SMOOTHNESS OF AUDITING

A lecture given on
21 September 1961

Thank you.

Well, this is 21 September, 1961 and you, I trust, are a little closer to Clear – I trust. This is not grading a great probability about it because, after all, something that's been going on for the last – I don't know, when were you Clear last? About two hundred trillion years ago? Something like that? Well, it's been going on for this long, I suppose you can suffer with it a while longer. I suppose.

But unfortunately you won't have to and if your auditing would just improve, why, you would find that it would be of mutual assistance for your auditing to get better. So this is not a demand, you understand, but just a pathetic little plea for your auditing to get better. I see Bob, here, is taking that bad. Your auditing isn't perfect either. Yeah. Nor is mine. Once in a blue moon, you find yourself taking your finger off your number.

But I will say this, I will say this, I take my finger off my number less often than you do. And there are some of you going in the direction of perfection to such a degree, however, that you find it difficult to achieve mediocrity. Now, those are bitter words, but if you keep going in the direction of perfection, absolute, never errored perfection, you're going to miss that interstate known as mediocrity or even passable. Do you get what I'm driving at?

The fellow who keeps hammering in there about perfection all the time – you know, they've got to have – the auditor who sits there saying, "Well, I'm – now I've got to get this acknowledgment across. Well, what am I going to do? Well, let's see now, I had better get this order across to him. Now, let's see, was that too Tone 40? No, I guess that wasn't too Tone 40. Figure-figurefigure-figure-figure-figure-figure-figure-figure-figure." See, he isn't auditing the pc. See?

And I would rather you did a personalized job on the pc first and a technical perfection second. You got the idea? And then all of a sudden you'll get some horrendous win or other, you'll find out you *can* do it and then you'll find out that it's very easy.

The wrong way to you can go at this, you know. you can say, "You have got to be perfect before you can do anything for the pc," and you sit there giving a session being too perfect and then nothing happens with the pc. But of course, you aren't auditing the pc, you're auditing your own auditing. You see how that can work?

No, audit the pc. The pc comes first. And all you want is a majority of rightness, that's all. Just be right more often than you're wrong and you'll get there. It's as simple as that. It's the percentages. Auditing – the percentages are rather cruelly high. you have to be about 92 percent right. Life you only have to be 51.

But what I tell you is true, that the pc forgives anything but no-auditing. A pc doesn't forgive no-auditing. And if he has a problem that is bugging him or bothering him or he's worried about something or other and the auditor is mainly worried about the ritual, you've got the source of the bulk of ARC breaks.

The auditor is so worried about the ritual; worried about, "Let's see, is it the sensitivity knob that's supposed to move? Or let's see, I guess you take the reading at the sens you know the sensitivity knob on my meter hasn't fallen ever since I started the Security Check."

And the auditor is so, so, so concerned about what he is doing, that the pc never has an opportunity to impart the fact that he's worried as hell. The pc never forgives it, see? Because the pc is sort of talking to a bundle of technology, not a person. And with – the pc finds himself talking to a bundle of technology, he goes out of session.

So auditing comes first, you see, and technology comes second. And that's all very well for you to say, because it will be used here and there as an excuse to do very horrible auditing. You see, you get me both ways. I mean, I can't be right along all these lines, but the point is that the pc sits . . . This kind of a situation is quite common in an auditing session: pc comes in, he's bubbling over with the fact that he's just been shot by a howitzer and the auditor sets up the E-Meter and adjusts the cans and adjusts the needle and tells him to sit there, and then starts in and asks him if it's all right to begin a session and so on, and all it looks to the pc like he's being denied auditing. That's all it looks to him, no matter what the auditor's doing

Pc meets you in the hall and says, "I've just been shot with a howitzer." Well, don't say, "What do you know!" and then go through the technology of starting a session. The pc is already – by imparting this horrendous piece of information to you – has already announced the fact that he is already in-session. It's obvious, because he's considering you the auditor and that's all you're trying to achieve with your ritual – is to get him to recognize you as the auditor. Well, if he's already done so, what the hell, man? What the hell?

So he meets you in the hall and says, "I've just been shot by a howitzer."

And you say, "Well, where?" and "How was that?" and so on. And steering him gently by the shoulders, steer him into the chair, and "Where was this howitzer? Where did it hit you? Oh, yeah. Well, have howitzers ever been a problem to you before? You may have a habit of being hit by howitzers in some fashion." "All right, well, what do you know about that! And this howitzer – how big was this howitzer?"

"Oh, 55 millimeter."

"Oh, well, that's a pretty big howitzer. All right. How do you feel about that now?"

"Oh, I don't know, I feel a little better about it."

"Well, all right. Now, let's recall the first time you were ever hit by one of these howitzers. Well, all right," and so forth. "All right, recall another time. Okay. Now, how does it seem to you?"

"Well, it's better."

"All right, now you think we can get on with the session? All right now?"

"Yeah, I think we can."

"All right, what goals would you like to set now?"

Your rudiment was reversed end to, wasn't it? Rudiments should have been in one place, but the pc was in-session. It's a delicate line between a Q and A and that sort of thing, but you're liable to go right on through to the end of the session and he never discovers that you've never started one. you obviously start one the moment that you steered him toward the auditing chair.

And the technical question comes up: When does the session start? Well, the session starts when the pc recognizes that he has an auditor – that's when a session starts. Pc recognizes that he has an auditor and goes into session, that is it. See, he's obviously willing to talk to you as the auditor, so he obviously is in-session. He's obviously interested in his own case, so he obviously is in-session.

Now we're going to make difficulties, see, now we're going to adjust the E-Meter cans and tighten up the leads and see whether or not the sensitivity knob is moving properly and read the maker's name plate. Have him get down on his knees – the way they'll be doing it a hundred years from now, unless you disseminate properly – get down on his knees along side of the chair and say a prayer to the – of the Auditor's Code before he begins the session. Unless I get some of your terminals run out, that's what'll happen. I'm being mean today, you know?

But anyway, just look it over. Look it over. What's a session? Your point of view as a moment ago, why, your point of view of a session might have been two people sitting in chairs and the auditor going through a routine and ritual called Model Session, see? Well, you just alter that point of view and you will be right. Some pcs practically don't get out of session; so the main problem is trying to get them out of session overnight. See? They are just in-session, bang, you see? Well the difficulty is ending the session.

Now, the difficulty in starting a session always comes because the auditor doesn't recognize the start of session. It always is in that category. Something wrong here.

Now, there's two ways this can happen. The pc is leery of going into session because he too often has been denied a session. All right, that's good. We start one anyway and just run out his auditing – ARC break, that's all. Something like that and you've got him started and you've got him in-session. But in-sessionness is a technical condition. It has nothing to do with placement of bodies or a ritual. It's whether or not the pc has recognized his auditor and is willing to talk to the auditor. Of course, that's part of recognizing the auditor. And is interested in his own case. And that's what a session is.

And if you recognize that as a session, the suddenness with which a pc will start talking to you in a streetcar or on a bus or something, is amazing. Now, you have certain rights as an auditor and that is not to run a session while traveling on the upper deck of a two-decker bus, you see, in areas where one can't be heard or where you're going to get off at the next stop. you see? You have certain rights about that sort of thing. But nevertheless, confidence has been imposed on you – in you as an auditor. And therefore you should make an appointment for the session. That's the least thing you should do.

People start telling me their troubles and I haven't got time at that moment to listen to them, I never say, "Well, I can't listen to your troubles now." That'd be a silly thing to do, wouldn't it? "I'm sorry, I'm too busy to hear all this tale of woe that you're giving me." A week later we try to put the person in-session. Well, it has to start with an ARC break. You got it?

So, it's always a good thing to have a card handy, like an HGC card or a private practice card or something like that. And somebody starts telling you their troubles, say, "Well now, it's very interesting" – but you're going to get off at the next stop. And you say, "Right now, I've got to go. And I'm very sorry but I've got to go see this friend and so forth. Now, here is my card. And you make sure that you come and see me at two o'clock next Tuesday."

Well, that's fine, you're still interested, aren't you? That's the proper acknowledgment. You've acknowledged the person. You put him on wait, yes, and so forth. He hadn't even realized that he's in-session. But the mechanics of this will work. You'll find the mechanics of it will work. And then if you do start auditing that person as a pc you haven't got to start it with an ARC break.

The main problem is preventing sessions from happening in the wrong places. If you only knew it and if you were very smooth as an auditor this would be your main difficulty, is preventing sessions from occurring in the wrong places where you can't audit, like the second deck of a double-decker bus. So, you should give a little more thought to how you're going to get out of a situation like that, rather than worrying all the time about how to get a pc in-session. My difficulties is how do you get pcs out of session, not how do you get them into session.

Now, that's how far a look you can have on the subject of the technical practice of auditing. I mean, it can be totally the reverse to what you've been worried about.

Not that you have a sympathetic face or anything, but somebody says, "Oh, my," and you say – you knucklehead – you say, "What's wrong?" That's it. You've had it, he goes into session. You're an auditor, you're a pro, you've said the right thing and there he is in-session. Now, how are you going to get him out of session without him running something, see?

It's a very natural thing for you to do – well go ahead and do it. But also have the panacea for correcting it, which is to say, at least a point of continuance of the session, or hand him to a substitute. Send him to the D of P or something like that.

You say, "What is wrong?" You've started a session. How easy is it to start a session? Well, it's much easier to start a session than you think. But if you were working hard to start a session, you almost never start one. you see how this would be?

Now, if you just work real hard and you fumble with the leads and you get it all set and you adjust his chair and you get it all set up and so on and the scenery is all okay and then – so on. you hang a sign on the door and you clatter around one way or the other and you come back and you sit down and you heave a long sigh and you say to him, "All right. Is it all right with you if I begin this session now?" All right, that's fine. Now, that's perfectly all right, providing the pc is not in-session. And then, of course, that is totally wrong. There isn't a single thing you have done that is right. Not a single action you've undertaken is right from the pc's point of view, because you didn't handle the session as having started.

You probably didn't end your last session with this pc. Something like that is it – what's in error. Pc still had a present time problem, pc still interested in case, pc still back on the track and so forth. He's been awake half the night thinking up the answers he's going to give you to the auditing question tomorrow. He sees you; his instant response is to give you twenty-five answers to the auditing question in rapid-fire order. Well, attribute that to your prowess as an auditor. It isn't something to be neglected. Pcs do this sort of thing – you're good, that's all. Either you're bad at ending sessions, or you're good at being an auditor, one way or the other. You have inspired confidence. Well, don't abuse the confidence once you've inspired it.

How do you handle a situation like that? Well, you hear the pc out – not *all the way out.* Now, there's a vast difference, in auditing, and letting a pc talk and auditing a pc. And some of you have never differentiated between these two things and you will waste a lot of auditing time. Letting a pc talk has nothing to do with auditing a pc.

And if you sit there and you find out, in thinking back over sessions, that pcs have been very verbose, they sure do talk, they run on and on and on – and if you have had that kind of experience, chalk it up as a slight miss on your part. Because you haven't audited him, you've let him talk.

I'll tell you a liability about letting a pc talk. They talk their havingness down. you can get a pc to tell you your troubles – his troubles and go on with an improper acknowledgment and just letting him run on and on and on, and you'll see him go down from antagonism to anger, to fear, to grief, to apathy. And you'll see him go right on down the Tone Scale. That's because you're not auditing him; you're acting as a camouflaged hole.

Now, auditing consists in directing the attention of the pc. And when a pc is just sitting there talking – gab, gab, gab, gab, "And it's so on, so on. And I did this and I did that and so forth and it's so on." Well, then something is in error with your questions.

Do you realize that by the interjection of questions into what he is saying, you can direct his attention and throw him right back into session. And you must be in some kind of a mental paralysis where you don't think of a question to turn all this off You're not trying to turn it off, you're trying to direct it. And if you just sit there and let a pc gab, gab, gab, gab, gab, talk, talk, talk, talk, talk and tell you all of his troubles and so on, you're just asking him to run his havingness out the bottom. The way to handle that situation is always interrogation. If the pc talks too much, interrogate.

How do you interrogate? Well, your knowledge of the human mind should be adequate now to the address of the situation. You can be far too abrupt with your knowledge of the human mind. He is saying, "And my Instructor did this and that and the other thing. And I was feeling so bad and, by George, he came right in and dropped the bulletin right on my head," and so on and so on. you say abruptly, "What did you do to the Instructor?" That shuts it off effectively – creates a nice ARC break too. But in essence, you've got to ask him what he did to the Instructor. But how smoothly can you do this? And then that has to do with how smooth an auditor you are.

How smoothly can you ask him, "What'd you do to this Instructor that caused all this?" See, there are various gradients by which you approach this: "When was the first time you noticed there was some difficulty with this Instructor?" He's only been able to tell you by this time about two motivators – one motivator, two motivators, you see? But you can see by all the signs that he's going to go on for the rest of the auditing session telling you all the motivators. Well, that's not going to help him any. So by the time you wrap around this and figure out just about what he is talking about, you should be thinking of directing his attention. And when a pc is talking too much, direct his attention.

Now, every once in a while, a pc goes off in a high spate of interest of some kind or another and starts telling you about a *gimmegahoojit* or the interplanetary customs of the Z People. Well, very often also, you're interested. I had – some auditor here the other day said, "And he was telling me about this spaceship" – and the auditor is report – doing the reporting – "And he was telling me about this spaceship and how it really operates, and you know if I'd had money right at that moment, I would have bought one!"

Now, there's a pc doing a high degree of salesmanship, the auditor quite interested. We're not talking about that kind of a situation, you see, that's perfectly permissible. If you shut that off, you've had it.

No, we're talking about a different kind of yap, yap, yap, yap, yap, see? We're talking about a pc who's complaining and going on and on and on. The auditor that sits there and lets a pc go on and on and on and on and on just isn't auditing. It's the auditor who isn't in-session. The pc's willing to talk to the auditor but the auditor's not willing to direct the attention of the pc.

And the most obvious type of question that could occur to you is just "When did that trouble start?" He's saying, "And they shot me and they hanged me and then they dragged me across the field and then they brought all the cows over and made them stare at me." And he's going on and on and on in this direction *whammity-wham.* And if somewhere along this line about the time they shot him, you haven't asked, "When is the first time you had any trouble of this character?" you're remiss. And your pc's going to run his havingness down. See?

You should be in there directing the attention of the pc. All right, now, let's go back to this first situation I announced. The pc meets you in the hall and the pc's going gab, gab, gab, walla, walla, walla, telling you all about it, see? Now, you've got the problem of getting him into the auditing room, getting him into the chair, getting the E-Meter set up and getting it all fixed up and so forth. What are you going to do? There is no pat solution, except one – and that is direct the pc's attention. How do you direct the pc's attention? If you direct it too savagely, you have operated as a sudden shift of attention, have surprised the pc.

What are you going to say to the pc? Well, you're going to say to him something that directs his attention. Not necessarily onto the mechanics of the session – probably certainly not onto the mechanics of the session.

One of the tricks I use is put him in a comm lag and set him down. Ask him a question he can't answer right away. That gives you time. See, there's all kinds of things you can do. And they're all quite real and they're all quite convincing and they're all quite effective. He meets you in the hall and he says, "Gab, gab, gab, walla, walla, walla. And I thought up 365 answers to the auditing question which you were asking me last night. And as a matter of fact I've got them all ready to give you and so forth and we're all set and . . ."

Well, what the hell? You're not even in the auditing room. Now, what are you going to do? Well you're going to do something to direct his attention. That's what you're going to do. Now, how are you going to direct his attention? Reprovingly? Surprisingly? Oh, no. Nothing like this. You're going to say to him something on this order: "Uhm, by the way, did you have a present time problem when we ended session yesterday?"

And he's going to say. . . And I'm going to get the E-Meter set up and going to give him the cans, sit him down in the chair, put a sign on the door and so forth. He's sitting there looking at it. "Yeah," he says, "Yes. It was how to answer that auditing command."

And I say, "Well, all right, was that much of a problem?"

"Well, as a matter of fact I sure struggled with it until about last night about nine o'clock or something like that, I happened to think that you were asking – you were asking me about a man. And you know I didn't realize before that you were asking me about a man."

"Well, what did you think I was asking How did you define that?"

And he will say, "Well, I defined it, actually, as an island."

You say, "You did? Well now, how would you get those things to compare?" Finish it all up and so forth, say, "All right, now what goals would you like to set for this session? That's good. All right. Now, is it all right with you if I begin this process now? Thank you very much. Now, here's the auditing question," *bang.* "But, let's define it. Let's define it now. What do we mean by *blah, blah* and man?"

We actually have done a tiny shift of attention without distracting him too much. Now, we've asked him the pertinent question. You've always got to ask him the right question. You got the idea? You ask him the right question. Obviously he had a present time problem about the auditing or he wouldn't have been answering the auditing command all night. Obviously, you didn't end session. Obviously, there was some unconfidence involved in the thing, because he obviously, too, must have gone on self-auditing to some degree, so the session couldn't have been ended.

In other words, you've got to size up the situation. That's not a pat situation. The only thing pat about it is, is you've got to direct the pc's attention. You don't let a pc go on talking forever. It is a dirty trick. The pc will feel silly after a while. He will feel very out of session. Direct his attention and not crudely, suddenly or accusatively. You get the point?

Now, when is a pc in-session? Pc is in-session when he is *able* to talk to the auditor – change that over from "willing" to "able" – and is interested in his own case. Those are the only real requisites to being in-session. Given those things, you've got it. Now, if a pc is talking to the auditor, he obviously is able to talk to the auditor. If he's talking about his own case, he obviously is interested in his own case, so obviously there is a session. And you've got to handle it as a session. Because he's suddenly apparently elected you as the auditor. And maybe he's being audited by somebody else.

All right, this pc says to me, "You know, in that session yesterday – I was having a session yesterday – and all of a sudden we ran into a society where all they did was cook. And I got to thinking about cooking and I got more and more worried about cooking and so forth and I just realized in this lifetime I've never been able to cook," and about this time I suddenly

realize that I have been elected the auditor, don't you see? He is not just talking about his case conversationally, but is actually talking a session, see?

So I say, "Well, what did your auditor do about that?" In other words, I give him right back to his auditor. Just mention his auditor and I've shifted his attention. Well, obviously his attention is stuck there.

Now, when you get very, very expert, and when you seem very smooth to pcs, it will be because by interrogation you can shift the pc's attention. And when you can shift a pc's attention smoothly, why, he will get an idea that you have terrific altitude. And it's all in the expertness with which you can shift the pc's attention. You use that with questions.

Now, every once in a while in giving a Security Check, you ask Instructors, "How do you give a Security Check?" Well, that's fine, you give a Security Check by reading the question, finding out if there's a drop on the meter. All right, there's a drop on the meter. That's where you fall down, if you're going to fall down on a security question. There's where you fall down. Right there at that point. You've asked the question which is on the printed form, you've gotten a fall on the meter and right there a large percentage of auditors lay an egg. They do not direct the pc's attention. They read the question again. They do some version of question-reading; they don't direct the pc's attention with a question.

Now, just look at this little tiny microscopic trick here. you say, "Have you ever pushed over any tall buildings?" And you get a fall on the E-Meter. Now, instead of directing the pc's attention, you say, "Well, *have you* ever – " you know, substituting emphasis for brains, *"Have you* ever pushed over any tall buildings?" And you get another fall on the E-Meter. And then you say, well, it requires a different emphasis, so you say, "Have you ever pushed over any *tall buildings?"*

Now, you see that hasn't anything whatsoever to do with shifting the pc's attention. You see what – why it's wrong?

Now, even a banal shift of the auditing thing tends to shift the pc's attention. "Have you ever pushed over any tall buildings?" You get a fall. you could say, "Well, what was that?" Well, now if you point too emphatically to the meter, you'll get an out-of-sessionness on the part of the pc, because his attention is being pulled out of the session, out of his bank, onto the meter.

I as often as not will assume that the pc is not interested in the meter, but at this moment is very interested in having had an odd phenomenon of some kind or another. If you get a fall, it's usually accompanied by some electronic shift of some kind. you know, the fellow's going, "Tall buildings, I never thought of that before," you know. It's kind of a – maybe it's a lurch in his stomach or he gets a twitch in the end of his nose or his hands feel kind of sweaty suddenly. Well, I don't refer to this, I refer to that. I'm just as likely as not to say, "What happened just then?"

"Well, I had this lurch."

"All right. Does that have anything to do with tall buildings?"

"Oh, I can't stand tall buildings."

"Well, have you ever pushed over any tall buildings?"

You get the shift? You put his attention more on him, more on the bank and then reiterate the question that we want to know. And he says, "Well, it just seems like it might have happened. It seems – it seems possible. It's – it just seems like it's something I would do."

"Well now, why do you think you would do that?"

"Well, I have this fear of every time I see a tall building, that it'll fall over."

"Oh. Recall a time when that was that way. "

"Yes, yes, definitely."

"All right. Now, have you ever pushed over any tall buildings?"

"Augh, it's an awful question you're asking me."

He gets the idea that his attention actually by this time is being actually ground right straight down on the bank. He'll get a sensation that he's really being shoved into it, but you have not changed your intonation, you haven't changed the starkness of the question, you haven't lightened it up, you haven't made it more accusative, anything else. But the pc gets the sensation of you have just taken his attention, and you have said, "Stop looking at me, stop looking at the E-Meter, stop looking at this beautiful bright day around here and look at that bank, damn you. Now, did you or didn't you?" He'll actually get this kind of a pressure – sensation.

What have you actually done? You've restimulated the channel. You've restimulated the whole chain. You've got the whole chain of tall buildings now in total resting both by your security question, by asking if there was some sensation that went along with it. By asking him if he ever has any difficulties with tall buildings. Is there anything he's ever noticed, recalling a time when he noticed that and so forth. And now the security question again, "Have you ever pushed over any tall buildings?" And boy, he'll feel by this time as though he has been run into by a Mack truck. And he's going to give!

"Well, all right, if you put it that way, I pushed over the Empire State Building. That's why it's in ruins. That's why New York's never been the same since," if he ever did. He'd give it to you right now. "Ohh!" You get why? Because your ability to fix attention has been horsepowered up to his inability to fix attention and you have made him able to fix his attention on the thing which his attention is dispersing off of And he gets the idea just as

though you've backed up a Caterpillar tractor back of him and shoved. "Get in there and pitch. Let's you and him fight." This is what the thing sort of adds up to.

All right. I'll go over another instance of this. Now, "Have you ever whistled at a girl?" You get a reaction on the E-Meter. Don't say, "Ah, I have a reaction on the E-Meter here. Um, let's see, is there any other way I can pull your attention out of session? Do you have any present time problems? Are you worried about your wife or anything like that? Don't you realize you've been far away from home? Your children might be trapped in a burning building." Don't go on this particular course of action. That is the wrong course of action. That is the escapist approach. Letting the pc escape. You don't do that at all. you do it quite in reverse. You say, "Have you ever whistled at a girl? Did you have any sensations just then?"

"Yeah, as a matter of fact I had this sensation right across my head."

"Oh, well, what do you suppose that might have been?"

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

"Well, what would it have to do with whistling or pretty girls or something like that?"

"Well, I don't know. Why, how could it poss – ah, there it is again!"

"Well now, did you have a picture just as you did that?"

"Oh, yeah, well."

"Well, all right. Well, have you ever whistled at any pretty girls?"

"Well, no, not – ow! Not that I know of, so forth. I don't recall. Uh . . ."

"Well, do you remember any pretty girl?"

"Oh yes. Oh, yes, yes, remember a pretty girl."

"Did you ever whistle at her?"

"I get – there it is again."

"Well, what's going on here? What are you looking at there? What are you looking at there?"

"Well – well, if you must know, I whistled at this pretty girl down on – ouch! – I went down on – ouch! – down on Main Street – ouch! – one day and it was somebody's wife and he – he – he socked me."

"Oh, all right, you did whistle at a pretty girl, then."

"Yes, I – I did."

"All right. Ever whistle at any other pretty girls?"

"No – ouch! Uh – well. . ."

"Did you ever whistle at any other pretty girls?"

"Well, if you must know, I have never done anything else. It is just something that I just can't keep from doing. I try and I try and I try and I keep standing there on drugstore corners, whistling. I whistle and I whistle! What are you going to do about it! Hey, you know, it's a funny thing, I never remembered that before. I never noticed that about myself before."

All this type of phenomena falls out of the barrel by just the direction of his attention. And you eventually will put it right onto the chain of withholds and overts. You see? But it's all in handling the attention. And as I give you again, I'll give you the wrong way to.

Now, if you "Have you ever whistled at any girls? Did you object to my lighting the cigarette now while I was auditing you? Oh, you didn't? All right, that's fine. Good enough. Are those leads far enough apart? Okay. Now, let's see, what were we getting at? What was I just asking you? Uh – oh. Mm-hm. Well, there couldn't have been much reaction on that; I didn't notice it. Let's go to the next question."

Now, that would not be a good sound auditing approach. Why? Because it's demonstrating not-knowingness on the part of the auditor, the reverse of which is all-seeingness. All right. Let's get to the next point.

A person who security checks as though he's in the dark will always be in the dark with a Security Check. A person who pretends knowingness to too great a degree when he is doing a Security Check is also violating the R-factor. The R-factor is simply this: you want to know and you're going to get him to find out. And that is all the R-factor there is. And if you're in that state of mind you will direct his attention neatly every time. Not, you want to give a perfect Security Check; not, you want to follow the perfect technology; not, you want to always do your E-Meter right. See, those are not R-factors.

You're interested and you want him to find out. If those are the only R-factors present, boy, can you security check. You'll find out that a Security Check that ordinarily would take you thirty-six hours to get rid of – and some of them do take that long to get rid of – you could cut it right on down to about a four-or five-hour Security Check and you'd get the lot. It's just that difference.

You notice a fall on your meter, you know at once the pc is interiorized into some kind of a withhold. He's on a chain. It's live right now. Well, you take full advantage of that fact. you call his attention to the subject matter of the Security Check. You ask him to define the subject matter of the Security Check. You ask him what's been going on in this particular department. If he's ever had any trouble in this particular area. All why. Your questions are totally prompted not by a textbook question that I give you, but by the fact that you are interested and you are damn well going to find out.

And if that is the only R-factors with which you're dealing when you do a Security Check, you'll find out they really whiz. "Here's an interesting question, you know? It says, 'Have you ever raped anyone?' Have you ever raped anyone? When? You ever been worried about rape? You ever thought about raping? You ever been raped? What just happened just then? What did you feel just then? No, are you looking at a picture?" Get this kind of an approach, you see? It's all in, in, in.

And you get his attention all the way in, he'll pick it up. And he'll suddenly say, "Oh, I forgot all about her. It was Betsy Ann. I was two."

And you say, "All right, let's see if she is clean now. you ever raped anyone?" You got the difference of approach?

You've got to handle the pc's attention. Now, the reason why you very often fail to do this is because you do not perhaps have a sufficient reality on the weakness of a pc's ability to handle his attention on the subject of the buttons which make him aberrated.

Those things which have aberrated the pc have overwhelmed him. It's always a case of overwhelm. *Overwhelm,* what is that? Push in too tight. You could say, overwhelm, pushed in too tight. All right. Well, naturally, his attention must at one time have been a restraining factor on keeping things from coming in on him. That's a thetan's primary weapon. So he's restraining things from coming in on him.

Now, what do you think that we're going to have here when he gets on this subject again? We're going to have somebody whose attention cannot be controlled on that particular subject, because his attention has been overwhelmed on that subject. So therefore, if the auditor does not steer the pc's attention on the subjects in which the pc is having difficulty or on which he's having difficulty, the pc's attention does not get directed and thereby just wanders or just disperses. The pc is not capable of directing his attention on the subject of his aberrations. That is why he stays aberrated. That is why it remains unknown to him. That's the simple mechanic of the thing.

He's a man of iron in all such places except as appertains to his terminal line. And there it's solid custard. And the custard runs to the right and his attention runs to the right and it runs up and his attention runs up and it runs down and it just doesn't matter what the custard does, that's what his attention is going to do. And unless there's somebody around the auditing session who will direct the pc's attention, it isn't going to be directed by anybody but the *valence.* Now, isn't that fascinating?

This person, let us say, has a terminal – I'll have to pick one now that nobody here has – has a terminal called a streetcar conductor. All right, streetcar conductors are always directing things one way or the other, so we don't have the auditor directing any attention and we have a pc, of course, who is in the middle of the valence called "streetcar conductor," so the pc can't direct his attention, so we have left the session in the hands of a streetcar

conductor. Well, isn't that right? You can see it very graphically. That's correct. That's who's running the session.

Now, if this session runs overboard, of course, you say, "Well, it wasn't my fault. I was just sitting there going through the rituals, swinging the incense in the right directions, making orbital star patterns with the incense pot. And the pc, he was sitting there in the chair and we had him on the E-Meter, so it couldn't have gone wrong."

And there's a mysterious third party present called a streetcar conductor and he has said, "End of line, everybody out," and the pc says, "Well, that's the end of that."

And you say, "Yes? All right. Here's the next auditing question." You get the idea? There's nobody directing any attention around there but the valence. The mysterious third party.

And when it's a streetcar conductor everybody gets in and everybody gets out and they get to the end of the line and they go back to the beginning of the line. And when you run an engram with the streetcar conductor running it, look what it'd look like: You get to the middle of the engram and lose a lot of passengers; personnel of the engram would disappear at the beginning or the end or someplace; and then all of a sudden there'd be a tremendous number of people present that hadn't been present before. Trolley would come off the wire and stop for a while. And then you ask the question, "Why is it taking so long to clear this person?" Well, that's because streetcar conductors aren't trained auditors. You see?

Now, maybe there's a lot of bitterness and sarcasm mixed up in this, but there's a little truth to be found there, if you scrape at it. Unless the auditor directs the pc's attention, we have a valence that will do God knows what with it, and we have the pc who can't.

So out of the three people present, in a clearing session, we've only got one person who could direct the pc's attention, correctly, to get auditing done. And when that person doesn't do it, no auditing occurs, except by accident and the grace of Ron.

Now, I will admit that things are put together well enough that some auditing is always occurring. But just a minute. This is a special person who is running a special terminal. Every pc is a special case – every one of them.

All right, now you get a pc who has a terminal of a lion tamer. And if you, the auditor, don't closely direct the pc's attention as you're running the terminal "a lion trainer," you're going to be trained as a lion.

Now, don't come around and tell me that the session keeps going off the rails, because I will always tell you that obviously you aren't directing the pc's attention. That would be the pat answer which any Instructor could give any auditing session that started going haywire. Now, the auditor at no time should leave a session on automatic. You leave a session on

automatic and you're just asking for it. But what are you asking for? You're asking for the session to be taken over one hundred percent by the valence that you are running out of the pc.

So now, don't keep complaining that the pc is a difficult pc or that the pc ARC breaks easily or that the pc won't go into session, because pc be damned; there is no pc practically. When you – when Newton and Watt and some of the other – and I think an Italian named Erg, got themselves all fixed up, in measuring energies, they didn't get a small enough unit to measure the actual energy-attention output of a pc who is stuck in the middle of a valence. It is too slightly microscopic to even be measurable.

So if you're blaming this one one-millionth of a grasshopper-power of a person that is left, you see, after you've given full play to the terminal and then you're blaming this tiny, tiny amount of residual remaining energy for everything that's going wrong, it'd be something like saying, "This roaring torrent of a raindrop went down the side of Cleopatra's obelisk and split it in half." And that just doesn't make sense, you see? It isn't possible.

Now, this pc may be a very forceful person. This pc may be able to do lots of things. This pc is not totally a slave to his valence. Nobody ever is. But remember, you've got him in a situation where all the mechanics of auditing have made him again a total slave to this valence. And now you're going to blame him for what goes wrong. Well, there isn't any blame connected with it, unless the pc's attention – the one-millionth of a grasshopper-power left of it – is very closely directed by the auditor, of course what is left there – it's the entire investment of the pc's energy, via the valence. And you will see that valence all of a sudden materializing and going all over the place and doing all sorts of wild things with the session and so forth. You see what you've asked for?

You can almost predict how a pc will operate in a session, once you have his valence. If you know his terminal, if you're doing a poor job or if the pc is out of session or if your pc's confidence in you as an auditor is low, the session is going to be run by his terminal. So therefore, if you're going to run a bad session on him, we know at once how the pc will operate. He will operate just like that terminal.

So when this sort of thing shows up, don't say, "Well, the pc is a difficult pc." That is a – that's nonsense. No pcs are difficult pcs, but some valences are bitch kitties.

All right. Now, let's take somebody who has a terminal "surgeon." Now, wouldn't this be very interesting to audit, if you didn't run a session? If you weren't running a tight session? And you didn't have the pc in-session? Something around there is going to get sawed up, that's for sure.

Because the terminal knows how to run a session. The terminal knows very well how to run a session: You get the anesthetic mask, and you lay it out, and you get the sutures laid out and you get the oxygen put out properly and you lay out the saws and knock some bits of

rust off of them. See? And it would all depend on what part of the track, what condition of operation would take place in the session. So some would be rougher sessions than others.

And, of course, a surgeon is liable to do all sorts of weird things like hold the patient down. But who's the patient around here? Well, it's liable to be the auditor, it's liable to be almost anybody. So if you're running a surgeon some time, as a terminal on a pc, and you find yourself lying on the floor, with both of your shoulder blades pinned to the floor and him fishing around for a pen knife to cut your throat, you will at least have the satisfaction of remembering that you once heard a lecture in which it was stated that this could happen and you will at least know what you did wrong. You didn't direct the pc's attention. That's the whole lot. I mean, you can't really say much more of it than that.

When you cease to direct the pc's attention, there's only one party left in the session. And of course, the session will go exactly in that direction. I shudder to think what would happen up on the second floor if we had a chariot driver! You can see there that we have a point, though. Maybe put that way, maybe some of these incomprehensibles will cease to be incomprehensible.

There's an old rule, an old law, that's found in the *Original Thesis.* There are three laws in there. But it just amounts to the fact that, the auditor plus the pc is greater than the engram bank. And the auditor minus the pc may or may not be greater than the engram bank, but certainly minus the pc minus the auditor, and you've got nothing left but an engram bank. you get the idea? So it takes both the auditor and the pc in there pitching to hold a terminal down and run it out. And that's about all it amounts to. Takes them both. And the way you get them both is to direct the pc's attention.

How many ways are there of doing this? Not to labor the point particularly, but how many ways could you direct the pc's attention? Now, you just think of some of the ways you have misdirected the pc's attention. Can you think of having misdirected the pc's attention? Sometimes you can be quite inadvertent. Drop the ashtray. You certainly have directed his attention. But to the wrong place. He doesn't have any bank in the vicinity of the ashtray. That's the wrong place for his attention to go to. So of course, then, the tension built up by the session explodes, the pc drops out of the session, you feeling guilty for having dropped the ashtray, drop out of the session and what do we have left? We have a lion tamer, a surgeon, something like this. Everybody quit the session but the valence.

And that's the trouble with valences, is they're educated never to quit. You see, you've come very close to the basic dynamic principle of existence of Dianetics when you come to the valence. What is trying to survive? As soon as we realize that you don't have to *try* to survive, as soon as you realize that survival itself, the effort to survive, is a complete idiocy in a being who can't do anything else.

The most native natural skill a thetan has is survival. So now he's got survival on a via. He's got survival all built into a beingness. He doesn't have any survival left and he has become so concerned and worried about survival that it's all built into the beingness. Well, of course, these beingnesses on a via have a tremendous amount of survival mixed up in them. And they can be very resistive. But they are only very resistive when you get two willful missings in a session: the auditor and the pc. And then of course you have survival rampant.

And, of course, the survival of such a being is interesting in the fact that none of its actions ever add up to survival. That is what is peculiar. Once you get survival on a big via, of some character or another, it winds up as a non-survival. It winds up as a succumb.

So if any valence was left to ramp and roar across the boards of life, totally undeterred by a person's native good sense, well, naturally, it would wind up to the most destructive activity imaginable. In the first place, a valence's actions and packages are usually out of time. In other words, this person is all adjusted for the French terror. All geared up. All the now-I'm-supposed-to to get one through a certain period of existence – there it is. Only we aren't in the French terror. Do you see?

Now, a road – a highwayman of yesteryear – he knows how to survive. You go out and you stick up coaches. See? And you go back and spend it on the babes. That's how you survive. We don't know why – he probably had a lot of fun at that time. But that was all a very good business to be in, perhaps, when we had nothing but cavalry for police. But now the odds have mounted up. And things have changed. And you just try and disassemble a .45 automatic with the same field-stripping procedure as a flintlock pistol and you'll fumble. In other words, the skills are all out-of-date, all out of time and so on. So the actual activities of this fixed valence add up to nothing but succumb. The fellow's out of money, so he goes out and he buys a horse and he puts on a plumed hat and he rides out to Ashdown Forest, waiting for the coach to come through. And it's a wet night and he gets pneumonia and that's it. See, it's all as idiotic as that. And I do mean as idiotic as that – if not more so.

Now, you take some fellow, he's liable to believe that being a good.... Well, let's say he was a designer, a clothes designer. And in this lifetime he's been trying to be a clothes designer. But his valence is clothes designer and he's tried to be a clothes designer in this lifetime and he just somehow or another can't be a clothes designer in this lifetime. That's one of the most remarkable points about valences: is those people who have tried to be their valences in this lifetime have laid the most gorgeous eggs. It's fantastic. I mean, how far off these things can be. Why? Because they are valences rigged up to live in another age and time and they are incapable of change.

Now, why is a valence so incapable of change? That's because it's rigged for survival, so all of its facets and aspects are fixed. It won't change.

Now, let's say at some time or another you've had a serving girl. And you've tried to teach her to set the table. Day after day, week after week, you try to teach her to set the table. And somehow or another she is never able to set the table. She just cannot do it. she either breaks the dishes or spills them on the floor or trips over the edge of the tablecloth. And she keeps putting the roast pans on the table and the platters back in the oven, and she keeps spilling the soup and it just is a mess. And you say, "Now look, with a little good training – with a little good training – now we'll be able to make this grade." And two years later you're still trying.

Well, past civilizations have handled it this way: They have broken the valence with punishment. And in a past time the way that servant girl would have been trained is after she broke her first dish she would have been whipped for half an hour and then sent back again to set the table. And you know the funny part of it is, that didn't work either.

They take criminals and whether they use the whip or the jail or the stock or anything else, they just keep going back stealing cabbages. The guy keeps on stealing cabbages. That's what he does. And they put him in the stock, you put him in jail, you fine him – in more modern times, why, you deny him his social security or do something rigorous like this – and he still goes and steals cabbages. Why? Because you're working against the survival pattern of a valence. And there's nothing can break it.

Now, when you finally do break the person down, the person now is nothing because all you have is a broken valence. You don't even have a person anymore, see? See, it's possibly even better to have a good operating valence, you know, than to be nobody at all, but it's much better to be yourself than an operating valence.

In handling criminals – I'm very prone to be very careless with people and so forth, because I myself am seldom in any grave and terrible danger from their actions. But I have had, as I've mentioned before, I've had a whole shipload of criminals, and I never tried to make them into honest men. It was not necessary. In the first place, they were doing a criminal thing like fighting a war anyhow and just the simple matter of saying, "All right, it doesn't matter what you do on this ship, nothing is ever going to go into your record. We're never going to make another mark in your records." That was enough. "If there's any punishments, you have to be satisfied with the punishments I hand out, and that's all right." And, of course, the punishments I handed out were as freak and unique as any jail kangaroo court. You know, very freak. You know, like, "Well, you'll have to paint that gun all over, all by yourself, and so forth, and when you get that gun totally painted and so on, why, we'll inspect it. And if we find one single fleck of rust on it anywhere that hasn't been adequately handled and covered up, why, then you've got to paint the whole gun again." This was very satisfactory to that type of mentality. Very satisfactory.

Well, what was the net result? You had no broken valences. I suppose they stole each other ragged. But they couldn't object. And that was the way it went. And it was the most pleasant calm vista you had ever heard of. Why, there were ships full of honest men all over the place that were appetite over tin cup, at each other's throats day and night – but not this ship. There was no pressure exerted. Interesting, isn't it?

So you'd say that an operating valence is better than a broken valence. But a person is better than a valence. And you get your gradient scale. Of course, I say better than a valence, that's an understatement of magnitude. There's a tremendous difference between a person and an operating valence.

Once in a while you ask what is a GE? Well, a GE is just a valence. A GE is some kind of a superpackaged valence that has been set up one way or the other, that can continue to be regenerated. Now the particular form that man has adopted is no longer very useful to him. Various things happen to this particular form which shouldn't be happening to it. This form is perfectly all right in a meat-eater society. You can go out and eat and be eaten and slug animals over the head and be overwhumped, and your main difficulty is with bodies.

Well, you get a human body trying to duplicate a machine. Ah, well, that requires a different type of body. That's right. A thetan is not very happy running a machine in a meat body. He just isn't. He's much happier in a robot, doll body type of setup. Why? Because it's made out of metal and is animated and the machine is made out of metal and it's animated. So he does a perfectly nice duplication, he never gets sick running machines. Get the idea?

And, of course, you get a society now that has a high velocity. If you're in a car out here going thirty miles an hour and you hit a tree, the body you've got will have had it. It'll at least get bruised. Now, in a high velocity society that runs something on the order of fifty, sixty miles an hour on the highway and so forth, you don't want bodies that go streaming all over the road. Why, they bleed, and all kinds of things. And furthermore, they're not good survival for machines. Machines can't eat bodies. They're not good fuel, they're not good anything. You have to go bury them someplace because they start putrefying and so forth. It's a total waste.

You take a doll body, a doll body, a crash at sixty miles an hour in a doll body would be something like a mosquito bite. So you, of course, can perfectly afford to run a sixty mile an hour vehicle while you're in a doll body. you got the idea?

All right, so you have man protesting, very ineffectually, about machinery. Oh, well, there's – it's almost died out, everybody's sort of overwhelmed by the machine, but it's a big lot of trouble. You have man organized into safety councils and all sorts of things in order to restrain traffic and so forth.

Well, he's unhappy, because he's in a fixed-valence state. Now, at no time am I advocating anything like a pastoral return to nature or that we all pick up doll bodies and carry

on, because it isn't necessarily true that a meat body – a humanoid-type body – it isn't necessarily true that it's a bad body form. It is not a bad body form. As a matter of fact you should be able to take a meat body and throw it up against a brick wall that practically flattens it till it looks like a pancake, pick it up, shake it out, put it back on again and it's perfectly all right; there isn't even a bruise.

You have the evidence of this. What holds a broken leg broken? Have you ever healed anybody's broken leg? Have you ever speeded up a healing or an injury of any kind whatsoever? Well, what was holding it? If you could help it without doing anything with it, all you had to do was run out the engram or something of this sort. If you've helped somebody get well, then it must have been that the thetan himself was slowing down the process of healing.

Ah, but let's take that just a little bit further and say, then, the thetan must himself have been *perpetuating* the process of destruction. So it takes an entirely different type of orientation to run a meat body in a scientific, machine, high-speed society. There's no liability in doing so, but there is one where the body is oriented to fight lions and there aren't any lions. You look every place and you look under the sofas and in back of the hedges and you can find no lions. But there are a lot of things out there running up and down the highway that make a lion look tame. I'll tell you, a pat from a ten-ton truck is much more serious.

So, a fixed condition of a valence which is so fixed and unalterable that nothing can change it, not even punishment, and which is out-of-date, will of course make an unhappy person. Inevitable that it will make an unhappy person. Now, that these things have survival potential, nobody will dispute. They have tremendous survival potential. In that the entire history of healing has never been able to do anything with a valence is something on the order of an attestation. They've never been able to do anything with them either.

They've had all sorts of campaigns like "Be nice to the insane," you know? Doesn't work. There's nothing – there's been no way of handling a readjustment of beings.

Now you have a method that does handle the situation. All right, well don't be surprised that while you're applying this, the valence objects. It will.

You let a valence run on auto, be totally neglected and you're in for trouble. Now I'll tell you that I have learned a great deal this summer. I have learned a *great* deal this summer. I have learned, not by treating people experimentally but by doing what we have always been doing, the best that we could do at that time, I have learned that not even the basic processes of Scientology will do more than a patch-up when it comes to clearing – not even the basic processes of Scientology applied to a preclear whose valence has not been located. They won't do anything very much. It's not a permanent proposition.

Oh yes, you could cave it in, oh yes, you could change it around, oh yes, you can make some shifts; but you can't clear them. you can make an alteration of case, but you can't make a

regain of case. you have to apply the route of "find his goal" and that permits you to find the valence chain and then audit the valence. Now you can get someplace. Now you can whiz, because you are right there where you should be.

You have a pc who is unaware of being somebody he is being. They don't know they're being this person. So what use is being this person to them? It's no joy to them – totally unknown situation. And this sort of thing is something – is getting in their road and making them succumb on certain projects and is tripping up their lives and is messing them up in general, and they don't even know what it is.

Well, there's just an addiction to another period and zone of life, another time of history, another skill package. Fortunately, not all men's skill packages hang up as valences. You shouldn't say that everything a man can do or every package of skills a man gets is the result of a valence. It is not. It is not. A thetan is totally capable of doing these various things.

For instance, I don't think I ever got into – I probably never had a valence of when knighthood was in flower – that type of valence. Those periods come and go. On every planet you get everybody tired of doing anything and you'll get a period of when knighthood was in flower, you know, and it goes through the same pattern lines and all that sort of thing. All right, that's fine.

You arrive in a society of that character. Now, if you can excel in any way in a society of that character, then it must be that you can't be operating with a valence. How can you excel if you're operating as a valence? Because the operation of a valence is nonsentient operation. It is operation in the absence of knowingness. Well, you try to take one single run down the lists without knowing consciously how to do it. Just try it. And you're going to wind up in the middle of the damnedest scramble of tinware you ever were in.

There are never any two runs just alike. There are never any two jousts alike. So you can't even form a good valence to do that. But when a thetan is totally overwhelmed and when he has totally given up and when he decides to totally become this thing which will thereafter be him forevermore, he's now had it. He will never be able to do it again. Isn't that interesting?

He will never be able to be a good priest if his valence is a priest. Why? Well, the basic underlying impulse is what? How did he get to be the priest? That's interesting. How did he get into this valence? It must have been by resisting and trying to knock off priests. And he must have worked awfully hard at it. And he must have scuppered an awful lot of priests. Man, the landscape must have been littered with them.

And the basic impulse of the preclear toward the valence is destruction of the valence. So, therefore, every time you don't let the pc get at it, why, you get a valence takeover, because the pc has lost – what is the first thing he thinks he loses to? He must be losing to the valence. Although he might be blaming the auditor, he thinks the auditor has now ganged up with the valence, you see? It's the valence which has overcome him again. So his basic

impulse toward a valence is destruction. So you ever think you're going to get anything but destructive action from something which is being operated now by a thetan which has its primary impulse of destruction? It's primarily a destructive impulse.

So you have people who are living in valences toward which they have nothing but the most violent feelings. If they have any feelings left at all way down on the lower realm, they have the most violent destructive feelings toward that valence.

Now, this valence is going to succeed, is it? Ha, ha, ha! The dickens it is! So if we had a valence of a jousting knight and the person were totally in the valence of a jousting knight, we would put him out on the lists, and we could put him on the horse, and we could pretty him up, and we could polish his armor, and we could give him the most dizzle-dazzle of devices for his shield, and we could give him the very best ash spears, and we could have the prettiest girls tying their most suggestive underthings around his neck, and he'd wind up in a pile of tinware.

Because every time the thetan wakes up, even slightly, to call for a decision, he makes a destructive decision with regard to the action which he is doing. Halfway down the lists, the thetan says, "Let me see, where am I? Oh, this!" – crash! See? It just requires the slightest rekindling of the actual intelligence and personality of the being to cause a destruction to take place.

Now, it doesn't have to be in anything as romantic or as bombastic as jousting knight. This fellow's a machinist. That's the valence. He's been totally overwhumped by machinists. So this life, he's moving through Coventry, see, and there's no jobs anyplace but that of a machinist. And he finds himself there and he sort of trains as a machinist. And at first, it looks like he has a little facility of it, but he doesn't, but he does, but he doesn't, but he does. And then one day he's standing up at the machine and suddenly the thetan wakes up slightly and says, "Where am I? Oh! Machinist!" crush, you see, and into the machinery he goes, that's it. Get the idea? And he finds out he can't push him into the machinery because the machinist gets well and is back at his platform again. Now he could make him sick. See? He could make him feel bad. He could make him lazy. He could make him inactive.

And you might say the primary battle of the universe is the battle between the thetan and the valence. And the impulse of the thetan is total destruction of the valence, which ought to make your job as an auditor awfully damned easy.

Because you're auditing somebody whose first wish is to get rid of this thing. And as soon as he has, he's won. He'll come back to being himself and he'll be able to walk with his head in the sky again. But until that time he's defeated. He's defeated from the moment that he was overwhelmed way back a hundred trillion years ago, right up till now. He's been defeated the whole ruddy lot.

So that ought to make your job very, very easy. And if you look at it like that, you'll see. You'll also be able to understand the activities of men. You'll understand why this fellow is dramatizing being a bank president and always going bankrupt. Now, there's another fellow who is a bank president and he isn't going bankrupt. But he has trouble with a boat. you see? It's all kind of unexplained and all hit or miss.

Well, it's just that very solid fact of what valence is he in? Because that for sure he will commit suicide with. He'll commit suicide with it because his primary foe is that valence and that's all there is to that; that is the thing he is trying to kill.

And when you find that, the valence will ebb and flow and he will go through all the propitiative attitudes toward the valence and it will look for a while as though he really wants to keep this valence and so on and all kinds of misemotional reactions toward this valence. And it'll get on up the lot and when he finally comes out in the clear he is not any longer overwhelmed. So that is what you're trying to do, basically.

So, that is the attention you are trying to direct. You are trying to direct the pc's attention toward eradication of all of the points which made him a slave to a valence. And if you fail to direct his attention, of course, there is nothing else there to be directed. There is nothing else present except this valence. And if you overwhelm the pc in some fashion, he will dramatize the valence. So don't blame anybody but yourself if you have a rough session. And you can always predict how the pc will operate.

If you had somebody who was a trancer, let's say he had a valence called "a trancer" – you know, it's a person who went into trances. You'd know whenever the pc was out of session. Because the pc would trance. Pc isn't any longer present, the valence is present. You see that, as an immediate detection? All right, get the rudiments in. The rudiments must be out because the valence took over. See? It's as simple as that.

The more you know about the valence, the easier it is to audit the pc. And the more you know about the valence, why, the easier it is to predict what the pc *will* do and what you've got to do. Now you could sit down and have yourself a nice thought about that, if you know the valence of the pc you're operating. Just have a nice thought about it. Say, "I wonder what this pc would do," and just mentally forecast, what would be this pc out of session? What would be this pc as the total valence? What would this pc do as the total valence? Because that's what the pc is doing as a total valence when the pc is out of session. So anytime the pc does that, you know you should get your rudiments in. see how tricky that is? This information can be used.

All right. So, the first signal that you have failed to direct the pc's attention and that you have complimented the overwhelmingness of the valence, is a breakdown of the rudiments. Well, now you should be a clever enough auditor not to let it go that far. you shouldn't let rudiments break down. you should be able to catch them before they fall.

Now, some people have a fast reaction time and when an egg falls off the table, they are very able to catch it before it hits the floor. And other people, when the egg falls off the table, they have to go get a mop. And the auditor who has to go get a mop all the time, which is to say put the valence in [rudiments in] just isn't reacting very fast. See, he's got a slow reaction.

Now, what you want, when you're adding all this up – what you want in the final analysis, is ways and means of observation, of observing a pc to know what is going wrong and why it is going wrong. To know when the pc is in-session, when the pc is not in-session.

Now, I've just given you ways and means by which you can do that and it'd make you appear pretty clever if it.... Well, you know what the pc's valence is; pc's valence is a robot. Don't think you're really getting down to it when he starts to clank. No, the valences [rudiments] are out when he clanks. The pc doesn't clank. You can have a pc sailing all around and he doesn't clank. But a robot clanks, and you must have brought that into total replay. Must be a valence out – I mean, a rudiment out for the valence to be in. see that?

The pc who dramatizes his valence has a rudiment out. Simple? There are many ways of looking at this sort of thing. And, of course, one of the ways of handling this wrong would be as follows: Pc's terminal is a robot, so you've got it all figured out how the pc would operate if he suddenly went out of valence, he's going to go *whir-clank.* All right, so the pc is running through some terrifically heavy stretch of engram or something of the sort, and he starts going *"Rrr-rrr-rrr-rrr."*

You say, "Rudiments out. All right. Well, that's the last command of that particular process. Now let's get these rudiments in."

I don't think that'd be the way to handle that. As a matter of fact, I think that would have let the valence totally overwhelm the pc. Don't you see? No, the way to do that, is just be a little more positive, a little more direct, and direct the pc's attention. You forgot the pc someplace along the line, that's for sure. And you start directing the pc's attention and that whir will turn right off. you caught the egg before it went splash.

These are all the nice little niceties of auditing. These are little tiny *thingamubumps* that makes the difference between clearing in ten thousand hours and clearing in a couple hundred. See?

It isn't enough to say to you challengingly, "Well, now, if you just had sufficient powers of observation and if you would just learn to look, why, you would be a good auditor. There. Now, I've said it, and that's it." And anything you did wrong, why, then just say to you challengingly, "Well, you just don't know what you're looking at, and so forth, you see, and so on." That would be a Germanic method of teaching.

I went to Heidelberg once. They specialized in it. When they could get you into class. But fortunately at Heidelberg there was no compulsion of attending class. But the favored method of handling a student was just to show him continuously that he was wrong. Give him some wide generality of observation, you see, something that could be interpreted in fifteen dozen different directions, and then give it with complete German didacticness – usually an involved paragraph, you see, where everything modified everything and then all the clauses modified the lot. And then just with the most contemptuous, lordly tone of voice, call the students' attention to that, as though that solved all the problems of the universe, you see. It's quite a method of teaching.

Well, we don't pursue this method of teaching, and I would feel I was doing it to you a little bit if I didn't tell you what you should be looking for and what you should be looking at. And if you as an auditor have an idea that you're looking for anything else than compliance of the pc for the auditing command, direction of the pc's attention to his case, keeping the pc in-session – if you think you're doing something else, you ought to shed it as excess baggage. You ought to drop it over in the canal. Because the canal's a long distance from here. And because it's just so much excess baggage.

Anything that doesn't contribute to this exact situation of getting the pc into session, directing the pc's attention, getting the valence plowed out, and bringing the thetan back up to where he can breathe light and air again, is not auditing Anything that detracts from it, you can jettison, at any time. If you do those things, man, can you get a case to run! And a case can really run.

You would be amazed how thoroughly and how solidly and how much of a sprint of gain can be done in one session, with the pc totally in-session and the auditor in there pitching the whole session all the way through. Wow! I mean, tremendous changes can occur just by never letting the pc's attention wander. You say the auditing command and he says, *“Whir, whir, whir, whir, whir, whir, whir, whir, whir, whir, whir, whir, whir, whir, whir, whir, whir, Whirs* Well, from about the second *whir* on you are wasting time. He hasn't got your auditing command; that's what's wrong. The least you could say is, “Did you get that?”

“Oh, uh – wha – hmm?”

“Well, here's the auditing command.”

Or, “How'd you do that? What were you looking at? Okay, that's good. Good, here's the next auditing command, bang. What are you looking at now? Did anything happen then? All right. What's going on?”

For a while he'll say, *“Nyyrrr, nyyrrr,”* and he'll act like a robot or a lion tamer or whatever he is. And all of a sudden he'll say, “You know, there's somebody in here looking over my shoulder. Maybe I'd better start working on this. Do you suppose I ever could.... Do you suppose in some slight – do you suppose that there's some tiny, tiny, tiny, faint little

chance that at some time at some undetermined future I might possibly get up parallel with this lion tamer? Do you suppose? I don't know, sounds pretty – pretty something or oth – . Ah, yeah. It's not true. Couldn't possibly be...."

And then the auditor's back in there again saying, "All right, you can lick that lion tamer, you know," kind of a thing, "You can direct your attention around," and so forth. "You don't have to do what the lion tamer does. Now, what I want you to do is so-and-so and so-and-so." The next thing you know his confidence starts coming up and his confidence gets bigger, you know, and there's less and less lion tamer, and there's more and more pc.

But it can ride for a very long time if you just let th – matters take their course and remember to do everything technically perfect and think to yourself, "Now, let's see, let me make sure that I get the acknowledgment across to the pc. I wonder if he got that acknowledgment. No, I think the next time. Now I'll give a more forceful auditing command this time. Now, let's see, is the E-Meter all tuned in properly?" and so forth and so on.

You go on worrying about how you're running the session, you won't run one, because you're worried about directing your attention. You couldn't possibly be worried about directing your attention and worried about directing the pc's attention at the same time because now we've got two pcs. And two pcs don't make a session. And the only thing which is in your favor and the only reason auditing can be done is, you very seldom have the same terminals. But wouldn't that be a ball!

You know, auditors will sometimes deny a pc their own terminal, or become upset because the pc has a terminal similar to theirs. All kinds of wildball things can happen. But fortunately, there's an infinite number and the chances of match-up are very slight. So you fall amongst – you fall in the sunlight that lies amongst the shadows and you can do your job very easily.

Thank you.