STYLES OF AUDITING

(Note 1: Most old-time auditors, particularly Saint Hill
Graduates, have been trained at one time or another in
these auditing styles. Here they are given names and
assigned to Levels so that they can be taught more easily
and so that general auditing can be improved

(Note 2: These have not been written before because I
had not determined the results vital to each Level.)

There is a Style of auditing for each class. By Style, is meant a method or custom of performing actions.

A Style is not really determined by the process being run so much. A Style is how the auditor addresses his task.

Different processes carry different style requirements perhaps, but that is not the point. Clay Table Healing at Level III can be run with Level I style and still have some gains. But an auditor trained up to the style required at Level III would do a better job not only of CT Healing but of any repetitive process.

Style is how the auditor audits. The real expert can do them all, but only after he can do each one. Style is a mark of Class. It is not individual. In our meaning, it is a distinct way to handle the tools of auditing.

LEVEL ZERO
LISTEN STYLE

At Level 0 the Style is Listen Style Auditing. Here the auditor is expected to listen to the PC. The only skill necessary is listening to another. As soon as it is ascertained that the auditor is listening (not just confronting or ignoring) the auditor can be checked out. The length of time an auditor can listen without tension or strain showing could be a

factor. What the PC does is not a factor considered in judging this style. PCs, however, talk to an auditor who is really listening.

Here we have the highest point that old-time mental therapies reached (when they did reach it), such as psychoanalysis, when they helped anyone. Mostly they were well below this, evaluating, invalidating, interrupting. These three things are what the instructor in this style should try to put across to the HAS student.

Listen Style should not be complicated by expecting more of the auditor than just this: Listen to the PC without evaluating, invalidating or interrupting.

Adding on higher skills like "Is the PC talking interestingly?" or even "Is the PC talking?" is no part of this style. When this auditor gets in trouble and the PC won't talk or isn't interested, a higher classed auditor is called in, a new question given by the supervisor, etc.

It really isn't "Itsa" to be very technical. Itsa is the action of the PC saying, "It's a this" or "It's a that." Getting the PC to Itsa is quite beyond Listen Style auditors where the PC won't. It's the supervisor or the question on the blackboard that gets the PC to Itsa.

The ability to listen, learned well, stays with the auditor up through the grades. One doesn't cease to use it even at Level VI. But one has to learn it somewhere and that's at Level Zero. So Listen Style Auditing is just listening. It thereafter adds into the other styles.

LEVEL ONE
MUZZLED AUDITING

This could also be called rote style auditing.

Muzzled Auditing has been with us many years. It is the stark total of TRs 0 to 4 and not anything else added.

It is called so because auditors too often added in comments, Q'ed and A'ed, deviated, discussed and otherwise messed up a session. Muzzle meant a "muzzle was put on them," figuratively speaking, so they would only state the auditing command and ack.

Repetitive Command Auditing, using TRs 0 to 4, at Level One is done completely muzzled.

This could be called Muzzled Repetitive Auditing Style but will be called "Muzzled Style" for the sake of brevity.

It has been a matter of long experience that PCs who didn't make gains with the partially trained auditor permitted to two-way comm, did make gains the instant the auditor was muzzled: to wit, not permitted to do a thing but run the process, permitted to say nothing but the commands and acknowledge them and handle PC originations by simple acknowledgment without any other question or comment.

At Level One we don't expect the auditor to do anything but state the command (or ask the question) with no variation, acknowledge the PC's answer and handle the PC origins by understanding and acknowledging what the PC said.

Those processes used at Level One actually respond best to muzzled auditing and worst to misguided efforts to "Two-Way Comm."

Listen Style combines with Muzzled Style easily. But watch out that Level One sessions don't disintegrate to Level Zero.

Crisp, clean repetitive commands, muzzled, given and answered often, are the road out – not PC wanderings.

A PC at this Level is instructed in exactly what is expected of him, exactly what the auditor will do. The PC is even put through a few "do birds fly?" cycles until the PC gets the idea. Then the processing works.

An auditor trying to do Muzzled Repetitive Auditing on a PC who, through past "therapy experience", is rambling on and on is a sad sight. It means that control is out (or that the PC never got above Level Zero).

It's the number of commands given and answered in a unit of auditing time that gets gains. To that add the correctly chosen repetitive process and you have a release in short order, using the processes of this Level.

To follow limp Listen Style with crisp, controlled Muzzled Style may be a shock. But they are each the lowest of the two families of auditing styles – Totally Permissive and Totally Controlled. And they are so different each is easy to learn with no confusion. It's been the lack of difference amongst styles that confuses the student into slopping about. Well, these two are different enough – Listen Style and Muzzled Style – to set anybody straight.

LEVEL TWO
GUIDING STYLE AUDITING

An old-time auditor would have recognized this style under two separate names: (a) Two-Way Comm and (b) Formal Auditing.

We condense these two old styles under one new name: Guiding Style Auditing.

One first guides the PC by "two-way comm" into some subject that has to be handled or into revealing what should be handled and then the auditor handles it with formal repetitive commands.

Guiding Style Auditing becomes feasible only when a student can do Listen Style and Muzzled Style Auditing well.

Formerly the student who couldn't confront or duplicate a command took refuge in sloppy discussions with the PC and called it auditing or "Two-Way Comm."

The first thing to know about Guiding Style is that one lets the PC talk and Itsa without chop, but also gets the PC steered into the proper subject and gets the job done with repetitive commands.

We presuppose the auditor at this Level has had enough case gain to be able to occupy the viewpoint of the auditor and therefore to be able to observe the PC. We also presuppose at this Level that the auditor, being able to occupy a viewpoint, is therefore more self-determined, the two things being related. (One can only be self-determined when one can observe the actual situation before one: otherwise a being is delusion-determined or other-determined.)

Thus in Guiding Style Auditing, the auditor is there to find out what's what from the PC and then apply the needful remedy.

Most of the processes in the Book of Remedies are included in this Level (II). To use those, one has to observe the PC, discover what the PC is doing, and remedy the PC's case accordingly.

The result for the PC is a far-reaching re-orientation in Life.

Thus the essentials of Guiding Style Auditing consist of Two-Way Comm that steers the PC into revealing a difficulty followed by a repetitive process to handle what has been revealed.

One does expert TRs but one may discuss things with the PC, let the PC talk and in general one audits the PC before one, establishing what that PC needs and then doing it with crisp repetitive auditing, but all the while alert to changes in the PC.

One runs at this Level against Tone Arm Action, paying little or no heed to the needle except as a centering device for TA position. One even establishes what's to be done by the action of the Tone Arm. (The process of storing up things to run on the PC by seeing what fell when he was running what's being run, now belongs at this Level (II) and will be re-numbered accordingly.)

At II one expects to handle a lot of chronic PTPs, overts, ARC Breaks with Life (but not session ARC Breaks, that being a needle action, session ARC Breaks being sorted out by a higher classed auditor if they occur).

To get such things done (PTPs, overts and other remedies) in the session the auditor must have a PC "willing to talk to the auditor about his difficulties." That presupposes we have an auditor at this Level who can ask questions, not repetitive, that guide the PC into talking about the difficulty that needs to be handled.

Great command of TR-4 is the primary difference in TRs from Level I. One understands, when one doesn't, by asking more questions, and by really acknowledging only when one has really understood it.

Guided comm is the clue to control at this Level. One should easily guide the PC's comm in and out and around without chopping the PC or wasting session time. As soon as an auditor gets the idea of finite result or, that is to say, a specific and definite result expected, all this is easy. PC has a PTP. Example: Auditor has to have the idea he is to locate and de-stimulate the PTP so PC is not bothered about it (and isn't being driven to do something about it) as the finite result.

The auditor at II is trained to audit the PC before him, get the PC into comm, guide the PC toward data needful to choose a process and then to run the process necessary to resolve that thing found, usually by repetitive command and always by TA.

The Book of Remedies is the key to this Level and this auditing style.

One listens but only to what one has guided the PC into. One runs repetitive commands with good TR-4. And one may search around for quite a while before one is satisfied he has the answer from the PC needful to resolve a certain aspect of the PC's case.

O/W can be run at Level I. But at Level II one may guide the PC into divulging what the PC considers a real overt act and, having that, then guide the PC through all the reasons it wasn't an overt and so eventually blow it.

Half-acknowledgment is also taught at Level II – the ways of keeping a PC talking by giving the PC the feeling he is being heard and yet not chopping with overdone TR-2.

Big or multiple acknowledgment is also taught to shut the PC off when the PC is going off the subject.

LEVEL III
ABRIDGED STYLE AUDITING

By Abridged is meant "abbreviated," shorn of extras. Any not actually needful auditing command is deleted.

For instance, at Level I the auditor always says, when the PC wanders off the subject, "I will repeat the auditing command" and does so. In Abridged Style the auditor omits this when it isn't necessary and just asks the command again if the PC has forgotten it.

In this style we have shifted from pure rote to a sensible use or omission as needful. We still use repetitive commands expertly, but we don't use rote that is unnecessary to the situation.

Two-Way Comm comes into its own at Level III. But with heavy use of repetitive commands.

At this Level we have as the primary process, Clay Table Healing. In this an auditor must make sure the commands are followed exactly. No auditing command is ever let go of until that actual command is answered by the PC.

But at the same time, one doesn't necessarily give every auditing command the process has in its rundown.

In Clay Table Healing one is supposed to make sure the PC is satisfied each time. This is done more often by observation than command. Yet it is done.

We suppose at III that we have an auditor who is in pretty fine shape and can observe. Thus we see the PC is satisfied and don't mention it. Thus we see when the PC is not certain and so we get something the PC is certain of in answering the question.

On the other hand, one gives all the necessary commands crisply and definitely and gets them executed.

Prep-checking and needle usage is taught at Level III as well as Clay Table Healing. Auditing by List is also taught. In Abridged Style Auditing one may find the PC (being cleaned up on a list question) giving half a dozen answers in a rush. One doesn't stop the PC from doing so, one half acknowledges, and lets the PC go on. One is in actual fact handling a bigger auditing comm cycle, that is all. The question elicits more than one answer which is really only one answer. And when that answer is given, it is acknowledged.

One sees when a needle is clean without some formula set of questions that invalidate all the PC's relief. And one sees it isn't clean by the continued puzzle on the PC's face.

There are tricks involved here. One asks a question of the PC with the key word in it and notes that the needle doesn't tremble, and so concludes the question about the word is flat. And so doesn't check it again. Example: "Has anything else been suppressed?" One eye on PC, one on needle, needle didn't quiver. PC looks noncommittal. Auditor

says, "All right, on.." and goes on to next question, eliminating a PC's possible protest read that can be mistaken for another "suppress."

In Abridged Style Auditing one sticks to the essentials and drops rote where it impedes case advance. But that doesn't mean one wanders about. One is even more crisp and thorough with Abridged Style Auditing than in rote.

One is watching what happens and doing exactly enough to achieve the expected result.

By "Abridged" is meant getting the exact job done – the shortest way between two points – with no waste questions.

By now the student should know that he runs a process to achieve an exact result and he gets the process run in a way to achieve that result in the smallest amount of time.

The student is taught to guide rapidly, to have no time for wide excursions.

The processes at this Level are all rat-a-tat-tat processes – clay table healing, Prepchecking, Auditing by List.

Again it's the number of times the question is answered per unit of auditing time that makes for speed of result.

LEVEL IV
DIRECT STYLE AUDITING

By direct we mean straight, concentrated, intense, applied in a direct manner.

We do not mean direct in the sense of to direct somebody or to guide. We mean it is direct.

By direct, we don't mean frank or choppy. On the contrary, we put the PC's attention on his bank and anything we do is calculated only to make that attention more direct.

It could also mean that we are not auditing by vias. We are auditing straight at the things that need to be reached to make somebody clear.

Other than this the auditing attitude is very easy and relaxed.

At Level IV we have clay table clearing and we have assessment type processes.

These two types of process are both astonishingly direct. They are aimed directly at the Reactive Mind. They are done in a direct manner.

In clay table clearing we have almost total work and Itsa from PCs. From one end of a session to another, we may have only a few auditing commands. For a PC on clay table clearing does almost all the work if he is in session at all.

Thus we have another implication in the word "direct." The PC is talking directly to the auditor about what he is making and why in clay table clearing. The auditor hardly ever talks at all.

In assessment the auditor is aiming directly at the PC's bank and wants no PC in front of it thinking, speculating, maundering or Itsaing. Thus this assessment is a very direct action.

All this requires easy, smooth, steel-hand-in-a-velvet-glove control of the PC. It looks easy and relaxed as a style, it is straight as a Toledo blade.

The trick is to be direct in what's wanted and not deviate. The auditor settles what's to be done, gives the command and then the PC may work for a long time, the auditor alert, attentive, completely relaxed.

In assessment the auditor often pays no attention to the PC at all, as in ARC Breaks or assessing lists. Indeed, a PC at this level is trained to be quiet during the assessment of a list.

And in clay table clearing, an auditor may be quiet for an hour at a stretch.

The tests are: Can the auditor keep the PC quiet while assessing without ARC Breaking the PC? Can the auditor order the PC to do something and then, the PC working on it, can the auditor remain quiet and attentive for an hour, understanding everything and interrupt alertly only when he doesn't understand and get the PC to make it clearer to him? Again without ARC Breaking the PC.

You could confuse this Direct Style with Listen Style if you merely glanced at a session of clay table clearing. But what a difference. In Listen Style the PC is blundering on and on and on. In Direct Style the PC wanders off the line an inch and starts to Itsa, let us say, with no clay work and after it was obvious to the auditor that this PC had forgotten the clay, you'd see the auditor, quick as a foil, look at the PC, very interestedly and say, "Let's see that in Clay." Or the PC doesn't really give an ability he wants to improve and you'd hear a quiet persuasive auditor voice, "Are you quite certain you want to improve that? Sounds like a goal to me. Just something, some ability you know, you'd like to improve."

You could call this style One-Way Auditing. When the PC is given his orders, after that it's all from the PC to the auditor, and all involved with carrying out that auditing instruction. When the auditor is assessing it is all from the auditor to the PC. Only when the assessment action hits a snag like a PTP is there any other auditing style used.

This is a very extreme auditing style. It is straightforward – direct.

But when needful, as in any Level, the styles learned below it are often also employed, but never in the actual actions of getting clay table clearing and Assessment done.

(Note: Level V would be the same style as VI below.)

LEVEL VI
ALL STYLE

So far, we have dealt with simple actions.

Now we have an auditor handling a meter and a PC who Itsa's and Cognites and gets PTPs and ARC Breaks and line charges and cognites and who finds Items and lists and who must be handled, handled, handled all the way.

As auditing TA for a 2½ hour session can go to 79 or 125 divisions (compared to 10 or 15 for the lowest level), the pace of the session is greater. It is this pace that makes perfect ability at each lower level vital when they combine into All Style. For each is now faster.

So, we learn All Style by learning each of the lower styles well, and then observe and apply the style needed every time it is needed, shifting styles as often as once every minute!

The best way to learn All Style is to become expert at each lower style so that one does the style correct for the situation each time the situation requiring that style occurs.

It is less rough than it looks. But it is also very demanding.

Use the wrong style on a situation and you've had it. ARC Break! No progress!

Example: Right in the middle of an assessment the needle gets dirty. The auditor can't continue – or shouldn't. The auditor, in Direct Style, looks up to see a puzzled frown. The auditor has to shift to Guiding Style to find out what ails the PC (who probably doesn't really know), then to Listen Style while the PC cognites on a chronic PTP that just emerged and bothered the PC, then to Direct Style to finish the Assessment that was in progress.

The only way an auditor can get confused by All Style is by not being good at one of the lower level styles.

Careful inspection will show where the student using All Style is slipping. One then gets the student to review that style that was not well learned and practice it a bit.

So All Style, when poorly done, is very easy to remedy for it will be in error on one or more of the lower level styles. And as all these can be independently taught, the whole can be co-ordinated. All Style is hard to do only when one hasn't mastered one of the lower level styles.

SUMMARY

These are the important Styles of Auditing. There have been others but they are only variations of those given in this HCO Bulletin. Tone 40 Style is the most notable one missing. It remains as a practice style at Level One to teach fearless body handling and to teach one to get his command obeyed. It is no longer used in practice.

As it was necessary to have every result and every process for each Level to finalize Styles of Auditing, I left this until last and here it is.

Please note that none of these Styles violate the auditing comm cycle or the TRs.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:jw.rd