WHAT IS AUDITING?

A lecture given on
31 August 1961

Well, this is the 31st of eventful August, AD 11. And the generalities which have come up to relieve auditing come into various new gains of some kind or another. I hope very soon that we can be through in Scientology with all bad auditing of every character, size, shape and everything else.

There is such a thing as poor auditing. There are two stages of it: Basically, the individual audits sort of naturally and then learns the rules of auditing and audits all thumbs with the rules of auditing You got the idea? And then eventually, why, these rules drop back to where they ought to belong and then the guy is now doing a very good job of auditing. There comes a time in any auditor's career where one audits with all thumbs. But the basics of auditing are what they are, which is to say you are auditing a human being, and this auditing is addressed to a case, and the road map which you have is better and better. And it's so darn plain now that you can almost walk out in an open field, you know, and you just can't miss the road. You will get to Tipperary whether you like it or not, you know, providing you do anything even sensible, but nothing discounts auditing. Auditing must be done. Auditing must be done. Now, what is auditing? What is it?

Well, it's the pc in-session. Definition: *willing to talk to the auditor and interested in own case.* Exact definition. We broadened that definition recently by saying "able to talk to the auditor." This becomes manifest in Security Checks – how you bring this about: able to talk to the auditor; interested in own case.

Well, interested in own case means interested in own case. Not interested in session. Get the vast difference here. Sessions should never be interesting Never. Never, never, never interesting, the session itself. The pc's attention should never really be distracted from his own case. And then he will find that it's a very interesting session. He will say it's an interesting session, but what he means is his own case was interesting during that session.

Now, you'll find many a witch doctor has violated this to such a remarkable degree that they practically bang everybody into apathy. But this is the way a witch doctor runs an auditing session: He gets a couple of rattles. And you don't realize it but he's the immediate forebearer here on Earth. There hasn't been any therapy since the witch doctor. That which went in between didn't get the 22M2 percent. The witch, the witch doctor, the witchcraft of

Europe which extended up into – in England here – up to the maybe about the thirteenth, fourteenth, fifteenth century. Yeah, I know it's extended into

the sixteenth century because that's where the doctors got digitalis. They got it from the witchcraft.

So it is a bit different being a witch and being a witch doctor, but their modus operandi was quite the same. They maintained such a compelling presence, their presence was so compelling one way or the other, that a patient didn't have a chance of doing anything else but being interested in the session. You take a couple of gourd rattles and a snake that leaps out of the middle of the witch doctor's bonnet, little things like that. As a matter of fact, I can scream like a witch doctor. Now, that's quite an accomplishment. I'll have to practice one of these days. Go down the woods and scare old Farmer Jones's cows.

In old Irish mythology, there's a wonderful, wonderful line: Two giants are fighting, and they made the ground shake to such a degree that the cows shed their calves, even though they had none.

But anyway, the witch doctor very often has a mechanism like this: Carries a little pouch. Normally, you'll see a witch doctor has a pouch. And this pouch is supposed to be an amulet. That's to keep the patient from knowing what's in the pouch. And they'll normally have things like Greek fire, gunpowder, pepper. You get the uses of these things. Gunpowder – well they've got a fire there, and the session is going very tamely, and they flip some of this gunpowder, you see, with a quick prestidigitation. Can't even see their hand approach the pouch, you see. They're making some motions in the air and suddenly pow! You see, the fire blows up. Well, it's interesting It distracts people.

And a while after the fire's exploded, they make some more motions in the air, and nobody notices that the hand has approached the pouch you see, and it's come out and flipped something in, but the fire burns glaringly red with leaping flames, you see, and all this kind of thing. It's very interesting.

And the patient's sitting there minding his own business, and he looks very calm at this particular moment, and with some prestidigitation and fast hand passes calling on the spirits of the air, why, the patient starts sneezing like mad because, of course, he's just had a face full of pepper. It's very interesting to watch.

North American Indian – particularly amongst the Iroquois, they had various . . . Well, as a matter of fact, the white man has so stamped out the Indian up there that there's practically no tracing any of the real old customs, but there were a few missionaries who went up there amongst the Iroquois and into the hinterland before the white man and rum and fur ever were a subject, you see. None of these things were a subject inland. And the Indian tribe was there as it was with all of their customs. They used to live – we think of them as living in wigwams, you know and all kinds of things. Actually, they used to live in bark houses in

palisades. And very elaborate. A very elaborate civilization, and the Iroquois medicine clans were fantastic. They were something that would make the AMA green with envy as far as organization was concerned. They were really a complicated clan setup. And they had rituals of various kinds that you would have been very interested in, to have studied them.

These early missionaries, as I mentioned, did find most of the dope about this, and they reported it endlessly, before of course they got executed or something of the sort or exorcised themselves from either the Indian or the white society. And we find there are very few books of this character still extant; they are very rare. And I've had the privilege of reading some of them. Very fancy.

They had ideas of soul transference. They had ideas of exteriorization. They had a medical-type exteriorization, you know. You fed a guy enough of the proper bark, you know, and gave him enough fumes, well, he'd find himself out of his ruddy 'ead and way up in the air, you know.

And they apparently could do something with animals, such as exteriorize and do something with the animal, you know. Make an animal do something peculiar and then reinteriorize and so forth. Quite interesting. And of course, their religion is indistinguishable from Christianity. That's why they had such a hard time making the Indian into a Christian. The Indian was full of endless arguments, of course, because the Indian believed in one god. And there the missionary would come a cropper at once.

He'd come in there with the big news that there is one god, you see. And the Indian would say, "Mm-hm. Ug." Total agreement, you see. "And at one time there was an enormous flood, and there was a fellow by the name of Noah, and so on. And he built an ark, and all of the beings on earth all died and perished in the flood except . . ." And the Indian will say, "Mm-mm-mmmm." And when the white man gets all finished telling him about it, he says, "Name not Noah. Name Hecton." Knew all about the flood, you see, but he had a different personnel in there.

Adam and Eve – knew all about Adam and Eve, except Adam and Eve wasn't quite the right names so the white man wasn't quite smart. He wasn't in the know. You see, all man had descended from Adam and Eve, and there had been a flood, and one god and, you know, the lot, you know. And God had created all the animals. Oh, yes, see, religion never had too much of a chance because the Indian never found out there was any difference.

But he had a very advanced medical technology that was around the subject of herbs, and so on, which was quite good. And it all got lost. Lost the lot because it wasn't a written technology, and it went down by word of mouth, and so on. And you had to have new people to be studying the thing in order to preserve it.

And as soon as the white civilization made an encroachment and disease like measles – which they call smallpox, but actually was just measles – reached, of course, from

continent edge to continent edge and practically wiped them out long before they had even heard of the white man. So much so that Lewis and Clark could uncork a little bottle, or just pretend to start to uncork a little bottle, saying, "Now you will have peace with all the tribes here on the Pacific Coast, and if you don't I'm going to take the cork out of this bottle and empty its contents over the land. And it contains the red death." And all the chiefs went pale and said we will have peace and they did. Thereafter, they had peace. That was a peaceful mission. Blackmail. Or redmail.

Anyhow, they – technology of healing contained so many factors of such complexity that it required half a lifetime to learn how to do these things. Now imagine if you as an auditor had as a requisite, being able to scream loud and piercingly enough, you see, to be heard about three city blocks. See, you find yourself going out in the woods and practicing screaming. Actually, screaming is an interesting therapy. You can sometimes send some preclear out and tell him, go on out there someplace where nobody can hear you, and scream for a while, and he'll feel better.

But anyway, as a therapeutic measure, the scream is used in this fashion: A piercing scream is emitted followed by a total silence. You see, you have to be able to cut the scream off right now and leave a silence in there and then utter the magic, hypnotic words. You see, they're actual – just an hypnotic command of some kind or other, like, "You will be well" or, "You will die tomorrow." They didn't care which way they sent people. And then resume the scream at the same pitch and volume. So actually you have: Here's the scream, you see, and then here's the silence with the command in it. And then that gets totally buried in the rest of the scream. And the patient doesn't ever realize that the practitioner has ever spoken.

He just lays one into the middle of the scream. Well, of course, when you're standing two feet away from a guy screaming loud enough to be heard three city blocks, and then you cut it off suddenly and then you put the implant in and then start it up again and so forth, why, all kinds of interesting things happen because the audience that is watching this on the tribal ground, they never heard the stop of the scream and the start of the scream, you see. And after this witch doctor has screamed at the fellow, of course, he either gets well in three days or dies in three days, whichever way was the most profitable. And they had it taped. All kinds of wild things like this.

You have to be able to leap in a back somersault high enough to go through the top of the smoke hole of a wigwam and sit on the trees, you know. Those poles. So that you ostensibly in a smoky interior simply disappear from sight, so that you cannot be found anywhere in the wigwam. The way they did this was to do a backflip and go up through the smoke hole and sit there on the poles, you see. And then by projecting their voices downward, talk in loud voices – spirit voices which had different tones and incantations than their own normal voice, you see – and boy, was this a show. And some patient lying there next to

death's door naturally would become so interested that he'd come back to life again. Very abrupt.

The history and breadth of medicine or healing or religious healing, or anything like that, has gotten pretty well unknown to the white man. He is so self-sufficient in his belief that he can do a great many of these things. But actually, their percentage was pretty high. Very high. You combine herbs and magic and superstition and these things together, and it's pretty high. And right now the white man in his arrogance, doesn't realize that in South Africa he is only doing maybe 30 to 40 percent of the cure, even when he's paid. Because the native goes across the street to see the witch doctor to complete the cure. And he merely considers the white doctor is quite inadequate because he never gives the spiritual fillip to it, you see, that drives the cure home.

That white pill might be all right, but that split feather in the pocket is a guarantee that it won't happen again. And the white man, of course, he doesn't realize these things so he's just stupid. The white man had never really better find out what natives think of him. It would be very, very bad for his pride, believe me. It was an awful shock to me. The first time I ever ran across this was the Eskimo.

There was a fellow there, and he wasn't working. And somebody said *"dudtha"* to him, you know. And my ear cocked up, and I had heard this word *dudtha* or whatever it was. Nobody can speak Eskimo. It's a fact. Nobody's ever learned all of it. I'd heard this word thrown in my direction, so I wondered what the connection was. And I said, "What did you call him?"

"Oh," he said, "He's a loafer. He's no good."

"Well, what did you call him?"

"Oh," he said, "he sits there. He's not helping us load."

"Yeah. What did you call him?"

He said, "A white man."

And wouldn't they get that impression. It's a good thing we don't hear these things.

Anyway, if you were practicing amongst such a people and you failed to follow these now-I'm-supposed-to's of what healing were all about, you see, why, you would naturally be suspect as a practitioner.

You couldn't flip backwards and disappear; and there were no spirit voices suddenly resounding where you had just left; and you would talk to somebody and he didn't start sneezing, you know; you got near a fire and nothing exploded; they'd say, "Fake, man, fake." Got the idea?

Well, you're walking forward straight into that in Scientology, but the fake is the guy who won't know Model Session and he won't know how to do this and he won't know how to do this and he won't know the proper form, so of course he isn't an auditor. Isn't that right?

You've got the now-I'm-supposed-to. Now these now-I'm-supposed-to's have very, very potent reasons back of them. They are tried and tested and true. But they also become a badge. And the ease with which a person can handle a Model Session is, of course, his hallmark of whether or not he's a pro. You get that? It's whether or not he follows the form. Now, he makes mistakes in the form; immediately the preclear thinks of him as a bad auditor. He omits part of the form. The pc is immediately upset.

It's in actually the same category as – he hasn't done a backflip and had spirit voices appear at the point he vanished, you see. So therefore, he couldn't possibly make anybody well, because part of the magic incantation is missing The now-I'm-supposed-to is missing so the fellow must be illy informed as to what to do. Rather amusing, but you're walking forward to that.

Now this can become so much a thing, that it is only necessary to follow the form to be an auditor. You see the reverse side of the coin? And that can become so idiotic as to be the same as the old master who was teaching the neophyte, and the old master, every time before he gave the neophyte his lesson, tied his cat to the bottom of the bed – having nothing else to do with the cat, you see, tied him to the bottom of the bed. So of course, the neophyte – when he became the master, he starts to teach somebody, and he says, "Now," he says, "the first thing let's do is find a cat and tie him to the bottom of the bed," you see. Now, that old wheeze is not without good purpose.

But you can get so interested in tying cats to bottoms of beds that the soul and spirit of auditing can vanish. It's all right to know the forms. And you sure better use the forms, and you better go through the forms, but auditing comes back to something else. It comes back to running cases. It is almost more important – always more important to run cases than to run cases according to form.

That doesn't persuade you in any way to abandon form, but it does persuade you to be able to use form with such ease that you can immediately and instantly sail into a case and find out everything you want to know about the case and follow the case through. And your use of the form is very, very easy.

Your use of the form can be so easy as to not really be apparent to anybody as a form. And that is the real art. That is the real art. When you're really expert, it won't ever look like a form to anybody. It'll look like just you're doing something. And it'll look like you're doing something effective. And that requires real art, and it requires real skill.

And that's the point you're moving over into. And if you stop short of moving all the way over into total, casual ease.. . Actually you're running something that is as bound in rules,

you see, as concrete. But you handle it with such offhand ease, and you handle it with such naturalness that it never occurs to anybody that it's a form. Now, that is really fantastic. You have to be terribly comfortable with what you're doing You have to be completely comfortable. You have to be able to move within the perimeter.

It's like Japanese painting. A Japanese painting, you know, is the most stylized painting in the world. The laws which surround Japanese painting are so fantastic that when I was a kid I used to wonder how on earth anybody could remember all the rules and still paint a picture that looked like that. A great deal of, you see, the stroke that paints the tree must be stroked upward since the tree grows upward. And all sorts of odd rules of this character, you see. And you have to do it this way and that way and the other way. And there are certain ways to grind ink stones. And oh, it just goes on and on. But when they turn something out, when a real craftsman turns something out, it is quite a piece of art. It is really remarkable. But he turned it out according to the rules, which made it three times as hard.

And I should think that the rule – instead of making auditing easier, I should think you are now at the stage where you realize that the form makes it harder, because you have to sound natural, and you have to be interested, and you have to be in there pitching, in spite of the fact that you are utilizing a form.

Now, if you fall short of appearing totally natural, then you will fall short of total control. There is where this thing bridges. If you sound the least bit artificial while you're doing this one . . . of course, if you don't use any form at all, you know you won't be a pro. That'll be – you'll be a fake, you see. You get the idea? I mean you wouldn't really be an auditor. "He's not a well-trained auditor. He doesn't use Model Session." You get the idea? "Doesn't run the rudiments right," and so on. "'Tisn't in the proper order."

All right. That's not enough. If you can use this to a point where the preclear never notices that rudiments are being used in that order – ah-ha, now that's real art. That is real art. You've moved over, way over on the other side. And your ability to control a pc and hold him in session will be utterly fantastic because he has no doubt about anything. He is very sure that your mind is straight on him and his case and that he must comply with what you've said, because it is obviously addressed to him and is totally natural. It is so natural that it must be addressed to him. Don't you see? And it sounds like a communication. This is very compelling

So your nadir, you might say, of professional appearance in auditing, is to be able to use the form perfectly, but to use it with such ease that it isn't recognizable as a form; with such casualness that it appears to be totally relaxed; and that there is no question in your mind as to what you're doing or where you're going or what you're going to achieve. And this very casualness seems to speak of reserved power – something on the order of a huge Rolls-Royce motor which is sitting at the curb idling. You got the idea?

Ease is power – always. Strain is never power. The soft voice will always compel more obedience than the loud one.

Man is in an utter rage with you. I mean you're bossing workmen or something like that. Walk over to the foreman and whisper something to him. Just whisper it: "Now, get these men back to work. Get them back to work." Walk away quietly. Boy, you'll have injected more enturbulence into that rage than you ever heard of. The next thing you know they'll all be back working, and they might still be muttering, but they figure that if anybody said anything to them

like that there must be something to it, see. Try it sometime.

Don't just Q-and-A with him out of rage, you see. Then out of that results war. I imagine, that if some of the warring nations of World War II had found the method of submitting a quiet enough message to one another in a quiet enough way, they would never have been in any war. But all the messages were very loud, weren't they? And they got louder and louder, and there got to be more and more confusion.

Now, this is based on the fact that – of the Effect Scale, naturally. And it's very easy for you to audit a pc with tremendous control, providing you yourself are not anxious. Providing you yourself appear to have, and actually have, every confidence that you can control every part of this situation. And you just go on and audit in this particular way. And the fellow says something, and you take it up. And you give another command, and he says something, and you say, "That's fine," and "All right," "How about that," and so on. And he's purring along there like mad. Because you are not trying to interest him in the session.

He feels that there is nothing to look at at all but the bank. There's just nothing to see around there but his case. Got the idea? And if there's nothing to see around there but his case, there's no great demonstration of rudiments, and there's no great demonstration of a nice, big fumble with the E-Meter. And there is big twisting of knobs and dials and the clatter of cans, and strained look on the face, and the deep concentration, and the this and the that, and the worry on the part of the auditor. All of these various things add up to no control to the pc.

The auditor sits down, takes the E-Meter, turns the thing on. He doesn't even bother to settle it in, you know. He settled it in before the pc got there. Hands the pc the cans and says, "All right. Good. Fine. Squeeze the cans. All right. That's it. Okay. Now beginning of session. All right. *Start* of session. All right now. Let's see. Where are we at today? Mm-hm. Mm-hm. All right. That's good. That's good. Now . . ." And here we go.

You go on down the line with your rudiments, check them out, and so forth. You're not doing anything very important. That isn't very important. The pc's ARC breaks aren't very important. Now you get down to a point of where you got – you're going to run the process, see. Well, you roll up your sleeves, you know. Just about that much interest as far as the voice comes up.

"All right. We got that out of the way. Now, here's the process I'm going to run on you." And you give it to him, see. "Here's the first command."

I seldom ask the pc if it's all right with him. I assumed that it was if he sat down in the chair. If he's fool enough to sit down in the chair, why, I'm not going to trifle with it. I'm not going to trifle with this any further, believe me.

And he says, "Wow! wow!" and "Gee whiz!" and so on and, etc.

And I say, "No kidding. All right. All right. What do you know about that. Yeah. Well, what do you know about that."

I don't say, "Yes. Good. Yes. Thank you." Much more likely to say, "Mm-hm. All right." Get the idea? Different attitude. It's the attitude of the fact that, all right, he's given, we're interested, and we're both in his bank running it, you know. And here we are and so on and that's all that's important that's happened around here. It's his bank. That's the only thing we're interested in. We're just interested in what he's looking at and where he's going and that sort of thing. That's where the interest is. our interest isn't on sessioning Got the idea?

Well, when you get that good, you all of a sudden will speed your results up. That's all. It's the ease with which you can do it. The ease with which you can do it is to a large degree born of confidence.

Your confidence is based, of course, on wins and ability. And when you have ideas that you're not going to win, naturally, your confidence drops. The reality factor has to be kept in. And if you're anxious about somebody's case, you will appear anxious about somebody's case.

I handle it another way. I say, "Gee, I sure am worried about your case these days."

And the guy says, "You are?"

I say, "Yes, Sir. I sure am. I was thinking last night. I was wondering what in the name of common sense this is all about?"

And he says, "You did?"

And I say, "Yes."

He says, "Well, I haven't been worried about my case."

I say, "Well, I have been."

"Well, why are you worried about my case?"

"Well, you never say 'Gee whiz.' you never say, 'Gosh, what do you know?' Nothing. You just keep running this stuff. I don't know. I – I'm worried." Much higher reality factor than, "Now we are going to audit you. You are going to sit there, and I am going to give you. . . Here is the first auditing command. Do fish fly? Good. Do fish fly? Good. Do fish fly?"

If you feel that way, it's much more real to say to the fellow, "Well, I hope this is the right process to run on you. Let's see how it goes."

And you'll find all of a sudden the pc is right in there pitching with you. It isn't the fact that you're anxious about it that makes him anxious about it. He's liable to try to cheer you up.

But, I mean, if you are looking confident apparently but are feeling very unconfident, he's liable to go quite the reverse. He's very likely to respond to your anxiety. Extremely likely to respond directly to your anxiety. And the more you withhold your anxiety, the less he'll go into session.

"I hope you can put up with me this session, because I feel a little bit tired. If that's all right with you, I'll go on auditing you."

"Oh yeah. Do you feel very tired?"

"Oh, not particularly. It's no overt. No overt for you to sit there and get audited, but if I flub a few times, why, you know what to put it down to. If that's all right with you, here we go."

No, he isn't getting ARC breaky. But you sit there, you're dead exhausted, dead beat, and you're saying – you know, brace – "Is it all right with you if I start this session? Good. Here it is. Start of session." He says, "What's the matter with this guy?" Thrown an unknown into the situation. The auditor's an unknown factor to the pc. Now, frankness on the part of the auditor is part of the auditor's communication. And this goes over to a borderline of evaluation. The auditor starts thinking unkind thoughts about the pc. Starts chopping up the pc one way or the other. And of course, this is very, very bad for the session indeed, and it jumps the code, and the whole situation is going to run sideways and backwards and upside down, and the session is going to drown. You can sure count on that.

Well, the answer to that is, if you're having bad thoughts about a pc, and you feel very antipathetic about this particular pc and that sort of thing, you better get one of your fellow auditors. . . It's a good thing, you know, to have friends because they'll audit you. And you better get one of your fellow auditors to flatten O/W or something on this particular pc. You'll feel better, and he'll feel better, before it's through, see.

But the reality factor begins, of course, in your actual command of your information. If you don't feel you have an actual command of the information and you're pretending to have an actual command of the information, your session will come a cropper every time. You cannot help it. It always will come a cropper. No matter how hard you try, it'll come a cropper. A session goes to pieces only on those points of unreality in the auditor. If you want to know why a session goes to pieces, analyze the points of unreality that the auditor had. It's interesting, isn't it?

You look it over sometime. If you're training a bunch of auditors, and you find one or two of the auditors having trouble auditing, find out what's unreal. Now, one of the ways you ask about what's unreal – I just give you this as a method of checking this down: "What were you disagreeing with in that session?"

You know, the auditor was auditing a session. Get him afterwards. "Now what were you disagreeing with in that session?"

"Well, I disagreed with this and I disagreed with that, and I disagreed with something or other."

And you find those are the exact points that the session went to pieces on and the exact places where the pc went astray. It is quite interesting. Because there was no R in the session. Now if there's no R. let me yawningly go back to 1950. There's no R. there is no A. And if there is no A, there is no C. Reality, affinity and communication: It is the triangle, and when one of those corners of the triangle goes out of balance, the other two go out of balance, and they go zip, boom. And don't think that they go out on a lag. The R doesn't go out, and then a little while later, like a half an hour, the A go out, and a little while after that, the communication goes out. That isn't the way it happens. That's a simultaneous triangle.

When you say the R goes out, and then the A goes out, and then the C goes out, you're actually talking in milliseconds. They all go out together. They're simultaneously operating factors. You may become aware of them later as separate factors. You may become aware eventually that the C went out. The C went out. Well, if you want to spot where the C went out – when the C actually went out – you had to go back and find out when the R went out. The R went out, and there went the A, and there went the C.

You feel mad with the pc. You'll find out that this was a gradient scale, that you actually started feeling mad at the pc much earlier, and it was at that moment when an unreality entered the situation from the auditor – not from the pc, but from the auditor – when an unreality was entered into the session. At that moment, the auditor started to get peeved with the pc. Just *bing-bing.* Happens right now.

All these things are sensible. Sensible factors. Now, a session, basically, is an ARC activity. And if a session has high ARC in the auditor – it's only necessary in the auditor – it will materialize in the pc. Now, a pc can look at his bank as well as he can communicate. A good auditor has a highly perceptive pc. That's interesting, isn't it? The same pc, audited by an auditor with low ARC, is not perceptive. Isn't that fascinating?

Now, we're getting back to the Iroquois Indian, practically, aren't we? We're getting into factors of telepathy and transference and rapport and empathy and all kinds of oddball factors. But actually these factors have always existed. No matter whether you call them good witch doctoring or good this or good that. These factors are always present.

Now, if you feel an annoyance, or an anxiety with the pc, basically, that annoyance or anxiety with the pc is going to drop R. and is going to cut C, and it can be very destructive to a session, be very destructive to the pc. The pc would find himself practically running in the dark. why is he running in the dark? Well, the auditor has got a low ARC. Not with him, you see, but the auditor – who is actually the projecting force of the session – is projecting a low perceptivity. And the pc can't see his bank. You got this?

This is one of the first factors that got in the road of Dianetics. This got in the road of Dianetics. One auditor would be able to get a session going and run engrams, and another auditor couldn't run engrams, and there was quite a big lot of question marks flying around in all directions. How could all this be taking place?

Actually, it was auditor presence in the session. You could explain it in many ways, and these many ways do not have to be explained by telepathy, or any odd factor at all.

An auditor who *is* confident, of course, is furnishing an auditing environment in which it is safe to depart into the never-never land of the unknown. It's as simple as that, don't you see.

So of course, you can say, well, an auditor who's not confident has a pc then who won't see the bank. Well, of course, it isn't safe to look at the bank in an environment which has got a sort of an 'ostile flavor to it. You got the idea?

So it's the auditor, in the final analysis, and the emotional tone of the session. And this has a great deal to do with whether or not auditing takes place. I'm talking to you now about the real high-school basics of auditing These are not just the mechanics of auditing This is where this stuff goes.

Now, when you're – you yourself have been auditing for a long time and you haven't cleared anybody – you're not auditing in any high level of confidence. Now, you've seen somebody cleared, and you start auditing in a higher level of confidence that we would phrase as hope. When you've cleared somebody, you start auditing in something that could be characterized as confidence. And when you really have rung up a string of them, nobody will be able to live with you. You'll be totally insouciant. But that in itself is a reality.

Now, also it goes this way. When you have audited a pc up to results, you feel more confident about pcs. And when you've not gotten these results, you feel less confident about pcs and so you're auditing in an auditing environment which has a low ARC in it. Got the idea?

These things are very easily explained. They are simply observable. You can always detect the false note in somebody's confidence, always. The auditor is sounding confident but isn't at all confident. And of course, this is observable. The pc is nervous. The pc's attention

goes off of own case on to auditor, because he feels there is something here he doesn't know. And we have an unknownness in the session.

Unknownnesses would be the keynote of this. The auditor doesn't know whether or not he can produce a result. He doesn't know whether or not he can hold a pc in-session. He doesn't know what he can do. He doesn't know what is going to happen. He has no determination of the final result. These are all not-knows, not-knows, not-knows, you see. It adds up to the pc that the auditor is not-knowing. Therefore, there is a mystery in the session.

The pc may try to spot this not-know. Very hard and arduously. The pc may be trying to spot this and not know what he's trying to spot. But he gets stuck on the auditor. Why? A thetan stuck to anything is, of course, just a mystery sandwich. It's thetan, mystery, object. Mystery sandwich. And of course, the auditor then can't keep the pc in-session because the pc has got a mystery on the auditor, and we have the auditor plastered all over the pc. You get the idea? Because the pc is... See? And he doesn't dare see anything, and he doesn't dare act. These are the factors. These are the factors that are involved. They're all explained on the order of how much mystery does he smell around here.

Well, I disabuse the pc of mystery as fast as I can, as a method of operating procedure. I tell him how long we are going to audit, if this seems to have any importance – if it has a bearing on the thing, I say, "Well, we're going to run this session until such-and-such a time."

Of course, if you're running the session not against the part of a pc's day where the pc will have anything to do, you say to hell with that. We're just going to run the pc, you see? Got the idea? I mean, you're running him from eight o'clock on, and you've got till midnight, as far as that's concerned, it just doesn't matter. The pc knows you probably may or may not start ending it at around ten. If he looks the least querulous about anything, well, you find out why. It's usually something about the time of the auditing session or something like that. So you'd set him right anyhow. Got the idea?

The rule of thumb is, if there appears to be a mystery about what is going on, you give the pc the dope. You just destroy the mysteries about the session. I can be counted on usually to give a pc a synopsis of what is going to happen. I've never gone so far as to say, "And at the end of that time you will feel much better," but I have gone as far as to say, "Well, we'll take care of that. I'm going to take care of this headache you've got." you know?

I ask the pc for his goals, too – it's polite – while I tell him what I'm going to do. Tell him what I'm going to run. If I ignore doing something, I tell him I'm going to ignore it. That is to say a rudiment. I'd say, "Well, there's a fall here on this ARC break with me. But that's what I'm running toward anyhow. And is there anything you want to tell me about this? I notice there's a little fall here."

"Yeah. Well, so-and-so and so-and-so."

"I thought it was something like that. Okay. Now we're just going to skip that at the moment because it'll come out in the session shortly. Okay?"

And the pc says, "Well, I guess so. Well, all right." And all of a sudden the ARC break disappears because so much R has been thrown into the session. Ha-ha-ha-ha. Get the idea?

And a quarter of the way through, you're running some kind of a process or other, and the pc seems to be floundering around and nothing's happening, I say, "I don't like the way this is going I'm going to give you another auditing command. Going to change the auditing command. What do you think of that?"

The pc says, "Well, I don't know. I think it'll probably be a very good idea."

"Well, I don't like the way the other's going."

"I don't like the way it's going either."

"All right. Here's the new auditing command."

No bridge. Didn't stop any session, start any session. See why? I'd introduce an unreality into this situation – without telling the pc why, I'm going to stop an auditing command; I'm going to throw a bridge in; I'm going to start another auditing command; I'm going to go through the tortuous mechanics of everything, you know. You can hear the wheels click, you know, and the cuckoo is grinding his beak inside the clock, and all this kind of thing. The pc can be counted on to look up and say, "Well – hey what – what – what – what's the matter?" I know that I've been a very bad auditor. I know that I've been an absolute fool if the pc ever looks up and asks me what's the matter. If I haven't filled him in before he thought of it, I figure I'm doing wrong

"I'm going to run through this, and I'm going to keep up with this command until I think the thing is squared away. Is that all right? A11 right. And that may mean that we'll be overrunning this session. Is that all right?"

"All right."

There's never any doubt in his mind that when the session starts to overrun that the session was going to be overrun. He knows about it already. See?

And I always try to make the pc right, and never try to make the pc wrong I never bother to make the pc right at the expense of my being wrong If he says I said something that I didn't say, I *acknowledge* him. I don't say I said it. Because that would introduce another mystery in it, because he probably knows down deep that I didn't say it. You see this? So I just acknowledge it. I'm liable to say something, "Well, can we recover from that? Is that all right?"

"Yeah, well, that's all right."

If I'm challenged for flubbing an auditing command or repeating an auditing command – if it is valid, if it is perfectly valid, if I did repeat one leg of a process, you know, running without any tally or anything of the sort on a ten-way bracket, God knows, and so on – I will normally catch it before the pc does, and if I don't catch it before the pc does, I figure I'm kind of slipping, you see. "How many ways from center have you batted your – ? oh, I've said that before. Excuse me. How many ways has your grandmother batted you? That's the right command. Is that okay? You got it?"

Pc says, "All right." He says, "Well, anybody can make a mistake." That's his reaction to it if he thinks of it at all.

And you say, "Well, how many ways have you batted your – uh – your – urn – uh – your grandmother?"

Pc says, "I answered that before."

Oh, man, that is really a lousy piece of auditing, see. It's not a lousy piece of auditing because you made a mistake on which auditing command you were giving the pc. That's not necessarily horrible. But it was horrible because the *pc* found it out. You got the idea? You didn't find it out before the pc did. See?

You should know more about what's going on in the session than the pc does at any given instant. And therefore, you have more R in the session than the pc, and therefore you stay in control of the pc in the session.

When you have a pc wising you up as to what was going on, well, there's – something has slipped. That's all. It has slipped, and it slipped a long time ago, and it slipped badly, and there's – R-factors are out, and everything else is out, from the middle outward in a session. This thing was out. This has probably been out for days or weeks. Lord knows how long it's been out if that kind of a condition can exist.

The pc is not always right. But the auditor doesn't have to tell him he's wrong because the auditor's not trying to prove anything to the pc. There isn't a single part of auditing that consists of proving anything to a pc. You don't have to prove a thing to a pc. You don't have to prove him there are Clears, or that he can get Clear, or that he can get released. You don't have to prove to him that Scientology works. You don't have to prove anything to him. Got it?

"Prove" is one of the basic games of the thetan. And people are always – on the whole track, thetans have been running around telling others to prove it. And a pc can get this games condition very early. But if a pc wants you to prove something to him, you already have got an out R-factor someplace. Something has gone wrong earlier than this point.

You say, "Well, I'll show you that Scientology works. I will give you a session." See?

The guys says, "Oh, I don't believe it works and I believe it's kind of fraudulent and so forth. And I'm not sure. And, uh, I'm not sure and, uh, so on."

Not because you want to prove anything to him, say, "What withholds have you got?" You know, this is a social conversation taking place in the underground. "What withholds have you got?" You know, very puzzled. "What's with you and the rest of the human race?"

Bzzzzzz. Boom. I never Q-and-A with whether it works or not. I wouldn't discuss for three seconds with anybody whether Dianetics or Scientology work. And I would never audit anybody to get a result that will electrify the community.

You know, the guy wants to be audited on this sole basis. He wants this young girl to be audited because it'll do so much for Scientology. And we hear that quite often. That's one of these "prove" things. Prove it. Prove it. Prove it. Sure, if we audit a young girl and get some result, it'll electrify the community. That's for sure. But isn't it interesting that every effort to prove the validity of Dianetics and Scientology, some of which efforts have cost as much as fifty thousand dollars, have all of them netted us not one single bit of gain.

It's given us lots of nice records, and I'm very happy to have the records.

The reason they have trouble with business is the president of the company is sitting there in his old slacks and his tweed coat that is out at the elbows – see, they no longer wear top hats because laborers knock them off. And he's sitting there at his solid mahogany desk, and he says, "Now you say," he says, "that this will up production. You say this will up production. Now, we could do it on a basis that if it did up production, why, then we would do so-and-so, and if it didn't up production, then we wouldn't do so-and-so," and so on.

That is the time to go yawn, yawn, yawn, because the old thetan game of "prove" has started stopping things. You shouldn't be selling him anything anyhow. Sit on his head and audit him. He'll come up at the other end, and say, "What in the hell happened to me? I feel better."

You say, "Good. Of course you do."

He'll say, "What is this stuff?"

And you say, "This is Scientology."

And he says, "No kidding." He says, "Does it always do this?"

"Yeah. Why don't you go to a PE course. I'm not going to give you one here. Or I'll give you some more auditing if you want."

The guy says, "Well, if you could just get me over my lumbosis, I would be happy to pay you four hundred dollars."

That is the time to go yawn, yawn, yawn.

You now say, "Well, I'm not trying to take any lumbosis away from you. But I'll give you some auditing."

"You don't want my lumbosis? You don't want this game? No game, you mean? No game? No game?"

And you say, "No game. Scientology's the game that everybody wins. The only game on Earth where everybody wins. So, we're not interested in your lumbosis, or proving to you or your wife or anybody else that Scientology works."

Because you've gotten the thing into a disagreement, an argument, and a games condition before you've even begun to audit. And an auditing session is not a games condition. You should know it. The one thing an auditing session must not become is a games condition whereby the auditor sits there and prevents the pc from getting a win, and the pc sits there and prevents the auditor from getting a win.

And this can be quite detrimental. But you should realize – and the only reason I've embarked upon this little excursion here is just this – that every Homo sap that is wearing out shoe leather or rubber soles on the metropoli of Earth is in a games condition. And all you have to do is just whisper, "games condition" and they're right there. It almost takes precedent over a session. And could very easily take precedent over a session.

So anytime a pc offers up anything that looks like a games condition, just let it fall with a dull plop in the middle of the floor. And every time you embark on anything that looks like a games condition to the pc, patch it up. Because from there on, your goal will be opposite from his goal. And if your goal is to make him better, then he'll get worse or try to. Because it's a games condition, he will try to do an opposite. He won't agree with you in this kind of a condition. And a games condition immediately and directly results instantly that you obey almost any part – except the eating one; oh, I guess maybe that one too – of the Auditor's Code. Those are all prevention of games conditions. They could be looked at that way in a loose, rough way.

Pc, well, get the shuns. The pc is sitting there to get smarter, so you educate him. See? He's sitting there to find out from himself, so you give him the information. Now let's put it a little more closely, and you'll see exactly how this fits. He's sitting there to find out something about his case, and he finds out something about your case. See, that just doesn't work. And it'll start putting him in a games condition whether you like it or not.

All right. Now, the pc says, "Uh, you said the auditing command before."

And you say, "No, I did not."

And you'll have a divergence of goals at that point in the session. At the least whiff of a games condition, a pc can be guaranteed to take off in that direction. They'll be knocking the tennis balls around the court from there on, man.

Disagreements, of various kinds, of course, lead directly into a games condition because the game is basically an individuated nonagreement. The only agreement there, is to

have a game. And as soon as you establish the agreement to have a game, of course, all other things go into a disagreement. You've got certain rules of this game, but the pc is on one side, and you're on the other side, and you're not auditing now. Auditing is the one activity in which a games condition must not exist. That's for sure. And, as soon as you drop out R. of course, you've dropped *in* an ingredient that could lead to a games condition. So that a missing R goes into a games condition.

Now, you're sitting there withholding something from the pc with magnitude – you yourself might kind of get tricked into the thing You're playing some kind of a game with the pc. You get the idea? It sort of reacts like that. You're withholding something from the pc, so obviously you must be playing tennis with the pc. You see? Just the fact that you are, will enter this type of atmosphere into the situation. Of course, C breaks down at once. Auditing is an activity of an auditor taking over the control of, and shepherding the attention of, a pc, so as to bring about a higher level of confrontability. He has got to be able to confront more of what he has done, is doing, and so forth.

You actually are not even changing the pc. Same pc. He's going to shed some valences, some various things are going to happen of one character or another, which will certainly appear as change. You haven't changed the pc,

because his level of vision can remain at 249 degrees in direction, only it is now eight miles long. It isn't being stopped two inches from his nose by an automobile accident he had. You get the idea?

So you haven't even changed the direction of his attention. Eventually he will wind up with his attention in all those directions, only his attention will be free in those directions. What you're doing, actually, is extending and familiarizing a pc with himself and his bank and the universe, various dynamics.

And therefore, his attention very well has to be shepherded. You can't expect the automaticity of an auditing command to do all the shepherding of attention, because the pc is going to duck.

The pc's attention is on object A, and the pc goes into a dispersal from object A, and you don't want the pc at that moment to be dispersing from object A because you don't think object A has been regarded at all. And yet you think at the same time that the pc is totally capable of regarding object A. We're not going to throw him in over his head. But he just told us that, "Well, I have this stuck picture of this candy shop."

"All right." Time goes on. "Now what are you looking at? What have you got now?"

"Well, I got this camel."

"Camel? What happened to the candy shop? It's all right to have a camel, but what happened to the candy shop?"

"Oh, that just disappeared."

"Well, what was that about the candy shop?"

"Well, I don't know. It was just a candy shop. And it was just sitting there. There, there it is now."

"Well, did it come back? Has it still been there?"

"Why, I guess it's still been there. Actually, I have this camel. It's a small picture up to the right of the candy shop. I hadn't noticed that before."

"Well, what gives with this candy shop? How come? What's on the other side of it? What's in front of it? What's all this about?"

Yeah, well, you shouldn't have asked. You shouldn't have asked, you see. This was the key withhold that was holding up the whole Security Check. He robbed it. That's all. And it just seems to have been totally occluded, and the only thing he's got left of it is a stuck candy shop. And the motion and action around there with the eighteen blocks he was chased by the police patrol car. There's nothing around the candy shop. Nothing, except policemen, guilt, potential prison, and an eighteen block chase, and a screaming police car, you see. Nothing around the candy shop. It's totally blank. That's it.

You can count on the fact that every stuck picture is in some degree held, but that the person is able to regard the action if he can regard the stuck picture. The indicator that he can regard at least some of the action or consequences in the scene, are indicated by the fact that he has a stuck picture blanking them out. So he can always do the gradient scale of looking a little bit further, and you can always do the gradient scale of looking a little bit further at what the pc is looking at.

You didn't ask the pc to look at the candy shop in the first place. You just found out that the pc was looking at the candy shop. You got the idea? And it's just a candy shop and a candy shop. Once in a while you'll have a pc saying, "Well, candy shop, candy shop, candy shop. *Aaaahh.* It's a picture of this cand – it's a picture of this damned candy shop."

"Well, what is that?"

"Well, I don't know. That's started to worry me. It's just sitting there."

"Well, what about it?"

"Well, it's just sitting there. There isn't anything about it. That's what's so mystifying about the whole thing, you see. There is nothing there. It's just a candy shop. And there's nothing going on. And I think I've had this for the last twenty auditing commands. I mean there's this candy shop. I mean there's just this candy shop, you know."

He's actually asking you, for God's sakes, let me investigate this thing or do something because I myself do not have quite the punch and power to do so. Don't you see?

So you say, "Well, look on the other side of it. Is there anything just short of it? Is there anything on the other side of it?"

You only have to do that once, something of that sort. And boom! He's looking at more, and this thing all changes and so forth. But changes on cases which are rapid, and changes on cases which are highly beneficial, very often come about from the shepherding of the pc's attention. Not from the permissive grind, grind, grind. But let's find out what he's looking at. And then let's get him to see it. That he's looking at something doesn't mean he can see it, because he doesn't know what's all going on with that situation. Now you're blowing more unknownness out of the session, aren't you?

The pc with an unknownness confronting him can become absolutely frantic. Utterly frantic. It is just an unknownness, and he can't seem to examine it, and he doesn't seem to know what's going on, and if the auditor at that particular time is deaf and dumb, and there's nothing happening, the pc can become quite upset. Why? Because he's letting the auditor steer his attention, and then the auditor doesn't steer his attention. You see?

He's granted the auditor permission to do a conducted Cook's tour through the bank, and then the auditor says, "Well, that's a ghetto over there, and we don't want to have much to do with that. And that there, that's the court buildings, and we don't want to go in there. And, oh, that's good enough. Well, fine. Just answer the auditing command, that's all. Now let's see, let's – well, that's just a street. That's just a street. That's all right. Keep your attention about four feet off the pavement, and you won't see any bodies or anything on it."

An auditor isn't there to conduct a safe tour. The only safety precautions you utilize in the bank is to get the pc to examine what he's looking at. And that goes skip, skip, skip, skip, skip, skip, skip. Well, there's another somatic. Skip, skip. And there's another somatic. Skip, skip. And there's another somatic. Skip, skip, skip. Another somatic. Another somatic. I now have eighteen. Skip, skip, skip. And there's another one. Skip, skip, skip. What are you doing then? You're just letting him collapse the bank on himself.

Well, somewhere along the line you have to say, "Son, as painful as it may be and as difficult as I know it is, on life's long highway, you will have to stop and turn around and stare, at least, some of the smaller devils down. And the time has come now. What is beyond that candy shop?" Have you got the idea?

Now, you can get into the idea that you can throw a pc in over his head much further than he is prepared to go, because the pc is always telling you that you have just done just that. How does he do this? He tells it to you by sweating. He tells it to you by screaming. He tells it to you by writhing. You got the idea? And all of these things are, of course, signals of, "We should get out of here." And the auditor who says, "Well, this poor fellow is in trouble. Let's get him out of there," of course, has just taken him and thrown him in trouble. Because

the trouble he got into originally in that area was by escaping from it. And he's been in trouble about that area ever since. So all the indicators that the pc gives you, is the pc is in trouble.

And the only error you can make is let him slide out of trouble, let him automatically wander out of trouble, let him somehow or another fall on the pavement, and roll into the gutter, so that he doesn't have to look at the candy shop. You get the idea? And this eventually winds up to a very slow gain.

Yes, eventually the auditing command will come around again and take another sweetmeat out of the window of the candy shop. And then fifteen hours of auditing later, we take another tiny little flick off the top cornice of the candy shop.

Now, an auditor mustn't press and be anxious and be upset about anything but the pc looking and going. Case gains. He wants the pc to get some case gains. He should be quite pressy about that.

"Oh, this process is taking too long, and I think we'd better run another process, because we've been running this process for five minutes, and nothing's happened. So let's run another process now," and so on.

That is the wrong way to direct a pc's attention, because it's directing his attention off of what he's doing. It'd be much smarter – five minutes have gone by and nothing has happened with the process. And you say, "What are you doing?"

"Well, I'm doing so-and-so."

"All right. What else you doing Whatcha looking at? Whatcha looking at?"

"Well, I got this stuck picture." That's usually the thing. Or "There's just nothing here. Nothing at all. I can see nothing wherever I look."

You say, "Is that so? Which direction are you looking?"

"Well, I'm looking up."

"Good. Look down."

Got the idea? Don't change the process because it isn't going fast enough for you. Get the pc's attention directed, and it'll go fast enough to suit most anybody. And of course, you get educated against doing this, because you do it five times with great success, and on the sixth time, the pc lets out a piercing scream, and you are yourself restimulated into remembering that poor native that you shoved the iron spear through while upholding imperialism, so the communists could eventually knock it down, you know. And you are restimulated into believing that you have just impaled this poor native again. Obviously, there's a man in trouble in front of you, because he is screaming.

Naw! He isn't in trouble because he's screaming He's in trouble because he's getting well, he thinks. See, he isn't in trouble. The only way to get him in trouble is say, "Now, come

up to present time!" He'd be in trouble. He'd be in trouble right then. You get what the right way out is? The way out is the way through.

And an auditor who cannot get a pc to move on through is of course an auditor who is being oblivious of what the pc is doing You can't get a pc to move through something when you don't even know he's anywhere. If the pc is exactly nowhere as far as you're concerned, you can't tell him to look up, down, sideways. You can't tell him to look further at something You can't tell him to go – "Well, I don't know," the guy says, "I don't know. I just – I don't know. Ever since I ran that picture about the camel, I've had a lot of difficulty here. I just don't seem to be able to get the auditing command and so forth."

"Well, what about the camel? Did you miss anything around the camel? Is there anything else around that camel?" and so forth.

Oooooooh! You shouldn't have said that. You see. You can count on it every time. Every time the pc stops running, the pc has started fixedly looking The way to stop him from fixedly looking is tell him to look a little more or look a little better. And the next thing you know, you'll be getting resounding and horrendous results that you never heard of before. This case will be running that you thought was all slowed down because you didn't have the rudiments in, and all of a sudden the case will be running bang, bang, bang, bang, bang Case will be very interested in what he is doing and so forth. Got it?

If I didn't teach you how to audit a pc, and if I taught you only how to follow a form, I would be doing very wrong. Forms are forms. But running a pc is running a pc. And that is all there is to it. Pc sits down in the chair, and you say, "Start of session." If you've got your ARC in and your R-factors are in, and so on, you go down there with the rudiments, you square them away, and you get the pc into the process, and then you run that pc – you run him.

Now, it doesn't mean repeat an auditing command and repeat an auditing command and repeat an auditing command. Yes, it means repeat auditing commands. But it also – what is the pc doing with the auditing command? What else is he doing with the auditing command? What is he looking at? What is happening? Tone arm all of a sudden isn't moving. Hasn't moved for about four or five commands. "What are you looking at?"

"Nothing but this stuck picture."

"Oh. How long have you had that?"

"Well, I don't know. Last five minutes or so."

"Well, what is it?"

"Well, it's a picture of a mosque."

"Okay. What's going on in the mosque?"

"Nothing It's just a picture of a mosque."

Oh, right away, what do you know? He must have run into a confusion and a stable datum. And the stable datum is the mosque. And he's looking busily at the stable datum, and he is ignoring the confusion. And the only thing that's going to let him out of there, of course, is to pay some attention to the confusion. And if you can get him to look at the confusion, of course, there goes the stable datum because the stable datum is no longer necessary.

His security is totally bound up in the fact that "If I just stand here and look at this mosque, I'm all set." The hell he is. He's been all set. But he's been standing there looking at the mosque in the bank with his attention all bound up on it for maybe the last thousand years. Well, that seems to me to be a long time to examine mosques.

Well, it hasn't done him any good for a thousand years to look at the mosque. How do you think it's going to do him any good through the rest of this session to look at the mosque?

You better tell him, "What might be around that mosque?"

"Well, nothing is around any mosque, of course. It is just sand in all directions."

"Yeah, well, what's around that particular mosque?"

"Oh, this one. Oh, well, nothing, nothing. Mossians or something, they come out and . . . Well, as a matter of fact, there is a Mossian right now. He comes out and he says something or other. Well, what do you know, ha-ha, something happened to the picture. Ho-ho. Hey, what do you know?"

That's good enough. Give him the next auditing command. And he executes it, and you say, "What happened? What happened to the mosque?"

"Oh, it's still there. The Mossian's stuck now."

"Well, what's around that mosque? What is around it? Where is this thing

located? What is it doing? What is going on? Anything you care to say?"

And he says, "Well, there's nothing around it." He says, "You see, the whole city has been destroyed. Everything except the mosque."

"Oh? Well, what are you looking at there now?"

"I'm looking at the destroyed city."

"Well, what else do you see there?"

"(Sniff) Nothing, except my whole family *(sniff, sniff)* dead."

But you see, the computation was if he could just stand there and look at the mosque for the next thousand years, he wouldn't have to notice all those corpses. Something of this sort, don't you see? It's always that sort of thing. *Always.* I'm not talking now about one particular case. The case that has the black field – wake up sometime and say, "What is on the

other side of it?" The case that never sees a picture there, everything is invisible, and so forth – "Which direction is this invisibility?"

"Oh, it's all around."

"All around in what direction?"

"Up, of course."

"Well, look down."

So much for the invisible case. You got the idea?

It's up to you to direct the pc's attention. Why? Because he himself, in that very bank he has been in, has his attention fixed on these objects solely for one reason only: that he has been powerless to direct his own attention in that particular bank and those particular situations. And if an auditor doesn't come along and do some attention direction, of course, the auditing command alone will do the attention direction. Well, it will do something at a slow limp.

But unless the auditor says, "Look. See. What is it? What did you do with the auditing command? What else did you do with the auditing command? What is happening?" Unless those things go in, you also don't have ARC either because the pc winds up believing implicitly that the auditor doesn't care.

If you want to run a session which has fast results, and you want to do fast clearing, I'm afraid you'll just have to get down to the fundamental, which is that the auditor is somebody who directs the pc's attention through his bank. Okay?

All right. I feel now like saying, "Go now and sin no more," but I won't. I'll be back nagging at you again next week.

Thank you.