly bright enough to say, "On suppress, has anything been suppressed?" All of a sudden it's an operating button again. Quite a remarkable revelation.

But the basic reason the button goes out is an incomplete cycle of action.

Now, you should, as an auditor, be very, very well aware of this thing called a cycle of action. It predicates this one basis: that things have a point where they start, that they have a period when they continue and that there is a point when they end. blow, that is a cycle of action. It's your create-survive-destroy cycle of action. It's start, change and stop.

Actually, you could put it down probably less effectively as a philosophic definition, but more workably, as a start and an action and a stop. See? A start and an action and a stop. You could be more explicit by saying "a start, an action which then continues, and then a stop." And that is a cycle of action. That is just in that whole line.

Life is probably cruel because things seldom stop. There is a great deal of thought put into continuation. Continuance is one of the bugs that thetans are addicted to. They like to see things continue.

And you've got actions going right now which began with the beginning of the universe and nobody has stopped them since. See? They've never been stopped. And that alone gives the longevity and mass of the physical universe. Actions which were begun were never unbegun, you know, or stopped. Time itself is probably some basic agreed-upon postulate which nobody has ever thought the end of, so you've still got time, you see?

Now, these things, of course, are done by postulate, but at a low level an individual is subject to them. And any case is subject to the cycle of action. Maybe he will get up to a point sooner or later where he is above the cycle of action. Oh, I say maybe: Yes, undoubtedly! Class VI, we've got all the stuff to put him there. And you get such oddities as a guy being able to move around in time. This is one of the more peculiar aspects of high-level action. You're not fixed in a time span. You can widen your time span almost at will. And there doesn't have to be anything there in the past time, but you can be in that past-time period, and so on.

It gives you all sorts of involvement's. For instance, you can be at the event while it is occurring by having been in the future and come back to it, and undo it before it goes on. It's very confusing.

Well, because it's confusing and because it's upsetting . . . Let's take two armies fighting each other. And army A attacks army B. So therefore army B knows that if it is in this position where it is being attacked at the time it is attacked, why, then, it will be attacked. So the thing to do is to be in yesterday and not march to that place. And we very soon have generals out of a job. We have various things going awry. A game becomes very difficult to follow and trace.

So the thetan settles for the simpler life. And that is “What is, is. What will be, will be. Insh’allah,” see? “Fate . . .”

Well, what they’re involved with there—kismet and everything else— they’re just involved with the inevitability of the cycle of action. Fatalism is the total subjugation of the individual by the cycle of action. “What will be, will be.” “If he starts going [in] the car, he will then go down the road, and eventually the car will stop.” Well, they even have it rigged that way. They’ve got oil prices up to a point where it’ll run out of fuel. And they’ve got tires to a point where they wear out. And the time payments will catch up with him, and the skip men will come and Bet him. Something will stop this car.

In the main universe by friction and other conflicts, a particle traveling is acted upon until it stops. In other words, it’s all—below the level of time, everything is sort of geared up to follow in along the time. If an action begins —I mean a single, individual action, not a postulate like time—if it begins, it is sort of geared up to stop.

Now, there are some of these things have not stopped, as I said a moment ago, which might be the composition of matter and such things as that. But even those things have a tendency to deteriorate as they go along.

Now, the point I’m trying to make here is that everybody is used to and in agreement with this thing called a cycle of action.

You aren’t using it in your auditing because it is true. I spoke to you the other day about gradient realities. Well, it’s one of the realities and it reaches pretty high at case level. It’s a reality which fades out just before a person can put some universal laws under control. I mean, it’s way up! So the reality of the PC that you process is tied in from the very lowest to a fairly advanced level with this thing called a cycle of action. And because the PC’s reality is tied in with it, violations of it bring about an unreality.

So if you want to tell him “What can you find unreal?” just start busting his cycle of action as part of the auditing: Start a process, don’t end it; get a process going, drop it. And the next thing you know, he starts going all unreal on you.

You’ve got an agreement with him that he is going to get processed in a certain direction to a certain distance and then that’s going to all come about. He’s still sitting in the middle of his bank, not yet having as-ised all the material available on this, and suddenly there he is parked. There is nothing more done about it. And he’s got this mass now, and these questions which he finished up—”finished up” with, since he didn’t finish up—and he carries those on over into the next process. And then he never gets that finished, so he carries on both of these now into the next process. And he never gets that finished so he carries all three into the next process. And you’ll find yourself all of a sudden dealing with a PC who is unflat on four processes.

Well, he won’t smoothly as-is anything, only for this reason: because it looks very complicated to him. It’s getting more and more complicated. He’s not getting free, he’s getting bogged down! His idea of freedom is finishing up some cycles of action. And let me assure you that that is a very, very good observation, well within his zones of agreement. He knows that if he finishes his work he can quit. See? These are realities. Their truth is—well, it’s very funny to tell you this, but their truth is limited. But everybody agrees with it.

So therefore, when you start snarling somebody up, you have these two factors: The mass he is mixed up with in his mind is restimulated but not as-ised, so he’s left with some mass hanging around. And he carries this incomplete cycle of action over into the next-begun cycle of action. And he will start accumulating mass and start accumulating upsets and he’ll start getting loses.

Now, the idea of a win is very closely tied in with the cycle of action. Very intimately. This fellow wins, ordinarily, by having accomplished something. You could even win to the point of having gone to a point and then not having been destroyed when reaching that point, so therefore you would have accomplished something. You could even have a negative approach, you see? “Well, I’ve accomplished something: I came downtown today and didn’t get killed.” See? Even at that low level, that’s a win. Now, where does all that come from? Now, what is the upper echelon to what I’ve just been talking to you about? What is the upper echelon of this?

Let’s really have an esoteric flight here. It comes under the heading of intention. Intention is part of the comm cycle, but intention is senior to the comm cycle. Intention: the ability to intend. An intention contains in it every power the thetan has—every power the thetan has. The ability to throw a lightning bolt, the ability to hold something in position, the ability to make something continue, the ability to do away with something, strength, accomplishment, power, wit, ability—these things are all wrapped up on the one common denominator of intention. Intention.

When you’re just half—oh, no, no. Well, when you’re just half-shot as a thetan, and you’ve almost had it and you think you’re on your last legs . . . Not in the condition you’re in, I mean, but pretty bad off, you know. You’re not yet wearing a body. You’re probably packing around an effigy. You have to be recognized and people have to say good morning to you or you’re unhappy, this kind of thing. You’re pretty “plowed-in” with mass. Your own actual GPMs are wrapped around your gullet. Your intention (this is a low-level skill, this is not a high-level skill) is quite good enough to, for instance, intend this crayon into the air in front of you, to intend this E-Meter over to the other side of the desk. This is low-level stuff I’m talking to you about. A guy is, oh, practically on his last legs when he can do this.

Answering a telephone, one simply intends the telephone up into his vicinity where he is listening and can talk. He intends it off the cradle up to his “ear” and intends it back onto the cradle. Giving you straight stuff now. This is almost recent time. You’ve been able to do this in recent times. It baffles you sometimes when a piece of MEST does not instantly and immediately obey you. But that’s simply intention. That’s low-level intention.

I’m not talking to you now about something very esoteric. This would sound very startling and make a newspaper reporter turn gray overnight. But intend him in a horizontal position outside the door, five feet off the pavement, and let him stay there for a while and cool off. I doubt he’d write it, because he of all people knows he couldn’t do it.

But there is intention. You get what I mean, now, by intention? You intend something to happen and it happens. The ability to intend. And that is 811 there is to a thetan’s power. There is no more to his power than that. There is his ability to throw a lightning bolt, to set a house on fire, to make the roof fly off, to turn a planet upside down. That is everything—his intention.

So all you have to do to weaken a thetan is to get in the road of his intentions—foul up his intentions. Now, if you can foul up a thetan’s intentions, you can weaken him.

Now, what do I mean by weaken him? A person picks up, on Monday, a five-hundred-pound weight, but on Tuesday can only pick up a three-hundred pound weight. Between Monday and Tuesday he has been weakened, right? Do you understand? It’s this graphic. It’s not the philosophic derivation of his morals become weak, don’t you know?

Well, on Monday he can throw a raw energy beam a hundred yards On Tuesday morning he can only throw one ten feet. Between Monday and Tuesday he has become weakened. That’s what I mean by weakened, see? And the way that is done is to give him loses on his intentions. All you’ve got to do is foul up or counter or blunt his intentions and he becomes weaker.

Weakness and strength in a thetan, and of course well, his weakness is the only thing that holds him entrapped. Weakness is the only thing that keeps masses pulled in on him. Weakness is the only thing that keeps him pinned down. You can only trap a thetan when he is weak.

And you need only really be afraid of things that are very weak, with, of course, the proviso of certain magazine editors; we skip them. Leave them out of that category, because they've had it.

The main thing that we have to watch in this, then, in auditing, is that we do not weaken the actual intention of the PC by blunting his actual intentions. And in order to do this, we must differentiate between his reactive intention— his dramatization, in other words—and his own intention. So we have the subdivision of the PC and his bank.

A person who is dramatizing during an ARC break actually is not intending anything they say. This is simply bank dramatized, do you see? It's all bank dramatized. "Roar, roar, roar, roar, roar!" He isn't intending anything. That falls out, then. That's a recording or something going off, you see? That is not his intention. So we don't say that everything somebody must do we must validate. You start validating the bank 100 percent and you've had it as an auditor.

But we're talking about, now, the actual intentions of the person.

He intended to have a two-hour-and-a-half session. And you give him a three-hour-and-a-half session. You have blunted his intention. He intended to get off this stuff about Aunt Hattie, and you called the process flat long before it were flat. So therefore, you have blunted his intention.

You can't ruin a PC. I'm just talking about how smoothly you can audit. You understand this? Because you're not going to spoil anybody's intentions or cave them in by auditing, let me assure you, see? But you can key in incidents on him, and so forth, where his intention is very badly blunted by simply taking an auditing cycle of action and not completing it. In other words, he intends, so forth. You intend, so on. And there you go. And you finish it off, and you wind it up. You've completed a cycle of action. That intention has gone through a complete cycle of action then. If you interrupt it halfway, no intention.

Goals for the session. Goals for the session. Here's a good point. You get a PC to put in goals for the session; that's actually a participating intention. So I always work hard on giving a PC goals for the session. I almost work harder to give the PC his goals for the session than I do to give him a session. See?

I can give anybody a session and cure anything or straighten them up, see? That doesn't worry me. But this PC sitting down there has just got through saying "To feel better about my lumbosis." I'll put that in. I won't take up the body of the session till Eve got the oddball goal out of the road. But any PC that is trying to break or stop or not go through with a Fattening and so forth, putting in a bunch of sideways goals, could actually stop you from auditing or completing your cycle of action and roll himself up in a ball.

A reactive barrier can arise out of this situation. So he puts in a lot of oddball goals that don't have anything to do about the price of the thing. I'll still clean them up. I'll still clear them up.

But I take out the little kit, you know? The little kit with the little whisk broom. I get those out of the road. And notice the PC apparently has a present time problem.

This is in R6 auditing. This is not ordinary auditing. I mean, this is therefore, any kind of auditing. If you'd pay attention to the PC's goals for the session at R6 when you're totally capable of getting a hundred TA divisions, you see, in two and a half hours, well, good heavens, how much would it apply down at the levels when he's getting fifteen in a two-and-a-half-hour session and lucky to get it, see? So this very definitely applies.

Person's got goals for the session. I'd look those things over—pickety-powpow! He's got a present time problem here. Ha-ha-ha-ha-ho, ho-ho-ho. Let's get the considerations for that present time problem. "Well, you—I notice you have a present time problem here. What considerations have you had about that? All right. That's fine. Okay. And you had a bad neck? Been bothering you, and so forth. All right, is that an R6 phenomenon? Is that from goals and . . . ? Yeah, doesn't seem to be from a goals GPM.

"Ah . . . Something else seems to have gone on here with regard to this. What was the first you noticed this? All right. Good. All right. Well, let's date this." Pow! Pow! Pow!

We're doing about a four- and five-minute process, don't you see? I mean, we're driving it right straight along the line. We got the PC on it. We're just brushing this thing off, see, getting this out of the road. But we're doing this other thing: We're giving him the goal for the session, see?

Oh, we got that out of the road. We dated it, the somatic blew and so forth. You have to be quick on this kind of auditing. He's made that goal for the session right there. I haven't even started the body of the session.

The session, now, is—with "since" mid ruds and everything else that has happened—is only thirty-five minutes deep, and we're away into the body of the session on what I want to do. He's already made his goals for the session.

You want to see the good indicators come in? Ha-ha! Make sure the person gets any PT-problem type of goal for the session and so forth, get him a win on it in the first five minutes of play. Then get down to something important.

"Oh, yeah," you say, "this takes very skilled, very fast, very tricky auditing. You really have to know what you're doing to be able to get rid of somebody's lumbosis that's been keeping them up all night in the first ten minutes of the session." No. No, no, no. Who's getting rid of it? We just keyed it out. We just gave it a swift kick, so it isn't bothering the PC. Made his goal for the session too. Therefore his intention level is up. So therefore he's more powerful in the session. Therefore he can look at his bank better. See this?

That's why a person makes no progress while he has a PTP: His intentions are being blunted or overlooked. And so he cannot rise superior to his bank. So he makes no progress.

What is a PTP? It is postulate-counter-postulate. You could just as easily interpret this as intention-counter-intention.

You will not find a present time problem where a person's intentions have not been blunted. Something is fighting his intention. And it seems to him that it's of equal magnitude—intention versus intention. He has an intention, somebody else has another intention. These two intentions lock together and you get a present time problem. It tends to hang up in time. And that's how you get a time hang-up, basic time hang-up: intention-counter-intention.

Let's look at Class V for a moment—not because we're teaching anything about Class V but because this is a marvelous field of demonstration.

Why do you think, in the Helatrobis and the trillions-two, and other implant areas, oppose was in vogue? It isn't even the actual GPM. The actual GPM is a subvolitional intention which is way downstairs. It goes in with an ax. "Everything inevitably brings about something else. Doesn't matter what happens if something else is going to be brought about." It's very apathetic, very low.

But these brisker levels, more ambitious levels: how did they knock out the power of a thetan? How could they possibly do anything to a thetan? Well, the implant means, by using key goals like "to go," "to stay," "to move," "to go away," "to forget," "to remember"—this type of goal,

all mucked up with innumerable variations of that goal, serve as key intentions. So when he intends to remember, he of course will get “nix to remember.” He’ll get an automatic and instant blunting of intention. That was the intention of the implant.

Very far from flawlessly works. Thetans transcend this stuff rather easily. But there—there is the woof and warp of implants and how they are done and why.

Anybody setting up implants that are going to be successful would simply blunt intentions. Blunt intentions, that’s the whole thing. So he says “to move,” he immediately gets “not to move.” See? And then the implant GPMs interact one against the other, so if he gets the idea to stay then he feels he has to move. And if he gets the idea to move, then he feels he’s got to stay. So they counter-oppose each other too.

So opposition or oppose is the keynote to an implant. And this is the only way they’re aberrative. There is no other reason. Bah! The amount of mass and—mass-mass. The thetan only keeps the mass of these things around because he can’t get rid of them and he’s automatically creating it and he’s doing other things, but an implant GPM has too little mass to be very upsetting to the individual, but it upsets his ideas. So he gets the idea to go and he gets the counter-intention—hits him in the face.

The way they “civilize” a child, for instance, all they have to do is break all his intentions. Somebody talking about spoiling a child or upsetting a child: That’s very silly to say that by giving a child everything, you spoil the child, or by being nice to a child, you spoil a child. They’re just drawing a longbow. They couldn’t be further from the mark.

It’s blunting every intention the child has. And remember that there are reactive intentions and that there are analytical intentions—two varieties.

So we let the reactive intention have its way. Child cries, screams and throws a tantrum: we instantly give him what he wanted. That validated the reactive intention. The child wants to sit quietly and look out the window—analytical intention so we get him busy doing something else. By the time we’ve crossed these things—in other words, validated the reactive intentions by rewarding the child and obeying the reactions, and blunted every analytical intention the child has—we’ll of course have weakened the thetan (becomes susceptible to illness and that sort of thing), simply because masses move in on hum.

I mean, a person who is weakened is unable to hold anything at a distance, so everything collapses on him.

You understand what I’m talking about? This is terribly simple. And it evades understanding just by being in itself so idiotically simple.

So your PC has two types of intentions. And one is totally reactive—it’s just a dramatization—so we won’t call it an intention; we call it a dramatization. Every time your PC dramatizes, you let him have his way; and every time your PC pleasantly, nicely wants to do something, analytically, you blunt his intention. After a while, you’re going to have your PC practically spinnny on the subject of auditing reaction. He won’t be able to handle things in session. You’ll find the PC isn’t cogniting. You find this and that and so forth. There’s many an auditor pays no attention to the PC until the PC starts ARC breaking.

Now the auditor knows something is happening, so he decides to do something for the PC because the PC has ARC broken. But actually the PC has been sitting there auditing splendidly, beautifully and smoothly. His pacing is very nice. And he sort of timidly brings up the fact that he’d really like to—you know, he’d really like to look at this engram he’s seen there just a moment longer. He brings this up; he says it’s bothering him a little bit. He doesn’t quite know what it’s all about. It’s a little bit of an origin, you see? It isn’t going to take any time. You don’t give him an additional restimulation. You say, “Yes? All right. All right. Well, what’s it all about?”—something like that.

“So-and-so and so-and-so and so-so.” “All right, that’s fine.” You get that out of the road and you go on, don’t you see?

But every time he says, “Well, I . . . uh . . . I don’t know. I don’t really . . . I don’t really have any more answers to that question. Uh . . . I uh . . .”

“Well, you’re damn well going to answer the question!” See? Lois is getting on to the borderline of intention, don’t you see? So he kind of gets upset one way or the other.

But the auditor doesn’t pay any attention to what’s going on, there. We’ve got an uncomfortable situation. PC’s intention, cycles of action, what he’s doing and so forth are all kind of getting mixed up. And the auditor’s paying no attention to this because the PC is still in a fairly sweet frame of mind, you see?

When the PC finally loses—you understand, a PC doesn’t turn nasty; a PC gets overhumped by his bank. That’s always the case. And the PC, own intentions having been blunted badly, then loses control. And the bank, powered up, overwhelms him and takes over control, and on an automaticity, starts blowing its head off—going into all sorts of dramatization of one kind or other, even though it’s just the dramatization of apathy. Bank is in a dramatization.

Well, of course the auditor acts. That’s what we know as acting too late. Catching a slipping situation too late gives you these explosive ARC breaks. They generally telegraph themselves way ahead. But what’s happened there is really the PC has become overwhelmed by his own bank. You’re not watching the PC’s intentions now, you’re watching the PC’s dramatization. But you don’t do anything about the PC’s intentions, you will eventually get the PC’s dramatizations. That’s quite an elementary situation. It’s one which an auditor should understand.

Now, I spoke to you some time ago in a lecture about what is a win and what is a lose. Just going over that cursorily: A win is accomplishing what you intend to accomplish, or accomplishing the not-accomplishment of something you didn’t intend to accomplish. You get the idea? You intended not to have any ARC breaks, and in the session you not-had any ARC breaks. You understand? Well, that’s a win, see?

And a lose is just exactly the reverse just exactly the reverse. Things you intended not to happen happened, and things which you intended to happen didn’t happen. That’s a lose. And that’s all a win is and that’s all a lose is. That’s all.

So when we compare this situation to auditing, we find out, then, that the auditor’s intention is valuable to the session. And because he’s less susceptible to dramatization from the bank in the PC—since he’s not really at all greatly susceptible to the bank of the PC; it’s PC’s bank, it’s not hitting the auditor—and because the auditor is capable of standing outside that perimeter of potential dramatization, the auditor’s intention in a session is therefore senior to the PC’s intention. But if the PC’s intention is totally neglected with regard to a session, we again get a weakening of the PC and an encroachment of dramatization.

So the auditor intends to flatten off such-and-such a process. And the PC intends to take care of something else he has thought about overnight. Well, that PC has been subject to dramatization because of restimulation. You’d be very foolish not to flatten off the original process, because that was the original intention, wasn’t it? That wasn’t finished, and yet the PC wants to do another one. Well, this is going to hang him up with an intention loss whether he likes it or not. And the auditor, standing outside this perimeter, of course, can complete the cycle of action on which he began. And that gives a win to the auditor and the PC. You follow this? PC’s analytical intentions, then, are valuable to a session. And they are very often expressed in the goals of the session, and they are cared for accordingly. That’s the way it is.

Now, he intends to get a certain distance, and actually, down deep he really intends to become OT. He's never investigated this. It's running far too deep. But way down underneath all the layers of God-help-us he intends to get to be OT, that's for sure. In other words, he intends to recover.

He doesn't even, though, have enough analytical awareness of where he is going to know what he intends. He intends freedom and a return of power— which is to say, he intends freedom and a return of intention. Well, he now can go all the way. He now can go all the way. That is well within grasp. If he walks along a certain path, and doesn't keep jumping off the cliff and so forth, why, he will arrive. Well, therefore, the intention for him to arrive is very sotto voce in him. And an auditor with some experience and action on this, intending him to arrive the auditor's intention is actually more reliable than the PC's, even though the PC's is more deep and fundamental than the auditors Why? Because every time he starts coming up the line, this PC is going to short-circuit into some direction, fail to complete a cycle of action someplace, leave a rock in the road somewhere or another. And he'll get some wild idea and—well, I've seen it happen, man.

This PC is supposed to be prepchecked on something or other in order to get something or other accomplished so that he won't always be coming to session with this gross PTP about his domestic affairs or something like this, don't you see? And somebody has decided to get this out of the road so they can proceed. And he's thrown that all sideways, and he's spent the night listing goals. See?

Well, in the first place is, the reason he listed goals had to do with the fact that his intention about his marital problem was being blunted. So case advance is now reinterpreted into some kind of an escape from his present time problem. So he doesn't know which way he's going; he doesn't know what cycle of action he's on. Is he on the cycle of action of completing his present time problem with his domestic affairs? Or is he on the cycle of action of becoming a free being? Well, he's on the cycle of action of becoming free from his wife. He's not on the cycle of action of becoming a free being.

Well, something weird goes on when you've got this kind of thing happening. He's on a small perimeter. He's on a little cycle of action, and he's using a huge cycle of action potential to accomplish this little cycle of action, you see? He's using a 20-millimeter machine gun to shoot a grasshopper, see? And of course he can't shoot this grasshopper, because actually you can't get the muzzle depressed enough. You get this kind of. .. Yet he's got freedom mixed up with escape. He wants to fix it so he doesn't have to confront things anymore. All this kind of thing goes on. And all that can get in an auditor's road hugely.

I'm talking to you now about fine points. You know? You know, in spite of all this, you can blunder through. You know? I'm just giving you some fine points here.

You could get there somehow, prepchecking the rough edge off of a person's lumbosis, and somehow or another this. And somebody puts him together with sticky plaster because too many unflat processes exist on the case. And then somehow or another you finally find a GPM, and you get enough tone arm action out of the GPM to—you get the idea—to sort of cancel out some of the other sins and ills that have occurred in it. You'd get there somehow; you could muddle through.

But these are the fine points. These are the fine points of the business.

He's as weak as his intentions are blunted. He will become as strong as his intentions are free. The greatest bolder-backer of intentions is the person himself, because he puts himself in danger every time he has a dangerous intention. I think your international champions in boxing, let us say, or something like that, probably have an awful time. They probably educate themselves right out of a hard punch, merely because they are walking through the society all the time. It'd be very, very dangerous indeed for them to uncork a hard punch in the Bide-A-

Wee Cocktail Bar, see? That's supposed to be reserved only for the stage, see? So here's an intention that is becoming narrowed and specialized. They eventually become quite weak.

I'm not talking about something that you could measure by the diameter of the biceps, the number of foot-pounds of punch deliverable. You see, they're having to withhold this intention. This intention has got to be very much pulled down. They've got to condition this intention.

If they have a trainer and a manager that tells him "Now, only hit with your right hand during moments of" something or other. Some fellow across—as their opponent in the ring could stand there with his guard dropped, the person's left hand in perfectly good condition to deliver the final blow that would end the whole match, you see, and yet would never strike the blow. See, his intention: his intention, now, is far, far too specialized and channeled.

And you ask a fellow, "What restraints do you have to put on yourself in your everyday living?" You're going to get almost a roaring automaticity, see? He has been taught that his intentions are dangerous to him. He's been taught that he can get a dangerous intention. He's been taught as well that his intentions can get out of his control and he can accidentally intend something.

So every once in a while you have somebody walking around in circles—there's been a fire in Birmingham or something of the sort—and there will be somebody walking around in circles worrying because he might have let an intention out from underneath his hat and started the fire in Birmingham. See? And he'll actively worry about this. You see? Whereas the guy couldn't even warm up a cup of coffee if he had a stove, see?

But thetans become very worried about this sort of thing. And they become very protestive. And one of the big games is to make somebody protest his intentions, you see? "What are your intentions toward me, sir?" You see, that's the standard girl's question. "Clarify your intentions," and so forth.

Wasn't it Voltaire that won every argument before he even began it? He said somebody had to define his terms before he could argue with him. Well, that's very interesting. But if you carried that a little further, you'd find the guy would get so busy defining his terms that his intention to have anything else happening would be nil. And you wouldn't find much of a debate in progress here. Don't you see?

"You must define your intentions, or what you're doing." Society does this to us in Scientology. Fortunately, they don't know what our intentions are. And frankly, we've never really sat down and mapped it all out as to what our intentions should be which is probably the way it should be, don't you see? Because therefore there's nothing to blunt. Nobody has ever expressed the matter. Sort of a lazy way to go about it.

But they have all sorts of assignments to us in Scientology as to what our intentions are. They wouldn't believe our real intentions, so we'll probably make them. But we lose. For instance, "a world without insanity or war," or something like that: it's a perfectly valid intention. Well, they consider this too high-flown. "What are their intentions?" So they assign a whole bunch of false intentions to the Scientologist, see? Well, let them. That's what makes their attacks look so silly, because of course they're fighting on a set of intentions which don't exist. So it makes them look like they're walking around talking to shadows, or something like that. It leaves us completely free and rather unwound, into the battle.

Actually, any broad intention we have is quite clear-cut, appears in many books, but it's way over their heads, you see? They can't figure they could blunt that intention because that's. . . Well, you take "a world without insanity"; you take this as an intention: Well, that's good roads and good weather; of course, very unreal, unaccomplishable—anybody who'd look this over—so therefore couldn't have anything to do with that. One of these days they're going to be awful surprised! See?

We'll have that intention moving. See? I even spent a little time in on, how would you handle vast numbers of insane, and so forth, see? Out of that original speculation, we got Scientology O processes, by the way. I mean, they're just an offshoot of that. I'd hate to have to confess that to you, but that was the body of research that came out of, which is just destimulate the environment. Give a stable datum for the environment.

So, intention: intention here is everything in case recovery. If a person is regaining his power or ability or something like that, he's merely removing out of his road what blunts his intentions and what has blunted his intentions, and that's really all he's doing. So if we look this over with a very critical eye, we find out that the auditor, going through almost any sincere job of auditing—even if clumsily done—will inevitably unblunt some of this PC's intentions. They will be unblunted one way or the other. And we're talking about the upper esoterics of auditing—how to keep auditing from blunting the PC's intentions, you see?

Well, an intention is a cycle of action. Any time you say "do," you add time. So a doingness intention or accomplishingness intention has time added to it.

The moment that you add time or doingness to the thing, you've got a cycle of action. So an intention is at its highest echelon, totally independent of time and the cycle of action. Intention is simply pure intention, and is not necessarily tied into time at all! You could just as easily make a postulate in 1492 or in 2658 as you could in 1964. There isn't any intimate and immediate relationship.

But as the individual has gone downscale, he has of course more and more associated his intentions with a cycle of action. You make the intention and then a certain thing occurs, or the intention goes across a space as in communication, you see—and then it arrives at the other end, and a certain result therefore takes place at the other end. So we have a cycle of action. We have the intention, now, worked into time and space.

So the intention originally is totally free of time and space and has nothing to do with it. And in actual fact, time and space have, as their only reality, the fact that they are made out of an intention. Doesn't matter whether this intention is an agreed-upon intention or otherwise. There is a basic intention which gives us time and space. So it is actually superior to all MEST. And you'll have your fingers on something that doesn't have to be MEST; but as it comes downscale, this becomes expressed to the PC, particularly at the lower levels of a case.

Lower levels of cases, this fellow's having a dreadful time! He's just staggering through life, man. He's hitting both walls and walking backwards and falling on his knees every time he turns around. Well, that individual's agreement with a cycle of action means that an intention... There are no intentions anymore. There, however, might be a cycle of action. See? The intention has disappeared out of the cycle of action, and you simply have this cycle of action. When he goes down any further, he goes down into pure chaos.

So therefore, you can take a person who is having a terrible time and tell him to touch the wall, and you've shown him an intention and shown him a cycle of action. You can short-session him. You can start a session, run a session and end a session. Ten minutes' worth, see? Then start another session, run a session and end a session. All you're doing is showing him cycle of action, cycle of action, cycle of action. The auditing command: cycle of action. The auditor's command, the acknowledgment, and the answer, the acknowledgment: it's a cycle of action. All you're showing him is you're demonstrating the existence of a cycle of action, cycle of action, cycle of action—any one of these things as they come through.

And eventually, the reason he cognites is his own intentions start to free up out of the obsessive MESTiness of it all. And he starts seeing things, and he starts coming back to battery. He starts adding up what's going on.

Well now, the only way the auditor can get in his road in all this, of course, is to foul up his own cycle of action—the auditor's cycle of action. Now we could foul this up. One of the ways of fouling it up is to leave processes unflat. Or misinterpret what we're doing with a process. We're trying to get rid of this fellow's lumbosis—a lifetime problem here—so we treat it like it's a rudiment. We give it a little dust-off and so forth. Well, misapplication of tools. Well, you're not going to get the intention clear because that back is not going to get better under that kind of treatment, so the auditor's intention is blunted, the PC's intention to have a better back is blunted, everybody loses under that situation.

So our intention on the thing, laid out: If we're going to have wins then we must validate analytical intention, knock out dramatization and be very consistent with completing cycles of action. Even though it's an auditing command or getting rid of his lumbosis. And those are the factors with which you are dealing.

The auditor must flatten a process within the reality of what he is processing—in other words, within the reality of what's he got here?

He's got a little problem that's been generated since last night. So he stops auditing the back, which has been going on for nine or ten years, and starts using heavy artillery on this little problem that came up last night. Well, he didn't complete the big cycle of action; he's trying to make too much out of this other cycle of action. He's misapplying his tools, in other words.

He's working on this bad back and the only reason he gets last night's problem out of the way with his little dust kit is, well, just so he can go on and complete this bigger cycle of action. You got to keep the PC on the main chance. You got to flatten the big stuff that you start. You're doing a Problems Intensive; I don't think you could prepcheck it in under ten or twelve hours. If you did a proper assessment on the thing, you'd—ten or twelve hours, I'd think that'd be a long—a short haul to cover everything, let us say, from 1949, July, on up to present time.

Well, how do you make it run that long? Well, it isn't how long you make it run: how much is there there? Well, that depends on how much you impinge on the PC. That depends on how much you make the PC work at it. That depends on how hard you sweat over this particular action, and how clean you keep the PC from ARC breaks, and how clean you keep his interim session difficulties—the between-session difficulties—from interrupting you from doing a cycle of action. And for that kind of thing, we've got little brush-off things. We just destimulate this stuff. The rudiment approach, then the main-session approach. And therefore, we can achieve the intentions of the PC, we can achieve the intentions of the auditor.

We flatten a process within the reality of what is there to be flattened, and how much is there to be flattened? How much are we tackling here? Well, the fellow has always had a little problem that had to do with—he's always had this problem, and 80 forth: he thinks he's inferior. Well, that's great. That's great. Now, you're going to handle this with a rudiments process? I don't think so.

The individual comes into session and he stubbed his toe outside the door and it hurts. You're going to give this a fourteen-hour Prepcheck?

So the magnitude of what you're trying to handle, the duration of time of what you're trying to handle, to a large degree establishes how much time it is going to take you and how much heavy action you will have to take on it and how thoroughly you'll have to flatten it. And those are the establishing factors. But when all else is worked out, you're trying to complete a cycle of action. And on the very bad-off case, that is all you can do. That is the most basic process there is, is simply get a cycle of action completed.

And I imagine that an auditing question like this: "What did you have to eat for breakfast?" Guy is having an awful time. Practically blind-staggers type PC, see? And two and a half hours later, with a great deal of two-way comm and discussion and so forth, he has answered the

auditing question. It sounds incredible, doesn't it? And yet, you know, the PC would have a win? PC would have a big win.

You went in too high. It should have been "Did you come to the session?" That wouldn't have taken so long to do. But if you can get an auditing cycle completed, you get a win, and if you don't get an auditing cycle completed, whatever else you look at or what you think you are looking at, you're going to get a lose. Elementary as that.

So when the whole thing is squared away, what you're trying to do as an auditor depends on what you're trying to handle in the PC, the order of magnitude in terms of time and trouble, duration and so forth, and that determines on what kind of flattening you use.

And the flattening of the main chance, the big long-term one and so forth, is done very arduously indeed. It's all done by TA. It's never done by anything else but TA. And, of course, your little stuff that you're trying to get out of the road so you can keep on with your main action is just a rudiments-type kick-off and you just flatten it to cognition or till it isn't bothering the PC and it's out of the road and you're away. You see why this is now? You see how this is? All right. I hope you can have some wins on this. Thank you.

Audience: Thank you very much.

Thank you!