PRINCIPLES OF AUDITING

A lecture given on
5 September 1961

All right. This is 5 Sept., isn't it?

Audience: Yes. Right.

And 61. Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

Now, I hate to begin on a theme like this. There are actually so many things to tell you, why, I don't think it'll ever get done. I don't think they'll . . these things can ever be told you; they are just too many. So I would like to invite your cooperation and initiative in sweeping up, surging forward and synthesizing some of this material as you go. There's no substitute for understanding and there is no understanding without experience.

Nothing was more wonderful than the North's total solution to the black slavery problem of the South. They were not encumbered by any familiarity with the problem at all, which is an optimum way to enter into any problem, of course. One is uninhibited by facts. And the South, of course, was totally uninhibited by any facts of what was going on in the North or what that was all about. The only familiarity they could establish between them, then, was war.

Let me point out that's a terribly, terribly apt example, because that in essence is an auditing situation where there is no understanding or familiarity. If you do not permit understanding and familiarity of the preclear with his bank, he will go to war. And if the auditor does not have understanding and familiarity with the pc and his bank and the mechanics of the mind, he will be at war whether he likes it or not.

The anatomy of hatred is totally based on the anatomy of noncomprehension. And noncomprehension is totally based upon a lack of familiarity and observation. If you want to not comprehend something, by all means don't look at it. But another condition applies: that a tremendous amount of pretended knowingness and pretended understanding can arise after one has not observed. The ancient example of the wise men and the elephant is a very poor example compared to an auditor attempting to audit a pc when the auditor has no familiarity with the mind.

Out of this you get such idiocies as Freudian analysis, which is just plain idiocy, and after some years will bring the patient . . who has to be patient; that is why, you see, the term is applied . . to a state, you see, where by being careful he can still live. That is the Freudian equivalent of Clear. That was their goal.

Now, a Clear is brought up to a point where he is free to act, which is just the other end of the spectrum. Now, the Freudian analyst sat there inhis analysis on a busy, busy, busy pretended knowingness. He "knew" that the observation of children's sexual parts brought about insanity. Well, it must have been, because he looked in childhood only for sexual incidents, and that's the area of the least sex, isn't it? Yeah, fascinating. So he knew what caused insanity, and of course he went on and made people insane.

The Freudians never released it, but in the first three months of analysis, at one time, the astonishing figure of 35 percent suicide resulted. Never been made public. They never validated any gains in spite of the fact that they had the whole field of psychometric tests available.

Psychology is even more idiotic. The psychologist is born out of a school of science that observed dead tissue. The medico has all of his stable data from the area and field of dead tissue. The pathologist does observe a few bugs wiggling, but dead tissue is the source of medicine.

But there . . the study of dead tissue . . ah, the psychologist came out of this same field. After you've sawed the top of a corpse's 'ead off, all you can find in a skull is a brain, so they studied it. Oh, I suppose that's better than nothing. But let me point out something to you . . that the thing they should

have been studying had left. And out of this, of course, we got a no-observation of the mind and the fundamentals of behavior because they were not observing what they were processing.

I'm not just giving you some tricks of logic here. What I tell you is absolute fact: that the whole theory of modern medicine is based on a study of dead tissue. They . . in medical school all they do is cut up dead bodies. They have a ball. They whittle and chop and classify, and that's all very interesting, and I'm sure they learned a great deal about anatomy. But when it came to the mind and they opened up the skull and found a brain, they of course studied it and they haven't been anywhere since. Do you realize that a field is as vital as it makes progress, and a science is as vital as it makes progress, and it is no more vital than that. Let me point out that there has been no significant advance in Freudian analysis over and above the day of its origin in 1894. And there's been no significant advance in the field of psychology since its origin at Leipzig, Germany, in 1879 . . they've not gone anyplace. So obviously they couldn't have been observing what the mind was all about. They couldn't have been or they would have found out something.

Now, the most novel thing that I introduced into the study of the mind was the observation of lying beings. Very interesting. What a new thought! But you'd have to be able to confront motion to do that, and you yourself would have to be to some degree a man of action. You'd have to be able to confront some action.

You'd have to be out there slugging it along with the fellows who were sweating. And you would never have studied this in any ivory tower. And to withdraw to the highest peak of the Himalayas and regard with curiosity one's umbilical remains is of course not the way to do it because no familiarity ever occurs.

After a while, you would start saying, "Well, if you stretch somebody's umbilical cord far enough, why, you'll get a Clear." Inevitable. All right. Let's take a look at this, because we can learn a great deal from this one fact. An auditor has two sources of familiarity . . two sources . . in processing. There are more sources of familiarity than this in general that he could work with but I'm talking now about sessions.

He has the familiarity we call subjective reality, and he has as well the familiarity of the observation of a preclear and his meter behavior while in session. In other words, while he himself is in session as a preclear, he has the opportunity of obtaining familiarity on the data and functions of life and thinkingness. And then as an auditor, you see, he has the opportunity of obtaining an objective familiarity on the behavior and activities and phenomena of the pc as viewed directly with his own eyes and indirectly through the electronic phenomena of the E-Meter.

In other words, there are two spheres there of observation as far as auditing is concerned. Naturally, there are more spheres. There's the sphere of observing life, observing lying. There is the sphere of living, as well as observing living. Of course, it's rigged so that if you do too much living in this particular society, you wind up with too many withholds. And after that, of course, your auditor has a lot of trouble trying to get you in session.

I don't know, I think there possibly is some phase of life that is not punished. I haven't discovered what it is yet, but . . but speaking strictly and entirely in the zone of sessions, there are these two sources of observation and familiarity. You have an opportunity to become familiar in two zones: one as an auditor and one as a pc.

Now, certain laws govern auditing. And if you were in a state of mind where you believe that there are too many laws and that you were having to memorize too many laws and that you have to think of too many laws while you were busy doing it, then I can tell you that you have a vast familiarity on the subject of laws and very little familiarity on the subject of the mind. Ever stop and think of that?

Now, rules can only go so far as to guide you in the path of right and light on the road to making Clears. They can only go so far. The great oddity is that it can be done at all. That is the oddity.

But factually speaking, no number of rules can deliver into your hands a familiarity with what is going on in the pc at any given moment. You yourself should be able to experience that or should have experienced it and should have some knowingness on it. And the moment that you gain knowingness upon this

particular subject, the rules will all fall into line and will all have proper value, and you will see the reasons for all of them. And you'll see which ones are important and which ones are not important.

All of that is very comprehensible; you have all been audited. This is obvious that you have familiarity with the mind because you have been audited. Oh, I've got a crasher for you. I've got a crasher for about 30 percent of the cases in Scientology: You have never seen a mind. That's a crasher, isn't it? That is only . . the only source of very bad auditing, is no familiarity with the mind.

Now, of course, I have got the machine guns out and the cordons divided up in all directions on just one subject, and that is Clearing And I am doing every possible thing that I can do to improve auditing, wherever it is, in order to make Clears. This is my push. And to make them faster and more smoothly with a minimum number of flubs. This is, you might say, my current crusade.

We look at a broader track, I might have some other crusades of much broader significance; but right now this is my current crusade, and this crusade has been in progress now since the 3rd South African ACC. So all I've been doing, actually, is just making better auditors.

And every time I find another gate opening on this route, I am very happy about it indeed. And though I myself may sound somewhat condemnatory occasionally, just assign it to my urgency. On this line, I am eager. And I would say . . having no actual survey present, but just at a . . offhand estimate . . that at least one third of the auditors in Scientology have never become familiar with the mind. They have no subjective reality on engrams, secondaries, locks, ridges, machines, circuits, time track, visio, sonic, tactile, kinetic . . haven't any reality on these things. Don't exist. Horrible state of affairs, isn't it?

All right then. This requires a special technology, and the second that we get this technology, we of course can advance cases much more rapidly. Why are cases dragging their heels to Clear? Why? Why? Why? Why? Why? Why are auditors being difficult to train? Why? Why? Well, they're only difficult to train in those areas where they do not have familiarity.

So obviously, the technical advance which is most needful at this present instant on this particular crusade and campaign is a type of process that will give one a great deal of familiarity with the bank and all of its aspects. And at the same time you would pick up all the hangfire cleared cases. All the cases that are hanging fire on the road to Clear are hanging fire because they are not going along the line they should be going in auditing. They are walking the far, far, far perimeter of the crater, operating so as not to fall in.

I don't know how many hours they could do this on current processes, but that would be up to the auditor. Now, the processes which we have, used in a skilled fashion by an auditor who has comprehension of the mind, would not possibly permit anybody to do this. They would fall in. Bang! That would be it.

Ah! But an auditor who has no familiarity on the mind will applaud this tightrope walk on the far, far edge of the crater. And so he makes very sure that the pc never falls in because that is the thing to do . . to keep out of trouble.

All of man's wars, sicknesses, diseases, economic disasters, political chaoses and anything else which he has assigned to the various plagues of existence come entirely from one area: keeping out of trouble.

If this planet and civilization were ever to vanish, perhaps I will come back someday and put a sign in orbit on its exact track . . just a single sign . . no planet, you see. "There was a planet here once, but they were very anxious to keep out of trouble. They were awfully careful." Oh, that sounds like a grim thing.

Well, fortunately, I'm not going to have to do that because we're all going to get in and pitch. This is for sure. But it's just this. It's just this. It's just that diffidence, this withdrawal from session. It's just that diffidence which makes all that difference. You're not supposed to keep a pc out of trouble if the trouble is in his bank. Only trouble you're supposed to keep a pc out of is session randomity, but you're not supposed to keep him out of bank randomity. If he's got a bank to fall in, you would do a grievous crime if you didn't unfasten the nails and bolts on one of the slats of the bridge.

Auditing questions are designed to take the drop; and if an auditor is administering them so that no drop will occur, this must be an interesting session. Here you have all the questions necessary to plunge somebody into a great familiarity with his bank . . on a gradient, so that it doesn't overwhelm him . . and are applying them in such a way as to prevent him from falling in. By that time, you will start misinterpreting rules. You will need rules, and you'll have to misinterpret rules, and you'll have to do all sorts of things, and you'll so on, and it all becomes very complicated and so forth. But your problem is a rather interesting problem: it is how to keep somebody out of the bank. It is how to keep somebody from getting in trouble.

A pc never protests at getting into trouble that presents him with familiarity . . possible familiarity. He never protests against this. What he does is protest against measures which prevent him from becoming familiar with the bank. you can always count on a pc protesting measures which prevent him from becoming familiar with his bank. To this degree, every thetan is owed a considerable compliment. They will do this in session. But sometimes in auditing they are being kind, they are being nice, they are being pleasant and they are being confused; and they keep the pc's attention out of the bank, and you get instant and immediate Trouble with a capital T.

Where do you get this trouble? Pc's getting no auditing, and he knows it. Well, how does a pc get no auditing? He's permitted to walk a tightrope far, far from the crater, and he's never permitted to fall into anything. Pc goes along, "Well, there's an answer to the auditing question. There's the answer to the auditing question," and so on.

And the auditor says, "Good."

And the pc says, "Well, there's the answer."

And the auditor says, "Good."

And the pc says, "There's the answer."

And the auditor says, "Good."

And the pc says, "There's the answer."

And the auditor says, "Good."

And the auditor knows better than to ever ask him, "How are you doing? What are you looking at? Where are you going? How do you feel about this?" Because if he did, the pc might confront his bank and that would be terrible, wouldn't it?

To audit without curiosity as to where the pc is and what he is doing is a sure-fire method of keeping a pc from ever getting into any trouble. If you never find out anything about what's going on, of course you don't have to confront his bank, he doesn't have to confront his bank and the time can go up to light years and nobody gets any auditing done. See? You don't find out what's going on. He doesn't find out what's going on. Here we go. Here we go.

Now, as a general rule, any mechanism that you introduce into a session . . any mechanism that you introduce into a session which permits the pc to avoid confronting his bank or takes the pc's attention out of his bank or takes the pc out of session is going to produce every evil you associate with auditing, which is ARC breaks, heavy problems . . all these difficulties of auditing They're all produced on the same common denominator.

Now, having learned this common denominator, I'll try to teach it to you so that you can really see this for what it is.

The pc objects to not being audited, and that is all a pc ever objects to. Now, if you just write me a catalog of how many ways a pc could not be audited, I will show you then every ARC break that a pc could have. See? That's all you have to do. That's all you have to do is just deliver no auditing, and you get back

every phenomenon that you associate as an evil. Pc ARC broke, pc this, pc that, pc not in-session, long grind, pc no gain, pc with a lose, pc not want any more auditing, all of these . . oh, just ad infinitum. Anything that you could think of that a pc is liable to do that you would object to as an auditor is all from the same source.

It isn't the pc thinking he has no auditing. It has to be the pc is getting none. And as soon as this occurs, you've had it. The rocket is up, the lifeboats are out, because everything is sinking with seacocks wide open. That's it.

You audit in such a way as to prevent the pc from being in-session and you're going to get every single evil that you have ever heard of or seen or experienced in auditing. So you just have to figure out how many ways there are that you could do this. So you can't lay it out, actually, one, two, three and say these are the ways. you just have to take it from this general, broad observation. That is the rule: You prevent the pc getting audited, and the pc is upset.

Now, this goes so far as an evil of this character: You always have a present time problem with somebody's wife while you're auditing him. Well, what's the basic source of the present time problem? It is always that the wife is denying him auditing. One way or the other, the wife denies him auditing, and this creates the ARC break. Get that?

I don't care what he said, "She went out with Joe, and they went to a bar, and she came home drunk, and I had to put her to bed, and therefore I am very tired, and I am having a hard time staying in session because I'm so tired, having been up all night searching the bars of South Main Street," or something of the sort. Whatever this is, it doesn't matter what the PT problem was, somebody is preventing him from getting auditing. See? So that makes a PT problem and that makes an upset. Got it?

Now, the reason she does this is another interesting reason, which is on exactly the same line; is she can't have any auditing. Just add it up. So the grades of cases are those that can't have any auditing, those that consider their auditing is being prevented and those who can have auditing.

Now, on the first two classes you're not going to get any clearing. So the obvious thing is to remedy havingness of auditing. That would be an obvious solution to any part of it.

This fellow's old grandma keeps Mattering into her teacup all the time about how he is doing this terrible thing of getting some auditing and so forth, and so forth. And you say, well, what's the matter with her? Well, you just better sum it up, if you want to understand this old girl, is she just can't have any, that's all.

Why can't she have any? Well, there could be several reasons why, but the main one is if you so much as rattled the knob of her closet door, an avalanche of skeletons would spill all about the room. There'd be such a nasty pounding and bumping of skulls flying about that there would be a terrible dishabille. Isn't that interesting?

Some of this could simply be noncomprehension. Somebody's mother, I think it was, was objecting to a girl being audited and was causing all kinds of present time problems. And the auditor finally got very clever and cross-questioned this and found out that there was no comprehension of anything that was going on. And she didn't know what Scientology was. So he took an old folder we had which gave the dynamics and the laws of Dianetics (Remember? The eight dynamics) and gave it to the old . . person. And she read it, and after that, auditing was fine. Just was simply the randomity of a missing datum. It was that wild.

Now, auditing for herself, however, would have run into the other barrier. She understood all about it now: There were eight dynamics. And this so gripped her as a concept that after that she knew all about it, and she became quite an authority. The only thing she actually knew was the eight dynamics, and she had gotten these totally on having been handed this leaflet.

I think the leaflet came into bearing on an identical situation or the same situation. I mean it came into existence because of that. We then started using this leaflet very broadly. I remember this instance well. It

was marvelous. People knew all about it. There were eight dynamics. And they were one, and they were two and three and four and five and six and seven and eight and that was it! And they knew all about it, and that was brand-new, and now life clarified for them, and everything was fine and it was all good roads and good weather.

But as far as them getting auditing was concerned, this again would have fallen across the skeleton. But if they'd gone on . . they'd read the eight dynamics and they'd gone on . . its cou . . only have been skeletons. So it could be missing data or too much data that they're holding on to, which again they make data missing for you, you see . . withholds.

So that third party situation still comes under just that heading: scarcity of auditing. Why is it scarce? Well, it can't be. It can't be had. Either it doesn't exist, which is they have no understanding of it and therefore it isn't anything or if it did occur, why, there would be too many social repercussions of one kind or another because they've got too many withholds. So they can't have auditing, that's all. So you never audit these people unless you practically back them into the corner of the courtyard, you see, and at gunpoint demand what the withhold is.

Anybody start arguing with me today on the subject of Scientology out in the broad public, something like that . . I'm sitting there enjoying my creme de menthe or something after dinner, and somebody . . all of a sudden somebody jumps me on the subject of Scientology and so forth, "Oh, that. Oh, you're that Hubbard. Oh, I see. Yes."

I tell you what I would do. I wouldn't go any further with the conversation with that. We used to say put them in session, run an engram and so forth. That's still perfectly all right, but I would now take a different tack. I would look at them surprised and say, "Well, what have you done?"

And they would say, "What?"

"No, what have you done that you couldn't tell me about? What have you done that these people shouldn't know about?"

It'd be so non sequitur, everybody would be terribly shocked, and they would look at me (they always think you're some kind of a swami with a bath towel wrapped around your head) and they'd . . "How did you know?"

"Well, it's fairly easy when you have familiarity with the thing. It does something to the eyes."

Every single one of the people present, the next time they were in the bathroom would gaze into the mirror.

All right. The pc who is ARC breaky or who gets present time problems is in some fashion or other being denied auditing in some way. I know this sounds very funny. I know it sounds rather monocentric on our part to say that they are denied auditing, because auditing is apparently something brand-new that hasn't existed. Adequate treatment has not existed on this planet . . period.

What's your first thought if you fall down and bust your skull, "Oh, God, doctors! Oh, God! Hospital bills! Oh, my heavens on earth! Well, they'll probably trepan me. Ooooh, whoa, wah, wah. . ." You're not worried about the fact that your car is wrecked near so much as the fact you're now going to be treated. Isn't that right? You get an injury, now you're going to be treated. You hope you don't get too sick because then you will have to be treated.

Rarh, you can see some sawbones coming around and taking cotton wads and sticking them on swabs and sticking them into your nose . . which won't do anything, you know, but irritate hell out of your nose, you know . . and monkey with it and say, "Well, you take this prescription, which you go up to the drugstore where I get a cut, you see, and over here to the chemist, and he'll fill this thing, and then he can put it on 'national service' or something." And then after you've gone to all this trouble . . . It's just enough trouble just to get some of this swill, you see, and when you take it, it tastes ghastly, and you know it won't do anything either.

Confidence in treatment on this planet is at its lowest possible ebb. The only planet I know of where it dropped any lower was the Marcab Confederacy, and it dropped much lower in the Marcab Confederacy. The way they taught medicine there, they had a number of drawers with dead, dried tissue in them. And they'd drag these drawers out, you see, and show the students, "And this is a dried head, you see. And this is tissue that's been affected by tuberculosis. And this is this . . ." and it was all dried, and so forth, and that was their total command of medicine.

The only thing that was wrong with this particular activity is these really were infected tissues, and they were still carrying the germ spores, which I thought was always a little bit rough. But I remember giving medical lectures occasionally, and any student gave me any trouble, why, I'd just drop some tubercular tissue on his desk. This was all sort of raw. But there it got to a point where you weren't ever permitted to get a new body. And this is typical of many space opera societies and is getting typical of this one. This one will go along too.

And this society has got it rigged up now where the best treatment for this and that and the other thing, you see, is to give some fellow an artificial medulla oblongata and wire him up, you see, for sound. And they're starting this evolution where they're going to replace the body with the mechanical parts . . you know, that I've told you about before . . and eventually they'll omit the printed circuit, and the things still work, and they'll say, "What's this?"

All right. Well, not to get off onto whole track, but you've got a point here where treatment is very, very poor. It's guesswork, it's unpositive, it is negligent. Little girl hurt in an automobile accident here in East Grinstead is taken up to the hospital. She lies there on a cot bleeding for several hours in an anteroom without anybody even coming around to put a tourniquet on. I mean stuff of this character just goes on all the time. Treatment has to be done by calloused people because it doesn't treat.

Now, the consternation which can spread through a hospital by a Scientologist walking in from bed to bed and doing Touch Assists and so forth has already been demonstrated on many occasions. And it is consternation. But nobody can confront it. The doctors can't confront it. Some of the nurses do, but never the doctors. Scientology has done some fantastic things in hospitals. Well, I personally have discouraged it. We are not in the field of healing. That doesn't say we can't heal better than they can. But healing is at such an ebb that if you cure somebody with a broken leg . . I mean that too, cure him . . and he's been in bed for three or four days with this broken leg, and they're getting ready to come in and put a souvenir cast on him . . I think that's why they put casts on things like that, it's so people can write their names on it and then keep the souvenir.

The end product of this is what? You cured him! My God, you never heard so many remarks as will be made by doctors which are further off base in your life. They are fantastic remarks! They are incredible! And it'll finally sum up to, "Well, the leg couldn't have been broken." And they will make this remark while they're looking at their own x-ray plate!

I had this advanced to me one time. A little kid was cured of leukemia by an auditor. In older days they did much more of it than they do now. And the auditor thought, boy, that medico's eyes are really going to pop out, see, when he finds this is all negative now.

It was an interesting engram, by the way. Mother's favorite phrase was, "It'll just turn your blood to water." And the auditor pulled this phrase out of the bank and the kid got well. That is, of course, leukemia. That was it. Interesting, huh?

But the medical pronunciamento is: "The child couldn't have possibly had leukemia because leukemia is not curable." Just try to wrap your wits around this, you know. you get kind of groggy, you know, trying to make all corners of this thing. They just throw everything out of existence because they know it's not curable and they know themselves are not capable of curing. Hence, their callousness. They have to make nothing out of their patients, otherwise the treatment would be an overt. The psychologist has to make nothing out of man because treating him would then be an overt. They're just lessening the overt, is their professional approach ordinarily.

All right. What does all this add up to? Absence of treatment. You have preclears who are trained from . . not the cradle . . they have been trained since the Roman arena; they have been trained since the last pyramid . . into the nonexistence of treatment. Well, that is then no cure, no auditing But the funny part of it is . . the very funny part of it is . . the very large percentage that still hopes treatment can take place. That is what is amazing! If you're going to be amazed about anything, not amazed about the fact that the wogs never whipped themselves up any method of doing anything, but be amazed at the fact that after all this people still have hope. It's never been killed in a large percentage of the people.

Now, those in whom it has been utterly squashed, to get them into any kind of a session and so forth, oh, wow, man, wow, because you're going on a total no-have of auditing, don't you see? But if there's any hope there at all, that hope must therefore be rather thin. By this time it must be rather raveled. And all the auditor has got to do is make a motion in the direction of no treatment and he ARC breaks the pc.

Why? Because the pc's hope of treatment is already so thin. So you're doing, at first, kind of a cheerleader's job, you know? I am talking about before he gets into session, you know? You have to kind of reassure him. And then when you get him in session, let him have treatment.

All right. Now, how many ways could there be of not letting him have treatment while he's sitting in the pc's chair? How many ways could there be?

First and foremost is not permit his attention to go onto his case. And that's practically a common denominator of all of them. If he's sitting there in the chair, don't let his attention go on his case. Even though he's putting in chair time, he's not being audited, see, and he knows it.

Now, the oddity is that the most crude fumbling around with the case itself, as long as the pc's attention continues on the case, elicits no real protest from the pc. He never protests about this. you run him into some of the juiciest bits that you practically will never be able to get him out of without superheroic auditing, see (actually, you can get him out of anything), and he never protests. He never really protests! But don't let him go into it and he'll protest.

All protests of the pc, all difficulties of the pc, all stem from this same button I am talking to you about: no treatment, no havingness on auditing.

And when these are even vaguely aided and abetted by the auditor, you of course have trouble with the pc; you will always have trouble with the pc. If you're going to give pcs auditing, give them auditing.

Now, what is auditing? Auditing consists of putting a pc in-session. And this has two things: able to talk to the auditor and interested in own case.

Now, interested in own case infers, of course, and means attention on his own case. So if you wanted to refine this and make that definition of in-sessionness even more workable, you would say, "Attention on his own case and able to talk to the auditor." And that would be an absolute necessity. So that would be what auditing is.

Auditing is directing the pc's attention on his own case and directing his ability to talk to the auditor. That would be the scope of auditing. And the only way, then, you could get into trouble, if that is an auditing session . . the only way you could get into trouble . . would be, take his attention off of his case and make it difficult for him to talk to the auditor. And that would add up on both counts to no auditing. And you would run square into this other button, and there is where you get the violence of the ARC break. It can be pretty explosive and can be pretty violent because actually it is painful to have these things happen. But the basics of the pain is, is there is no auditing, so therefore damage might occur which is irreparable.

You see, he knows . . he believes now the auditing could cure any damage, but if there's going to be no auditing then the damage isn't curable. And this is exactly which way his mind dives. So he's in a state of anxiety. The moment you violate in-sessionness, he is in a state of anxiety.

Now, there are many other phenomena involved with this. one of the phenomena consists of this: He is looking at an engram. The only space in the engram, actually, is brought about by his attention on the

engram; and until the engram is desensitized, he will have to keep some space in it to keep the engram off the front of his nose.

So that if you distract his attention suddenly from an engram, the space possibly may disappear out of the engram, and he finds the engram on the end of his nose. And the engram might have some bite in it. you haven't bitten him, but the engram has. By doing what? By taking his attention off the engram.

His attention is on the engram, and his attention is on as much of the engram as he is able to put his attention on it at that moment; and then all of a sudden the auditor betrays him and pulls his attention off of the engram. And of course the engram will collapse on him, bang! It's uncomfortable. He doesn't like this. It's physically painful; it can be. He'll develop a somatic from it. There are various phenomena will occur. Sensations occur that he doesn't like. And now he compounds it with an overt against the auditor . . one, two. See?

Now, how could the auditor distract his attention? How many ways could an auditor distract his attention? Well, once more we have a very long list. It'd be a dictionary full of ways. There are numerous ways his attention could be yanked out of session. One is choosing an auditing room, or permitting one to be chosen for one, which has action or activity in its vicinity. Why? Because you've set up an auditing session then as the stable datum around which action is occurring. See? That would be one. you can get away with a lot of that; but don't try to audit somebody in the middle of a busy street, because there's motion going on all around, and you'll find later that the auditing session is itself kind of an engram. Why? Because he got all this motion out of the tail of his eye, you see, and yet his attention is supposed to be on the case, and so forth.

Well, you can get away with quite a bit of it. But you'll find out in . . an operation in a hospital which is located in a busy traffic area of a city is far more serious than an operation in a hospital in the country where there is no traffic action. That's fascinating. That's how you make an operation hang up. Just put a hospital right in the middle of four freeways, and then put its operating room out in a corner of the building, you see, where you've got the visibility of two freeways. Now, we're trying to run the operation and we have a hell of a time running this operation. It seems to be an awful sticky operation. We find out it was for removing a pimple on the left gluteus maximus, you see? It wasn't much of an operation, but, boy, is it stuck!

You see, I know that there was . . now that there was larger scope in terms of cubic area to an engram. You'd think of the engram as taking place in the operating room, probably with a scope from the patient to the doctor, you see, or in the immediate vicinity, maybe a cubic yard of engram. You get the idea? Whereas, factually, it isn't even as small as the room, which would be something on the order of fifteen or twenty cubic yards of engram, you see? It's more like half a cubic mile. And as the pc starts running it, he becomes aware of more zone. And if there's activity in that zone, it pins his attention back into the operation.

One of the interesting ways of running an engram would be to pay absolutely no attention to what was going on, particularly, in the operating room . . this engram taking place in the corner of the building . . but just find out what he wouldn't know about the traffic around the hospital. You'd find all of a sudden the engram just goes fling! you see? It's just the traffic around the hospital, you see. Oohhhohhhh! Boom. That was what was holding the engram in place. Actually, the engram wasn't being held in place in the auditing room. It was being held in place in the corridor. Got the idea?

If a pc has had a lot of auditing in a very busy, active environment or area, ask them what has been unknown about the activity of an auditing area. And you're liable to find their sessions blowing up much faster than on trying to run out auditors. Get the idea? Because the auditing sessions were maybe fifty cubic yards of zone, and he's only looked at the first cubic yard, and he . . yet he was aware of the activity in fifty cubic yards. So the activity in fifty cubic yards pinned him down into the half a cubic yard. you get the idea?

Environment. Environment. Motion in the environment. Very, very interesting study all in itself.

All right. That would be the first thing that you would do about it, is guarantee the noninterruption of the session. That's the auditor's responsibility; no matter who made the room assignment, that's the auditor's responsibility.

All right. There are certain physical limitations against a certain thing like this. But any auditing room you've got around here, to give you some area of comparison, is fairly quiet. That's fairly quiet. Now . . there's a little interruption, but it doesn't usually amount to a hill of beans. I'm talking about more motion than that. you got the idea? It takes a little more motion than that to really pound them down and pound them in. It takes something like . . well, the most . . as we've known for a long time, the most horrible thing you could do to any accident patient would be to throw them into an ambulance, open up the siren, and drive them at eighty miles an hour. And I think that the boys know this down deep, and that they're just lessening the overt of treating him at all.

Basically, it'd . . in most (quote) treatments (unquote), it would be kinder to leave the fellow lying on the battlefield or at the scene of the accident, you know . . take him over the . . under the hedge and put a pillow under his head and say, "Well, are you as comfortable as possible?" Oh, yes. He's as comfortable as he could get under those circumstances. And if he gets well, he'll get up from the hedge, and if he doesn't get well, he'll die. But who introduced this idea of the scarcity of bodies? Well, there isn't any great scarcity of bodies.

Well, how all this treatment? Ambulances, you know, screaming sirens, eighty miles an hour, you know, traffic areas and so forth. And in the bustling reception rooms, you know, and up elevators and down carriage ways and halls and into a room that's gleaming full of all kinds of reflected light, you see? Oh, man. They're great. They're great. They're marvelous. They got it all taped. And then operate him on some kind of a gas with oxygen in it or ether with lots of oxygen, and have the oxygen tank explode or something like this. They do that very often. Anything to create randomity. Well, I'd say their mind isn't on their business, and we shouldn't make the same mistakes. All right. So much for the quietude of the room.

Now, an auditor who chatters endlessly about other things than the session while auditing a pc, or chatters at a pc in (quote) breaks (unquote) about other things than the session, of course, is actually setting himself up to get the pc's attention off of it. That is not a very broad error, but I have noticed it often enough in HGCs to comment on it. You're dragging his attention off of his case in the break, and then when he starts a session again or something like this, well, of course, the pc's attention is every place. The pc most normally wants to keep on talking about his case, if you ever noticed, during the break. Well, if you're tired of hearing of his case for the moment, excuse yourself and go get a glass of water. He won't object.

But now, in the session itself, an ineffective or unworkable process, of course, is no auditing. But we've got the technology of this thing pretty well taped, and you can almost neglect it. Just do a good technical job. use the tools which you have. Learn how to use them and so forth. That is an easy one. And that is actually not too much of a barrier. And yet it is the barrier at which you mostly strain. It is not the major barrier of keeping a pc in-session. Certainly, anything we have had since February run on a pc . . just chosen at random almost and run on a pc with . . inside the limits of what you can do and what you can't do . . would keep the pc in-session. I'm now just talking about smooth sessions, don't you see? Almost anything An old Dianetic engram would keep him in-session. So, technical . . technical is a separate compartment to these other things I'm talking to you about.

All right. Our next big hurdle then . . let's just lay aside technical. There it is, and it's very important, and that is what we're doing after all, but it is not the main source of auditing bust-ups. Even when poorly done, it is not the main source of auditing bust-ups, because it is auditing. It's administration of that technical which is the main source of difficulty.

Now we get to our next one . . our next one, and by far the most important one: the prediction factor. This has all sorts of things such as surprise. Surprise. What is a surprise?

Well, first and foremost, people who have low tolerance for the unknowns are surprised easily, much more easily than you would think. And the degree that a person can be surprised is in direct proportion to

his intolerance for unknownnesses. The less a person has toleration for the unknown, the more he can be surprised.

Now, what is a surprise? And the reason I'm talking about surprise rather than not-know is to give you a little better look at it. A surprise is not having known. A surprise is not not-knowingness; a surprise is not having known. A surprise is a past tense knownness. Now, I've been trying to crack what a surprise was here since 57, and there's what it is. It's a not having known, and that gets at the root of every surprise, and that just rips up all the surprises on the track, zippety-bap. That is very rapid for running surprises.

Not having known . . not-knowingness. "What isn't known?" doesn't run surprises. "What wasn't known?" runs surprises. You see, the fact had existence before he found out about it, and he is shocked by the fact that he didn't know about it by some weird prescience of some kind or another when it was going on. So therefore, the death of Uncle Zorch is uniformly a surprise, because Uncle Zorch died a week or so ago and we didn't know it. And that is the source of surprise.

Of course, the basic anatomy of surprise is elementary. It is just change unpredicted. So a surprise is an unpredicted change. That is your technical background definition, but how does this register in the mind?

An unpredicted change is not of any consequence unless there was a knowingness present which the pc didn't know and then finds out. See, like the death of Uncle Zorch: Uncle Zorch has been dead for a week, and now he suddenly finds out Uncle Zorch is dead. Now he is very surprised. You see? This amazes him. He's surprised. What's he surprised about? Well, actually, he tries to go backtrack into all that unknowingness of a week. And of course, he gets the impression of himself floundering around for an entire week in a not-knowingness, which is an invalidation of his knowingness and his permeation. And that is the only thing a thetan ever objects to: an invalidation of knowingness. Then he objects with violence, but it's on the basis of surprise.

He thinks of himself as going around all that week . . he thinks of everything he did that week with Uncle Zorch dead, which of course does what? It's actually a pretended unknowingness. He didn't really not-know it during that whole week, you see, but it was a fact that existed someplace of which he was not aware. So he gets a future that looks like this: that all sorts of things he doesn't know about are going on in his vicinity that he will maybe find out about and they will be a terrible shock to him. See? So he starts living in an environment in a state of anxiety. Because he has now had it demonstrated to him clearly and brilliantly that facts not known to him which are quite destructive can exist in his environment without his awareness. So he starts fighting the black thetans every night. You got the idea?

See, he's sucked back into the whirlpool of unknown yesterdays. Well, the truth of the matter is he knew his environment in those yesterdays, but he looks back at them as not-knowing the environment. So he doesn't know whether he knows it and he doesn't know whether he not-knows it, and things of horrible portent might be going on at just this very moment.

Do you realize . . I'll give you an example of this. Do you realize that your nearest and dearest and best loved one right at this exact instant might be in terrible trouble and you wouldn't even know it? Can you get a little spark of anxiety out of that? Well, that's what anxiety is and that's what nervousness is. And the fellow who's starting to get nervy about things has simply been taught this lesson: that facts can exist without his awareness of them, and he moves over, as a protection-survival mechanism, over into: "I had better be very alert because it can happen again, you see, that facts can exist without my knowing anything about them. So therefore I am living in an unknown environment."

And this, by the way, is the greatest destroyer of IQ there is. IQ goes down in direct ratio to the amount of unknownness which the individual conceives the environment to hold. It isn't how stupid he is. It's how much unknownness does he conceive to exist there, which is quite amusing. So this then will also apply to a subject.

Fellow can't learn German. He's stupid on the subject of German. Well, why is this person stupid on the subject of German? Well, there must be a lot of feeling that there's terrible unknownnesses in the zone and area of German. I think you take somebody that fought in World War I, World War II and tried to teach them the German language, I think you'd have a ball. See? After he . . he's sitting there minding his

own business eating his bully beef or something of the sort, and all of a sudden somebody says, "Well, there was an attack yesterday over on A Company, and Bill is dead." It isn't even really the shocks and shells, don't you see? It's Bill is dead, but he should have known it yesterday. Get the idea? See?

If he was any good as a thetan (this is his self-criticism) he'd know these things. Got the idea? He doesn't know these things, so therefore he's stupid. His . . his conception of the amount of unknownness on any subject gives you the direct ratio of his intelligence on that subject. So in the environment at large you get an additional one which is, the amount of unknownness he conceives might exist in the environment at large, regulates his intelligence about the environment at large.

Ah, you get people in insane asylums where this has gone all the way out, and they don't know those walls are there, ooohhhhoooohhhh. Might be something else, you know? Ooohhoohh.

Watch them, you know. And then they get to a point where they don't know. They don't even dare look at the wall. They don't know they don't know about the wall, and so forth, and uhhhh there might be spooks present and . . and then they very often will solve this whole problem. The anxiety factor, when it comes to solution, gets to be gruesome indeed. They will mock up unknown presences so they can be known presences, you see? They solve the whole thing They say, "Well, the way to conquer all this unknown environment, or this unknown about what the people are going to do, is just put the people in the environment. And we will say they are there." Don't you see? Now, let's solve it with a total delusion.

I saw such a fellow. I was up at Lowestoft inspecting a couple of motor fishing vessels not long ago and there was a war veteran there, and he came aboard one of them, and he was evidently using one of its cabins to change his clothes. And he came aboard and he changed his clothes and he went out and with the most vile language was having violent arguments.

First, he tried to have a violent argument with the boat guard, but this didn't work too well. But he had the most violent argument going along, and I listened to it. And, of course, everybody said, "Well, he's been crazy ever since the war, but . . " and so forth, "and it's just something he does," and so on. But I looked at him rather interestedly from a standpoint of exactly what he was doing, you know, as a Scientologist would. What is this fellow doing, you know? And he was scolding back at somebody who was reprimanding him . . probably a sergeant . . very defensive, snarling, vile, violent kickbacks. There was obviously somebody in his environment that was just scolding him all the time and reprimanding him all the time and telling him all kinds of things all the time, and sometimes the person would be over on the right and sometimes over on the left, and he'd have to bop and turn in that direction and shake his finger at this fellow and curse him out and say . . and tell him off, really tell him off. And he'd walk a few more feet, and the fellow would be over here by now, and he'd tell him and he'd tell him off, and so forth.

Well, what was he doing? He was putting a known in an environment which had become intolerably unknown to him. He could no longer tolerate that much unknown in his environment, so he had put a known into it. In other words, he had gone through the line of just merely being insane on the subject of the environment, and he was now in a pretended knowingness on the environment, which was really gone. you get the mechanism? Well, that's the mechanism of surprise.

Well, this applies to sessions, very closely and very directly applies to sessions. Most of what a pc is going through is accumulations of unknownnesses that he suddenly found out, and nearly everything he's got in the bank is a prevention against being caught unawares again. I won't bother to give you any examples of that. If you're interested in examples of it, look in Dianetics: Modern Science of Mental Health . . any engram in there that is detailed . . and you will find out that it is the intolerance of the unknownness that causes the person to get the reactive computation that will act without his finding out about it.

You see? He's got some kind of a mechanical setup that any time . . you see, it's very dangerous. The little fish gets bit in water that has yellow stones on the bottom. So, of course, when he sees yellow stones on the bottom, why, he must have a mechanism now which tells him to get the hell out of there because he's in danger, and he just does this automatically. And he (quote) doesn't like yellow stones, don't you see, (unquote). so he never goes near yellow stones, and this keeps him out of ever being bitten

in water where there are yellow stones. And then, of course, he starts to go kind of daffy because the next time he gets eaten up, he gets eaten up in water that has blue stones. "You can't win," see; that'd be his motto after a while.

Do you follow this rationale of how all of this comes about, exactly what occurs when a pc finds out something in session from the auditor which existed before he discovered it?

Now, let's look at a mechanism of what could happen in something of that order. The pc is sitting there interiorized into his bank. All right. That's all very well, he's sitting there interiorized in his bank, and he's going along and he's looking at it and so forth. And then all of a sudden the auditor reaches over and diddles with the E-Meter cans, and says, "Well, the meter is out so we have to stop the session." This happens more times than you'd think.

Well, the pc is given the datum that the meter was out and he didn't know it, so there wasn't a session when he thought there was one, and this has possibly been going on for a little while, see? And the little while that this had been going on, of course, is an unknown area, so that's what pins him in the session . . not his consequent overt so much as what was unknown. Got the idea?

Now he's finding out about his case, and he's going along fine about his case, and he thinks the auditor is satisfied, and all of a sudden the auditor stops the process. The pc thought he was doing all right, the auditor didn't think he was doing all right, so you've got an unknown.

That's a come-to-realize more than a surprise, but it's a come-to-realize that an unknown has existed . . an unknown has existed . . and those are the damaging points of the line. They're not complicated otherwise. See this?

Of course, surprise is based on change, and sudden change is the anatomy of all surprise, and so forth. But we're interested in the more . . the living phenomena connected with the change, the unpredicted character of it. What do we mean by unpredicted? We mean not known. It's the not-known character of it that is the sticker, and that's what sticks them in surprise. It's not the fact that change occurred that sticks them in surprise. It's they didn't know it. And you better learn that one well as an auditor.

You can change a process fifteen times an hour on a pc without damaging him, but you can suddenly change a process on some consideration he doesn't know about once in two hours and ARC break him across the boards. See? The unknownness. He thought he was doing all right. All of a sudden he isn't doing all right, or something like that, don't you see?

He thought he was going to run this thing flat, and the auditor isn't going to give him a chance. The auditor has been sitting there, possibly with some critical thought . . because the pc will add up and put supposed knowingness and all sorts of things in the way, and therefore he gets accusative of the auditor. He'll try to solve this problem. What's he trying to do? What are all these accusations against the auditor? They're just efforts to solve the unknownness which existed before the fact of change. What the hell was all this about before the change occurred? You see? He's left in a zone and area of noncomprehension.

All right. That's very messed up. That can get very messed up in a session. That can go blooey-blooey-blooey. Do you see what the exact mechanism of it is there?

All right. Then you could do auditing along in this style of you could advise the pc well in advance of what you were going to do and what you intended to do, and if you did this in a way so as not to yank his attention too violently off of what he was doing, well, it'd be fine. So, your one-two-three would be something on the order of find out what he is doing and then advise him what you are going to do.

You say, "Well, what are you doing? What are you looking at? What is it?" That's perfectly all right. You can ask him all kinds of questions that you possibly care to along this line. "What is it?" "What are you doing?" "How is it going?" "How did you answer the question?" "What did it apply to?" "Did any picture come up?" "Is a picture there?" "Have you seen any pictures for a little while?"

Any type of questioning like this, of course, is directly putting him in-session, isn't it?

All right. Now, if we only do this just before we throw in the bridge and end the process, this becomes a signal that he didn't know the process was going to end at this moment; so you ask him how he's doing . . this can get this silly . . you ask him how he's doing, and he'll tell you that he didn't know you were going to end the process. He gets upset because he didn't know you were going to end the process. See?

So if a pc is getting into that state of thing, auditor patter can move over onto this as a cure of the not-knowingness of the pc; and you can say, "Well, I'm not going to end the process just now, but how are you doing and what are you looking at?" You get the difference?

"Oh," the pc'll say, "Well, that's all right," you know?

"Now, I want to find out what you're doing, because it's getting toward end of session. I just want to find out what you're doing so that we can get this patched up okay before we end the process."

Why, that's okay with the pc too, don't you see? See, that cures his notknowingness.

All right. Now, you can ask him how he's doing before you tell him to do something, and he'll be fine. But if you start suddenly on an auditing command . . this isn't ne . . this doesn't get people into much trouble . . you start suddenly on an auditing command without telling him you're going to do so or clearing it, he will normally go ahead and run the auditing command. That is not a very fruitful source of trouble about it. But if the auditing command doesn't work after you have done that, of course, he thinks you are impetuous or rash. See? So this is just one other way that you're denying him auditing.

Now, a pc is only one kind of victim. There's only one victim . . only one victim complex in a pc. He's a victim of no auditing. That's the only victim complex he's got. No matter how many victim complexes show up on his case or motivators or anything else, these things are minimal. What's important is that he's the victim of no auditing and . . because out of that becomes all your auditing difficulties, and we're talking about auditing difficulties in this lecture, see? So it's just that one thing. It's no auditing. See? You're making a victim out of him.

All right. Now, this reads to him on this basis: that an unknown exists that he doesn't know about in the session. That's why you have to keep the R-factor up. pcs know. They can sense these things, you see? And unless you keep them genned in and keep the R-factor in and keep the knowingness factor in and so forth while you're auditing, you get into all kinds of trouble that's very mysterious to you. And you say, "What in the name of God is happening? I mean, what is wrong with my auditing?" Well, your auditing might be practically flawless except it'd omit these points. It'd omit the basic point of denying him knowingness. See? So your auditing becomes an unknown, and that's why you've got to keep an R-factor in.

You're tired. You don't want to audit him. In a very short period of time he's going to find this out, and of course that makes a new surprise, because the mechanics of surprise are there no matter how gently the news broke. See? So breaking the news gently, to hell with that. Just make sure that when an unknowingness is about to occur to the pc, you turn it into a known as far as you're concerned as an auditor . . from your viewpoint as an auditor, as far as the session mechanics are concerned. Warn him. Keep him aware of what's going on. Got the idea? What you are going to do.

Now, of course, you can err perhaps in being too verbose about telling him what you are going to do, but that error is not serious. It just consumes a little time. The error is in trying to make time in an auditing session by omitting this. That is the error which causes your ARC breaks and upsets. Omit this. why do you say, "Now I am going to audit you"? See? Why do you say such things as that, except to gen him in. "Now this is the process we're going to run." Well, whether you have his agreement or not, for God's sakes give him the knowingness.

Now, you can audit a pc without his agreement, but you can't audit him without his knowingness. So move your importance from agreement over to knowingness, and you'll start running awfully smooth sessions. Get smart at this. Get real smart at this.

Right at the beginning of session, give him a whole timetable of the session, then keep it. Tell him what you're going to do, step by step. Keep him genned in as to what's happening Now he'll relax about the environment, because his main difficulty is he thinks the environment is full of unknowns. Well, don't make the auditing session another unknown to him. Give him the gen. Give him the gen.

Now, ARC breaks clear up most rapidly on not-know processes. These are killers. And you want an ARC break process that works, man, that is one of them. But remember that a not-know process run in that wise is always run past tense. Don't ever run it present tense. Run it past tense.

"What wasn't known," you see, "in this session?" "What wasn't known about what I was doing? What didn't I know about what you were doing?" Didn't I, you see? Past tense. Not "What don't I know about what you're doing?" Always past tense. Always past tense, because that's the element of surprise. That's where the track is collapsed. It's that an unknown existed which he found out about. And it's the find-out-about point that you are hitting now in auditing and that is not the damaging point. When you try to clear an ARC break you're trying to clear all these find-out-about points, the known points, and they are not the difficulty in the session. The difficulty in the session is the period which preceded it. So he is thinking of this notknown always in a past tense.

This doesn't apply to Security Checking or anything like that. I mean you're not interested in . . we're just talking about sessions. Doesn't matter what tense, as this doesn't influence the use of not-know elsewhere. You use those past tense or present tense or the other ways, you know, any way that it's supposed to add up. I'm just talking about patching up ARC breaks and keeping a session running.

So you keep the knowingness in, and keep it in good and heavy. And you keep in, at the same time, a fairly predictable activity. Well, that gives it, of course, Model Session. You're asking in certain order and you're asking in certain ways on the basic bones of a session. And this is predictable to the pc, so an auditing session becomes known to the pc; and every time you jump this in any way, the pc is liable to object. But it is possible to jump it providing you genned him in enough. You just gen him in. you don't even have to have his agreement. Just gen him in. Don't be so propitiative. Just tell him. You know? You say, "I'm sitting here thinking of doing something else with this particular thing we're doing. How is it going to you? How is it doing?"

"Well, it's not doing badly. It's doing fine. I'm right in the middle of this engram here."

"Well, do you think there's anything we could do to make it go a little faster?"

"Yeah. There possibly is because I sure stuck up here."

"Well, what are you doing right now?"

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

"All right. I'm going to vary the auditing command so-and-so and so-and-so, and it's going to be so-and-so and so-and-so now. Do you think that would get anyplace with it?"

"Oh, yes. I think it would."

Well, apparently, you're seeking his agreement. Actually, you're filling him in. see the difference? He'll never ARC break on you on something like that. He'd know. It's not that he'd agree or not agree. It's that he'd know. Do you follow that?

All right. Now if "unknown" is that vital in a session and if "unknown" plays this enormous part in the existence of a thetan, don't you suppose that an unknownness about the constituency, size, shape, general characteristic, name, rank and serial number of his bank doesn't register on the pc with exclamation points? Man, don't it! It really does!

If you don't know about banks, if you don't know about engrams, if you don't know about secondaries, if you don't know about ridges, and you don't know about the time track, and you've never collided with

any of these things . . you'd carefully skirted that volcano . . of course, you're auditing from what pedestal? From the same pedestal that the North declared war on the South. You're auditing in the grand, vast deserts of the unknown. And, of course, it registers straight across to the pc that you don't know your business. And, of course, after that you'll have nothing but trouble with pcs. Interesting, huh?

So if you don't bother to ask pertinent questions that make sense to the pc, and if your questions don't make sense to the pc, of course, the pc doesn't think you know what you're doing. And your ability to control and command a session is directly proportional to your familiarity and knowingness on the parts of the human mind. Directly proportional.

Ah, you've long muttered and thought about this, of how come I could audit pcs that you might have trouble auditing? Or how do I get results faster than you do? It is basically just that. It's right on that basis.

I very often leave a pc gasping as to how I found out that this was about to occur. Well, that's an all right kind of unknown. That's perfectly all right to him because he now knows something else: He knows he's in safe hands. Even though he doesn't know that there is an arquebus pointed straight at his midriff around the corner, why, obviously the auditor already knows that the arquebuseer is standing there.

I even demonstrate this to a fellow every now and then. I move him up a few more minutes . . I can realize that he just isn't going to go near the part of that engram at all; he isn't going to go near that part of the track, that there is something there, and he is not even approaching it. And I keep saying, "Well, is there something else there?" you know? "Which direction is it?" and so forth.

"Yeah, well," he says, "I am looking to the left."

And I say, "Well, why don't you look to the right? Why don't you just look over to the right?"

And, of course, he gets it straight in the midriff, and he's going to say to himself, "How the hell did he know that arquebuseer was standing over to the right?"

Well, of course, I might or might not have known that the arquebuseer was standing over to the right. But I sure know that if he's going to look over to the right he's going to find out more about the engram, and how do I know this? Well, because he's looking to the left.

And it gives you a strange aura of omniscience to the pc. He feels that you must see all, know all.

Well, let's give him a reverse look. Let's give him a reverse look. He's looking at an engram, and he's about to get his head chopped off on a chopping block, and there he is, and this is all very grim, and so forth.

And you say, "Well now, how about that lock there that you're looking at?" and so on, and so on. "Uh. . . uh, look around the room and let's see if you can have something." Instantly and immediately, he thinks you're the most stupid character he ever ran into in his life. So therefore the unknownness is resident in the auditor, isn't it? You didn't ask the right question.

Get familiar with the mind and make the session familiar to the pc, and you'll be a bearcat of an auditor.

Thank you.