

SUBJECTIVE REALITY

A lecture given on
6 September 1961

Okay, this is 6 Sept. 61. Which is more properly AD 11. Special Briefing Course, Saint Hill.

Well now, I was early for the lecture today and I had a complete lecture to give you, and I forgot it. So I'll now have to dream up another lecture.

The difficulties of auditing that I covered yesterday, if you will remember, had two ways that you could learn something about auditing, that is to say, as an auditor observing the pc and being audited . . the subjective reality. So today's lecture is definitely on the subject of subjective reality, and this then perforce includes numerous parts of the mind and what it's all about. It's a very restimulative lecture, so if you're easily restimulated why you'd better put some earplugs in. you better get your earplugs in because this is very bad stuff, you know; I mean, engrams, secondaries, things of this character, they're just horrible. Shouldn't go near them! Might get stuck in them.

The earliest days of Dianetics still expresses some of the awe and almost fear with which the reactive bank is regarded. The viciousness of the subject matter, the . . what an engram can do to you, what a secondary can do, the horrors of being stuck on the track, and that sort of thing, of course immediately drops down intention, and so on, the more command you have of the subject.

Now, we have tools today which make the tools of 1950 look like moving mountains with a teaspoon, and there is no great difficulty in getting somebody out of an engram. For instance, England, on the 5th and 6th London ACCs, Scientology almost bit the dust in England asking people to go into the bank and look at engrams and secondaries and try to learn how to run engrams and that sort of thing. It was completely beyond them, much to my shame.

Well, basically we didn't have tools enough to move an engram through on somebody who was having a terrible lot of difficulty looking at an engram. Person was having a great deal of difficulty looking at an engram, he didn't want too much to do with the engram. This gave a great deal of difficulty to the auditor, who himself had no reality on the engram, in holding him in it and pushing him through. So this compound difficulty of the auditor with no reality on looking at the pc in an engram and the auditor with no reality on being in an engram, and the difficulty the pc was having being in and staying in an engram, made a dog's breakfast. Made a pluperfect mess. Well, just because it fell on its head in this degree is no reason under the sun why it should continue to be on its head. Because you could run an engram today with no difficulty at all. you could get a guy stuck in an engram and unstuck in an engram, and so forth, as quick it'd make you spit.

Just nothing to it, believe me, believe me. And in this lecture I'm going to give you some processes that get people over their allergies of the bank.

Now, an auditor who believes that there is such a thing as an engram and there is such a thing as a time track, and who has the idea that there are such things as masses and has a good intellectual approach to the subject, and who is totally aware of pcs having been out of present time, but himself has no slightest idea of ever being in another time stream than now, is a dangerous auditor. That is a dangerous auditor. Because that auditor is doing an escape. He is escaping from then. And now is only an escape from then, by definition. Therefore he will do everything in his power out of kindness to give the proper solution to the preclear. And the proper solution to the preclear is escape from then.

This is directly in reverse to what makes Clears and what makes people well and what recovers things . . is you have to show somebody that he doesn't have to escape from then, because he can confront then, and once he can confront then he is no longer stuck in then. you see, that's very simple. In other words, you have to show somebody that he can stand and fight his demons down. you see. you have to show him that he can survive in spite of. You have to show him that these things which are traveling after him

were the shadows of life, not the substance. Now, that's what you have to show him. And if you're sitting there showing him how to escape from life, of course, you're teaching him to be worse off.

Now, an auditor who is permitting a pc to escape from life, from the bank, will make mistakes from a standpoint of auditing. And this is the most fruitful source of mistakes. Auditing mistakes, auditing mistakes, auditing mistakes. Pc has no feeling that the auditor is pitching with him; the pc has no confidence in the auditor; pc ARC breaking . . . all of this kind of thing is all mainly caused by this mechanism of the auditor is not getting the pc to confront the bank. And the pc down deep knows this is wrong. So the pc objects. Pc knows he isn't getting auditing in some vague, dim way, don't you see? And you get all these ARC breaks and upsets, and so forth.

Now, as I say, you can learn a thousand rules. Well, just . . . I don't know, what are you going to do? Keep a dictionary open alongside of the E-Meter and look up the rule for every auditing command? Or are you going to have understanding and instinctive knowingness adequate to what the pc is fumbling around with? Of course, there is no substitute for an understanding, and understandings are all built on observation and familiarity. There can be no understanding, actually no basic deep understanding, without experience. And a person who has not had any experience of a reactive mind trying to get somebody to handle a reactive mind, of course, as I said, just makes a dog's breakfast out of it. That is a mess from there on.

Now, it has long been said that a Scientologist is harder to audit than raw meat off the street. You hear this every now and then. you hear this left and right. Well, may be several reasons for this, apparent reasons. One of those is the Scientologist knows how it ought to be and how it ought to go. He is also accustomed to handling an auditing session. So as a pc, of course, he is more accustomed to handling the session than a pc would be. He knows which way this thing is. Actually, he audits faster. But he ARC breaks more, you see. Don't get these two things mixed, don't say that a Scientologist gets less case gain than raw meat, that is not true. He gets more ARC breaks than raw meat. He is more critical as a pc. Why? What is the basic reason for this criticalness as a pc?

It is all in the zone and area of duplication. He just cannot sit there and permit himself to duplicate a bad session. All of his training tells him not to duplicate bad sessions. You see, he's supposed to run a good session. So he sees a session running badly, he becomes totally unwilling to duplicate it. So therefore, his havingness of the session disappears. Havingness and duplication are almost synonyms. So his havingness of the session vanishes much more rapidly than somebody else's because he recognizes what the session should be. And if he doesn't conceive the session to be what the session should be, why then, he is unwilling to duplicate the actions or activities of that auditor. So as a result he ARC breaks. He loses a session faster than raw meat, even though he's in better shape. The apparency is that the amount of ARC break would be a case indicator. It is not a case indicator. He has a professional specialty, and all of his training says, "Do not duplicate bad auditing." So he, of course, cannot duplicate a bad auditor. So if he feels the auditor is doing a bad job, he refuses to duplicate the auditor and of course, duplication and havingness, being the same breed of cat, he of course loses his session much more rapidly. That strike home? That sound familiar to you? All right. You're just unwilling to duplicate a bad session, so therefore you put up quite a show as a pc. Has nothing to do with your case, but has a great deal to do with your professional attitudes or aptitudes.

All right. Nothing shows up faster in the auditor than an unfamiliarity with the bank. And if a Scientologist who is familiar with the bank is being audited by a Scientologist who isn't at all familiar with the bank and hasn't any idea what the bank is all about, you're never going to get a session, and that's it. At every side this thing is going to ARC break. Naturally, because a Scientologist is supposed to duplicate a bank-handling procedure which is reliable and good, the pc, being a Scientologist, will not duplicate a bad handling. Quite interesting. It's an interesting function, manifestation. A rather effective process to get over a bad auditing session would be, "What part of a blank, or an auditor or a person's name, would you be willing to be?" or "What about so-and-so would you be willing to be?" "What about so-and-so would you be unwilling to be?" You get the idea?

Well now, that shows up with great subjective reality at once, that there are certain things about the auditor that the pc is unwilling to be. And it is his unwillingness to be which makes it almost impossible for auditing to occur.

Now, a Scientologist will respond much faster to routine auditing which does so . . . show some insight than any raw meat that ever walked off the street, I'll guarantee you. If this other factor is introduced, however, he will not move at all. Because, of course, he can't communicate in the session. Communication-duplication. You have to have duplication in order to have communication. The auditor gives an auditing command, the Scientology pc is out the window. If the command has absolutely nothing to do with what the pc is doing, raw meat thinks he's wrong, you see. He thinks, "Well, I . . . I don't know, something new to me."

Therefore he says, "Well, the grapevine, the grapevine? I'm supposed to climb the grapevine."

The auditor has said, "Well now, take a look at that grapevine." Well, he's never really ever mentioned a grapevine, you see. There wasn't any grapevine in the session, and suddenly out of the blue, why, the auditor says, "Take a look at the grapevine."

Well, raw meat just says, "Well, grapevine," he says, "There must be a grapevine here. There's obviously a grapevine here," so he mocks up a grapevine or something of the sort. Tries to make something out of all this. And he's a little bit confused, but he doesn't dare protest because of the altitude factor. All right, so he'll go on and do an apperency of pc-ing, you see.

You tell a Scientologist . . . he's sitting there and he's looking at this railroad track and the auditor says, "All right now, what about this grapevine?"

And Scientologist says, "Grapevine? What . . . what the hell are you talking about? What grapevine?"

"Oh, a grapevine you mentioned a few minutes ago."

"Grapevine I mentioned a few minutes ago? I don't recall mentioning any grapevine. Oh! Oh, oh, oh, oh, you're talking about . . . No, I said it was on the grapevine. It was rumored."

"Oh."

And you'll get something like, "Christ almighty, why the hell don't you learn how to audit?" Almost instant response, don't you see. And the auditor has not been in good communication with the pc. He's made some little flub of some kind or another, you get this razzle-dazzle going, and whambo, see?

Well now, if the auditor has a good familiarity with the bank, he will know exactly what he has done. So therefore he can handle it. And therefore the ARC break doesn't continue very long. He understands, don't you see. See, instantly he'll say, "Well, this pc must have been looking at something else and was quite absorbed in it and I've distracted his attention and I must be writing script here. See, I must have written a little script. Now, let's find out what the pc is doing" So right away the auditor finds out that he's had the wrong look at the situation, he says, "Well all right, what are you looking at then?"

"Oh," pc says, "This railroad track."

"All right, all right. What about the railroad track?"

"A railroad track, and it goes on to infinity," and so forth, and it so-and-so, a cognition and this and that, and so forth, "and that was what I was trying to tell you."

"Well, all right, I heard you now."

There's no more ARC break.

But the auditor who has no reality on the bank will go this way: the pc says, "Grapevine? What the hell, grapevine? Good God, why don't you learn how to audit?" See. Well, he's thinking; he's almost going into this, you see, and this other person says well . . . takes up at once the flub. Puts the pc's attention on the flub, you see. And the flub isn't anything because it's not aberrative. But what's in the bank is, see.

So he puts his pc's attention back on what is aberrative, see. And the auditor isn't so self-conscious about this.

But the auditor who has no familiarity with the bank will say something like, "Oh, well a couple of minutes ago you talked to me about a grapevine. What did you mean about a grapevine?"

"Uh, well, I don't know, it was this grapevine, I mean, I said it was on the grapevine, and that meant some kind of a rumor, and so forth."

"Well, I misunderstood you. I thought you said that . . I thought you said that you had a grapevine there."

"Well, I didn't have a grapevine here!"

"Uh, oh well! Well, what kind of a rumor was that that you were talking about?"

"Well, I don't know, I've forgotten about it now."

See, the auditor doesn't have the dimmest concept. He sees the pc, the pc is apparently there in a body, is apparently there in present time, is apparently able to talk, and so forth, and has no idea that the pc is not in present time, but the pc is on the backtrack and the pc is actually expressing displeasure at having his attention flicked off of what his attention is on, you see?

Well, the auditor that has some experience with the bank, he says, "Well, this pc's attention is on something else. What the hell is his attention on?" Don't you see? He says at once, "Well, the pc's attention must have been on something else. Well, what is the pc's attention on?" And, of course, the session continues.

But if the auditor thinks that this ARC break is terribly important, the mistake is terribly important, he'll put the pc's attention over on the mistake and we get an entirely different situation going because now we have nothing to talk about but the mistake. Now, we'll get off with TR 5N, and so on, and all this adds up to what? This adds up to no auditing. Ah, but that is the only basis of the ARC break. Ha-ha! So the more we handle the mistake, the less auditing occurs, so the more ARC break occurs, so apparently then you can't blow an ARC break. Look simple? You see?

So the auditor who has no familiarity with the bank does not see why the pc is going kind of zzzz-zzzz. See? He hasn't any subjective reality on the idea that somebody can be there and absorbed in something and looking at something and trying to do something and trying to follow out maybe an auditing command and has his attention on something. If he understands this and if he knows this, and if he has subjective reality on it, of course his first thought . . rules or no rules, you see . . his first thought is, "Well, what the hell is his attention on?" See. Not self-consciously, "What horrible mistake I have made. Now I will have to remedy this terrible mistake I have made." Well, of course, the person isn't projected on the pc, hasn't any reality on what's going on, he hasn't any idea that the pc's doing other than just sitting in a chair. See, he thinks the pc's sitting in a chair so the pc's there to be sat in a chair, so therefore the pc is a person sitting in a chair in present time, who is just nastily and out of the meanness of his disposition or her disposition is having an ARC break. You get the adjudication, see? So you get an overt on the part of the auditor and an overt on the part of the pc, and then you get a dog's breakfast for a session. Get the idea?

You can make a fantastic number of flubs if you know what you're doing You actually can. you can just go on, flub, flub, flub, and you know what you're doing, you can always grab them. But if your flubs are being made and you have an understanding of the subjective situation of the pc, you can straighten them up so fast that they're just there.

Yeah, you give the pc a wrong auditing command, or something like this; you miss an auditing command, and so on. And pc starts to answer it. Don't stop him, let him answer the auditing command. Then give him the right one. Don't keep dragging the thing up to PT. But you see, a person who has no subjective reality on the bank has no idea that he's dragging a pc up to PT. You see, he's not using any process that

drags a pc up to PT, except put attention on the session. So actually the pc now gets present time collapsed on the track. Well, he's rather out of control. He has a hard time orienting himself.

Now, disorientation is for one thing the source of dreams and delusions. Disorientation. Person has a dream . . . Well, if you have a dream . . . you're worried about having nightmares, something like that; you want to cure yourself of having nightmares . . . or when you wake up, out of the nightmare, well, look it over and figure out how the nightmare spotted you somewhere, how it located you. And figure out where you are, and locate yourself. After you've done that a few times you become so unanxious about locating yourself that you don't have nightmares. Interesting, isn't it?

Thetan's in the skull and he can't find out where he is, the eyes are closed and the body is asleep, he can't find out where he is so he puts up some pretended or false knowingness as to where he is. And so the false knowingness as to where he is then makes this sequence known as a dream or a nightmare, or whatever. And that's all that is. It's a pretended knowingness about location is what a dream is.

Old Papa Freud were around, why, I'm sure he would contest that. He'd say that's . . . "Actually a dream is the expression of inhibitions, because everybody knows man lives with a horrible, ravening beast, barely repressed below the censor." I think the guy must have been on a naval vessel during the time of war and after duty he always had to censor letters or something. He had some engram running there.

But the upshot of this is, of course, you'd get a totally wild idea. If you were processing a brain or something of the sort, and you . . . and there was a thetan present, why, you'd choose the thetan for your randomness and after that you'd, of course, believe that there was a primitive being of some kind or another which lay down below the intellectual surface of the mind and you'd get all sorts of wild ideas, and so forth.

Well, the second you disorient a thetan you give him the only real shock that he can get. You've sort of chosen him out for your randomness. You sort of told him, "Get lost. Get confused. Get lost."

Now, when you're auditing, with the processes you're using and so forth, you're in direct communication with the thetan. All right, now, this guy, he's got problems and they're disorientation problems of various kinds and most of these problems are just disorientation. He doesn't know where he is, you see. All right, so he's down the track someplace, groveling around, and looking under odd corners of things to find out where he has been and you spring a surprise on him and his first reaction is not to know where he is, so his next action is delusory knowingness. He'll put up a pretended knowingness. He knows he doesn't know something, but the first . . . his first reaction is to tell you that he doesn't know something. He doesn't know what you are doing. He doesn't know this, he doesn't know that. you get the idea? Well, actually all of he's . . . all he's saying is, "I'm disoriented. I was in one time stream and now you've got me back in this other time stream and now what the hell are we doing?" It's as simple as that, don't you see?

He thought he was going through the back alleys of Timbuktu, about to be knifed, don't you see. And you've got him all persuaded that he's in Timbuktu with your auditing command. Whether you realized it or not, you were persuading him he was in Timbuktu. You've said . . . you've given him an auditing command of "What unknown alley could you confront?" see, and he's obediently confronting some unknown alley, and then you give him an unknown room, because he's not aware of the room very much, and you give him the room suddenly, don't you see. And then you insist he stays in the room while he is still in the alley, and he'll put up delusory arguments. See, just like a dream or nightmare, you know. He'll put up all kinds of reasons why you did this.

And the only reason why the auditor did this is because the auditor didn't have enough subjective reality on the bank to realize that the pc is in another time stream, and that's it. That's the only thing that occurred. He didn't have enough reality on the pc's bank. And he fostered a disorientation and the pc becomes confused thereby. And the delusory character of a pc who is telling you all sorts of extraordinary things about your auditing, and so forth, these things are simply delusory. He's trying to orient himself, he's trying to find the unknown. But, of course, he's in the unknown of thinkingness because he's confused enough not to be able to confront the unknown of whereness.

See, the unknown of whereness, you know, location, always requires more on the part of the pc than unknown of idea. you see, solids take much more ability to confront than an idea. See, a thetan finds it very easy to confront an idea because he generally even thinks of himself as an idea. you see, so he finds it very hard to confront suddenly the masses, which is to say location. His location factor is the last thing he'll confront, so therefore he gives you delusory ideas as to what is going on, when as an actual fact he's looking for a factual location as to where he is, don't you see?

And if you don't put him where he is in a hurry he will go on delusorizing as to what you are doing and what he is thinking and what this is all about, don't you see. He just adds significance, significance, significance, significance, significance. And this is all an effort on the part of the thetan, believe it or not, to orient himself. It doesn't sound like it at first collision, but it is just an effort to orient. Where he is . . . all the auditor has to do to shut any of this off is to find out where the pc has been and where he is. That's all. It's so elementary, you see.

But an auditor would have to have an idea that there is a place to be called the bank, before he could ask the pc where he is in it. See, if he didn't have a good, solid subjective reality on the is-ness of a bank, he could be startled enough not to remember the textbook rule of "always ask the pc where he is." He would never think of this because it's one of seven thousand rules.

An auditor who has a good subjective reality on this . . . the pc says, "What? What the hell? What . . . what was . . . what . . . what are you doing?" so forth. He knows what he's looking at. He knows he's . . . pc's attention has been on something, and therefore he's had an orientation called a bank orientation, don't you see. And he now no longer has this orientation. He is groping for an orientation, he can't find himself in the room, he can't find himself in the bank and therefore he feels very confused.

Of course, all the auditor can do is to find out, "Well, where are you?" see. "Where are you? What are you looking at? What were you looking at?" Not even, "Just before you said that," you see, "Just before I made this mistake, where were you?" Now, of course you've done this sequence. You've put the pc's attention on the mistake, and then put them on the whereness, and now he doesn't know where the hell he is, see. You've given him a via.

You can cure up an ARC break and then by mentioning it in your next question, ARC break the pc twice as bad all over again. It's very simple. You're asking a Security Check question of some kind or another, and you say, "Well, now, just before that ARC break I was going to ask you this question now, and you. . ." See, what'd you do, you disoriented him again. See, he thinks he's supposed to be looking at his bank and getting auditing, and you seem to be insisting that he look at a no-auditing called an ARC break, don't you see.

But if you've got a good reality on the bank and the thenness of things, and so on . . . which is a rather simple reality to attain, actually . . . why, you get this other response. And he rather grumpily says, "Well, I . . . I was looking at this alley."

"What alley?"

"This alley!"

"All right. How long is it?"

"Well, it's just an alley alley. It isn't very damn long. Alleys normally aren't." He's still nattering. He's a little bit disoriented, and so on.

"Well, does it end? Does it run between two streets, or what?"

"Yeah, well, it ends between two streets," and so forth.

"Well, where is it there, exactly?" and so on.

"It's here in Cairo. Oh, this is Cairo!" he says. "This is Cairo! Yeah, I got it. This is Cairo. There's the mosque, and there's the street, and there's the fiacres, and there's the anti-British slogans, and. . . Yeah, I see where I am now."

"Oh, fine. All right, that's dandy." And he forgets all about the ARC break.

Orientation. That's all it is. But if, of course . . . as I say, stressing again . . . if the auditor has no idea that there is a whereness called the bank or the time track, of course, he doesn't . . . he isn't actually capable of finding the whereness in the pc because he only knows that it exists intellectually. So, yeah, having a look at a time track, and having a look at some pictures and engrams and secondaries, and getting a sensation of thenness, and so forth, is worth a thousand hours of TR 0 to improve auditing quality. See that?

All right, now, I'll give you a few processes by which an auditor could be audited and would wind up with a reality on the bank you couldn't shake with a bat. And actually he'll have to attain this anyhow before he even vaguely gets Clear. He'll . . . an auditor who is skipping out of the bank and skipping out of the engram and skipping off the track and skipping into PT . . . he reminds somebody of a parachute, you know, with compressed air blowing up against the top of the chute. He's . . . never goes down, he just always floats up. No matter what you do, he comes up. And he'll have to get over that before he gets Clear anyhow, so this is a great kindness.

Here's a command: "What unknown would you escape from?" and "What unknown would you attack?" This is simply a basic command form. And this is, of course, reach and withdraw on unknowns. Any verb form on either one of them is just "escape the unknown," "attack the unknown," see?

Now, you put it over into the valence rules and you say, "Think of an unknown. Who would escape from it? Who would attack it?" Got the idea? That gets valences coming into it. And you can go at this in reverse and you could say, "Think of a being. What unknown would he escape from? What unknown would he attack?" All kinds of command forms. But it's just escape and attack from unknowns.

And, of course, you . . . the pc in this particular case is sitting in the middle of some wild unknown incident of some kind or another, and he'll start attacking and escaping from engrams. He just cannot help himself from doing so. And he'll plunge around in the track like a bumblebee in a bottle . . . won't know what the hell's cooking. Of course he's never realized that he's right in the middle of the track; he is not in present time. He has kidded himself for years. He is not oriented at all because he's totally surrounded by engrams he isn't looking at. And anybody who's obsessively in present time is simply stacked up with engrams and that's all there is to that.

People who have obscure somatics or not-so-obscure somatics are, of course, sitting in an engram. Now, when you find that person who has somatics, who has also (quote) "never been back on the track" and has no awareness of thenness in the bank . . . you know, has no awareness of yesterday in the bank . . . of course that person is not in present time at all. That person has escaped by total withdrawal from some environment which may be two hundred billion years ago, see, so they're not in present time. Not even vaguely. And, of course, this type of auditing command, "Escape an attack from unknowns" . . . well, of course they're trying to escape from the unknown of what they're in, and at the same time they must be trying to attack the unknown of what they're in, and it'll just unfold engrams like a bunch of picture postcards you buy in Venice. That's one of them. That's just one of them.

Now, you could have a valence-type process: "Who would escape from things? Who would attack things?" Milder process.

Now, you can throw this over into beingness . . . you can throw it over into beingness . . . and you'll also throw up track that comes into view. I'll go into this in a minute as to why, but you can write it down. Beingness: "Who would you be willing to be? Who would you rather not be?" will show up track. Your first one is the beefiest one. These others are simply variations of one kind or another.

Now, the reason why a beingness is functional, is that valences are packages and part of the package of a valence is a track. A valence has a track. This is a great oddity, but every once in a while you find somebody without his own bank. He isn't running in his own bank. Any pictures of himself will be

wildly out of valence. He is never, never, never in valence. He always sees himself from afar. If you do get him on the track he sees himself from afar, and he gets the vaguest and thinnest impressions imaginable of being in anything . . . it's very unconvincing, don't you see. I mean, well, he has this picture of himself as a child; well, ask him, "Well, how do you see the picture?"

"Well, the child is down there."

Well, you can immediately assume you have somebody out of valence who is therefore having valence trouble. If he does have any pictures of his bank, you would not be able to find them at first glance. Why? Let us say he is in Mother's valence, so of course the only pictures he gets of himself are the pictures seen by Mother. He always sees himself through somebody else's eyes. So he has the bank of each person in whose valence he has gone. And this becomes the most disorienting, confusing sort of a thing that anybody ever had anything to do with. But first and foremost thing that it does is promote an unreality of location. Because, of course, the fellow knew he was in himself as a child, but as he gets the picture of it he does not see himself below his eyes, he sees himself over there on the other side of the room. Well, obviously he's seeing through somebody else's . . . this must be a picture in somebody else's bank, immediately, you see. Quite curious, some of the phenomena here.

But every valence is a complete package. A valence has a bank, has all these now-I'm-supposed-to's, has skills, has disabilities, and so forth. It's just a package person, don't you see? It's a package person that does not exist in fact, but is only resident in the mind and is mocked up by the pc.

Now, the pc, of course, entered this on the basis of not being able to have the person and not really controlling the person, and so if the pc doesn't have or control the person in any way, of course, he cannot have or control any of the mechanisms of the person. So you cannot move that bank. It's not his bank. See, he hasn't enough ownership of it to run it as an engram, don't you see how? He hasn't any ownership of this bank, because it's somebody else's.

He doesn't have any . . . there's no way he could change that person's personality. You could audit him practically forever, and you're trying to change somebody else's characteristics. Never his own ideas or characteristics, they're all packaged characteristics of the other.

Now of course there was a point where this person did enter or did accumulate or collect this other valence, see? And that's the only point where the valence will break. By following this principle that a valence is a total package, and then by the dealing with beings who, you see, and persons, rather than ideas . . . the auditing of beings rather than the auditing of ideas and conditions, the auditing of beings rather than the auditing of pictures . . . these views of other banks, you see, will suddenly blow off And the person will be left with some of his own pictures. Or you get two or three of these things blown off.

And one of the most effective ways of doing this happens to be Routine 3 complete. And that's why it clears people, of course. But there's a shorthand way of doing this. And you can really shake up a bank . . . you can really shake one up . . . just by running any beingness process. Just any beingness process, just like: "Think of a being. Thank you. Think of a being. Thank you. Think of a being. Thank you. Think of a being. Thank you." This'd be the most idiotically . . . it's a long drag sort of a process, it may not be very stable, may not be anything happening, but it is going to shift the bank. It will shift the fellow around, and it will cure somebody of standing outside looking in at his own life, and it'll give him his own track back.

You're every once in a while auditing pcs who have a tremendous number of pictures that they dimly recognize as not theirs. They don't have much familiarity with these pictures; they've got no real recollection of these pictures and it seems sort of dull, and sort of thin. you get a hell of an unreality going

Well, there's . . . I run across a case in point: there was a person had a whole bunch of pictures of sexual activities. He couldn't fit them on the backtrack, he couldn't fit them on the whole track. This is one of the mechanisms by the way which invalidates past lives, every once in a while an individual gets into it and sees some thin pictures of past lives, of some kind or another, he can't integrate them in any way, and he says, "Well," dimly, "well, I, sort of have some pictures on the track, but I don't know," and so forth. The person's having beingness trouble.

Of course, in his past life he was another being. And his other beingness is so flagrantly a fact that it's the same as somebody else's bank when this has occurred: that when the other being he was being in the past life was in another valence. Figure that one out.

Now people that have valence trouble go very easily . . . accumulate very easily other valences, and go into other valences very easily, so he probably has been doing it for a number of millennia. So it's not just one life's worth of pictures that are wrong; it is utterly thousands. I'll give you an example of this, a subjective reality on the thing This really had me puzzled for a while. Back about 1605, something like that, I was set up . . . I won't go into the story in any great degree. But it took a warship and a company of marines and a broadside to kill one girl. And it's such a fantastic ferocity, you see, to launch against one girl. She was protected by four redcoats and me. And of course, we caught it in the first three seconds of play. Don't you see, that was the end of us.

But it was such a terrific ferocity against this girl, who by the way, was blind. Now, this really starts pouring it on, see. she was! And her face was so disfigured through a bomb assassination attempt, when she was a child at seven, that she had to wear a mask. And she was a rather pathetic little character. A whole man-of-war and a company of marines landing in boats and a full broadside to kill this one girl.

She was the last of the family of Charles V. She was the granddaughter aspirant of the old Holy Roman Empire, and one of the innumerable French that lived down here about sixty miles had decided she was a great menace to the throne. So they set her up to be assassinated. Well, that was quite an assassination. It was with . . . it was skyrockets, see.

Well, I was being audited one day. I found myself sitting around with a picture of a girl on a rock, apparently about 1870. Didn't compare with any track I had. Nice exterior view. It just didn't make sense. Didn't have any track I knew anything about. Here was a girl, sitting on a rock in exactly the same location, in exactly the same place, and I knew what happened to the girl and I knew all about it and so forth, but I hadn't ever known the girl. Fascinating.

What this was all about was very, very simple. Apparently I'd kept a spot of attention on this person as a thetan for the next couple of hundred years. I didn't have the girl's valence particularly, but there was a . . . there was a cross, there, right at the moment of confusion, don't you see. I had her future bank. you know, I'd tracked the bank of this particular . . . which gave me a whole set of totally disrelated pictures that had absolutely nothing to do with my pictures and nothing to do with the track. It was very intriguing. They were very thin, very unreal. I knew all about them but they didn't have any real substance, don't you see.

And right now I could say, well, possibly this is the way the track looks to an awful lot of people. Don't you know, it's very thin, and there's nothing much to it, and so forth, and it's all just kind of an idea. Well, it was this girl's track, from the time she had been killed, straight on up. I still had it on file.

Funny part of it is that this girl, picking up another body after that, had gone along for a very long time and had then happened accidentally to be taken by her parents to exactly the same rock that she was killed on in 1605. And she became very ill and she sickened and she died! Just keyed her in complete. You possibly know the place. It's right across from Gib., and the Hotel Reina Christina is on the Spanish coast side. And it's one of those rocks right close to the Reina Christina Hotel. And of course, it's a tourist resort and her parents had taken her back there. What a dirty trick. That must have been some vacation, man!

All right, so you take an incident of vast confusion of motion that one is not willing to tolerate. Well, one is willing to tolerate such motion in battle perhaps, one . . . in a naval battle and it's all the way it should be. But the motion occurs at a moment, or with a target, which isn't suited to the motion, don't you see? There's this much bombardment and yippity-yap, and it causes a hell of a disorientation. And you say, "Well that shouldn't be," you see, and big protest about the whole thing, and therefore you start tracking it.

Now, a valence could occur that way. And ordinarily, however, what would have happened is that whoever had been there would have picked up the girl's valence, don't you see, and would have gone ahead with the girl's valence, and that would have been the person who died because her parents took her back on the rock, don't you see. That would be what a valence . . . a solid valence picture would look like. And this person wouldn't have any more pictures than the man in the moon. They'd all have somebody else's pictures, don't you see? It'd all be something else, and it'd all be from the wrong point of view, and what would this add up to? This'd add up to a disorientation, all of which springs from a spot of total disorientation. Some incident which has in it total disorientation, then is liable to breed a total, out-of-valence situation from there on up.

All right, somebody who's in that kind of condition of course is having valence trouble. And an auditor who's having too much valence trouble, of course, has no great reality on somebody else's bank because he thinks this bank is not a bank, you see. It's kind of . . . well, it's about as real to him, you know, as a thin, indistinguishable picture cast up on that wall with the room lights on, with a cracked magic lantern slide. Never bothers him to look at pictures. Doesn't bother him at all.

You start running this person back, however, they wind up in the middle of some kind of an explosion. Eighteen spacecraft all of a sudden collide instantly and immediately on one point in space, because as he was picking up his paperweight off of the chart room desk, you see, it wasn't the paperweight, but it was the fleet signal alarm, or something, you see, and he shouldn't have done this! And you'll find him at this point of disorientation. And he'll be in . . . and there was a cabin boy there, or something of the sort that he was quite fond of, and you find him in the valence of the cabin boy. Only he isn't quite sure, maybe it's the captain, you know, and it's all a tangle, and it goes back to such a point.

That is the type of incident it takes to make a valence transfer. They are not just the conditioned reflex. Well, Joe just keeps hammering at Mary, you see, and keeps hammering at Mary, and pretty soon, why, Mary goes into Joe's valence. That's ordinarily how we look at this thing. We're too prone to believe that aberration is a gradient scale because it can be taken apart by a gradient scale. Aberration is no such thing. For Joe to go into Mary's valence there is either a long track association with plenty of violence, murder, poison and sudden death on it, or there is a very similar person or something, and there is some fantastic overt of some kind or another against such a person which contains a tremendous amount of violence and motion. That's what it goes back to.

But, of course, the "psyrologist," looking at the tame, stupid life that he himself leads in our modern world, you see, sitting at his hydraulically operated desk with his chromium, self-pushing graph pens, and . . . he couldn't concede of this much experience, don't you see. And he doesn't find that there is anybody in life ever has any real experience, so of course it just must be the business of living itself, day-by-day living, is what is aberrative. This is what he winds up at.

And of course, you take this character, he would have no reality on the backtrack. He'd have no reality on anything of that character. You shove him back on the backtrack and he finds out there was experience of some kind or another on the backtrack. If he continued to see it through an other-valence bank, you see, of some kind, you wouldn't wind up then with any kind of reality on it. He wouldn't have much reality. But of course, the keynote of the case is he doesn't have much reality anyhow. So he never conceived of this sort of thing.

Now, one of the things you want to watch for in auditors is the auditor who says that he has no reality on past lives. Watch it. Because that person has not collided with his bank very hard. He has a touching acquaintance, he has, you know, sort of a polite hat tip. you get him in the tonsillectomy and he's out there on the outside of the hospital, you see. And he knows how to run a tonsillectomy: You get on the outside of the hospital and you just watch the picture, you see the picture of the hospital, and you kind of look through the window and that's fine, and that's it, you've run the engram, you see.

"Have you ever seen a picture of an operation?"

"Yes," he says, "yes." you see, and that line of questioning is not very productive of anything. But the line of questioning of, "You have any reality on past lives?" . . . that is productive, see, because he'll tell you quite frankly he does not have. All right. Well, that's not reprehensible. Nobody's trying to force

anything on him. I'm just giving you a symptom of the thing. This fellow is having valence-bank trouble. And having valence-bank trouble, you're not now likely to discover an in-the-middle-of, 3-D sort of picture, unless you look pretty hard. All of a sudden, if he gets in the picture, he'll come out of it. See, there'll be no idea of attention stuck on pictures or attention in pictures or anything like that.

Well, until he himself has got some kind of a reality of this character, he will worry about his auditing flubs, and these auditing flubs . . . He knows that he has a perfectly decent wish to help his fellow man. There's nobody disputing that in any way whatsoever. And hell wonder why pcs ARC break or why he can't quite handle this pc or handle that pc and this will be very mysterious to him, and hell say, "Well, I better have eight thousand hours more of TR 0, see. And I'd better grind the midnight oil," you know, "and I'd better read Scientology 8-8008 or something. Or maybe there's something on a tape I haven't heard, or..." And hell get into a considerable anxiety about this particular activity. Why does he . . . why do his pcs blow up? And then he'll get a lot of loses, and then hell decide, "Well, I maybe shouldn't audit," you know, and so on. What's he trying to do? He's trying to orient himself with a datum or something of the sort. Well, the datum he's actually looking for is just this: As long as he has a low subjective reality on a bank, of course, when a pc gets into one, his understanding is not instantaneous, so he will do a fumble. Hell do a little fumble, and a little comm lag, and this little fumble and little comm lag will be just that instant necessary to permit the ARC break to go bloom! See. The pc drops down in tone and is not making very much forward progress and then maybe blows up or blows session or something of the sort.

This is the . . . a common experience. It is not true that this person was trying to do something bad to the pc. That is not true. It isn't true that this person didn't know his Scientology . . . he did. None of these things that you would normally consider true are true. It's just this one little fact . . . is the individual's mechanisms of handling life have been: "Escape from self into others," "escape from situation," "out," "up," "don't get any real good contact with the horrors of yesterday, because they're just too horrible, man! And the best thing to do is just stay out of valence and out of picture and out of thenness. And if you just stay out of thenness enough, you'll be all set."

Alcoholics Anonymous have themselves a considerable time with this, they have little mottos like: "Live twenty-four hours at a time," and so on. They also have another little motto which gets in your road occasionally, and if you don't know about it you'll have trouble processing alcoholics. They have another motto which . . . "Alcoholism is incurable." And that's the first thing you have to know, and that's the first thing you have to admit to be a member of Alcoholics Anonymous. You can get in the wildest arguments with an alcoholic. Well, you say, "Well, we'll audit you for a while, and then you'll be all right." And you wonder what the devil's the matter with the man, you know. What's the matter with him is he had to swear on a stack of . . . well, I don't know what they swear on, actually . . . I guess empty bourbon bottles, that they will never be cured of alcohol. It's . . . practically amounts to that. When you read the textbook of Alcoholics Anonymous your hair stands on end. All looks fine right up to the point when you read the fact that they can never be cured, they will never get over it, and they've had it, and they must just succumb to the whole idea that they are an alcoholic. They have to admit this. Ah, you're digging somebody out of that, what are you doing? They're just plowing him in, harder and harder and harder, into the valence of somebody that he thought was an alcoholic.

Anyway . . . that aside beyond the point . . . the difficulties which you encounter all come under the heading of auditor comm lag. And you yourself will recognize it, looking back over the times when you've had pcs ARC break on you, that if you'd just been in there a little faster it wouldn't have happened.

And if you yourself have been ex . . . inexpertly audited, you can look it over, and you can look at it very bluntly, and you realize that if the auditor just said something before all of that silence, and so on, or, you know, if they hadn't fumbled and given the appearance of fumbling, there wouldn't have been any ARC break. Well, what's that fumble? Now, we're really getting down to fundamentals, see.

Well, that fumble is just the unreality that he has on what the pc is doing or going through. And the fumble is sufficiently long to permit the pc to get out from underneath his control. So actually you don't have time to look up the datum in the textbook, or even to remember it, don't you see, your response must be instantaneous. You must be in there, so on.

So when I say there is no substitute for knowing your business, of course, you've got to know Scientology, but you've also got to know instinctively the reactions of the mind. "What is this guy doing?" See? "What goofball situation is this?" you see. And you haven't even got time to say, "Well, let's see, what is hap-pen-ning here?" you know. Well, the only thing that teaches you data to that degree is experience. A race driver who has read a lot of textbooks on the subject of racing car doesn't take Dead Man Bend, you see, out of the textbook. He feels the wheel slipping, it's gone off and it's hitting just slightly into the gravel, it's only an inch deep in the gravel, and he's back on the track. Ah, but if he read it in a textbook, and it said, "When you feel the wheel hit the gravel on the edge of the track you should turn the wheel slowly to the opposite direction."

"Oh, yes, I remember that now. It was on page 73."

Well, by this time they are of course are putting him in the ambulance.

And that's just exactly what happens in your ARC breaky auditing difficulties. When you get into these you don't yourself have enough subjective reality. This isn't true of all auditors, you see, because they do have subjective reality. The edge of the wheel hits the gravel, and they of course, they say well, the edge of the wheel has hit the gravel, but they're already doing something about it, you see. They've already turned the wheel. Pc isn't going in that direction anymore.

It's very simple. It is so simple that an auditor who has good subjective reality hearing this tape will wonder what the hell I'm talking about.

They say, "Of course. Naturally. Yes. Well, so what?" And then they sit down opposite Mr. Doakes for an auditing session. They're the pc now. And Mr. Doakes, in the auditing session, the wheel edges over, and one inch of wheel . . . tire moves over into the gravel and Mr. Doakes looks up in the textbook on how to drive racing cars . . . how to drive a Mark Sixteen racing car particularly . . . and the conditions of the track. And that's all on page 173, and so forth, and he happens to get stuck on the datum of the worm gear of the steering wheel, and so on, details of, you see. Well, of course your poor auditor at this point is being picked up in pieces and put in the ambulance. That's about all that happens. Because really, you . . . what . . . what the hell is going on, see. And then you have great difficulty settling back and feeling relaxed enough to go into the bank. Because you know the next patch of gravel he's going to do the same thing.

No amount of explaining on your part, and no amount of teaching on my part or anybody else is going to teach him anything . . . enough data, and enough textbooks, and enough huge plots and blueprints as to how you do it, to overcome that little comm lag, see. you could maybe drill him that every time the pc says, "What are you doing?" he says, "Where are you?" But I think this would lead to an instantaneous ARC break, you see, because he really doesn't want to know. you get the idea?

So, the only basic, fundamental cure is to get somebody over the jumps.

Now, auditing has to be done before clearing. That, of course, is the fundamental problem. Everybody can look at this and say, "Well, of course, that is the problem. Let's clear everybody and then let's audit. Let's clear everybody on Earth and then let's audit."

Somebody figured it out the other day that you couldn't possibly clear everybody in New York City because it would require so many thousand auditors, working so many thousand years, and so forth. And they figured it all out, and they had it all taped, and this was conclusive fact that you couldn't clear New York City. They had absolutely, totally omitted the fact of making any new auditors. This had been omitted from the calculation.

It isn't true that an auditor has to be cleared before he can audit. That is definitely not true. And if it were true it'd be "God help Earth!" That would be a stopper that nobody could get around. It'd be nice, you see, and where auditors do get Clear you find out they make Clears very rapidly.

I'll give you a datum here. Brenda Scott, who was cleared on the last Australian course, back in Sydney, has cleared two more people. Well, she's hardly been home any time at all. But similarly an uncleared

auditor off a South African course who didn't get Clear has also cleared somebody in South Africa. See? Get the idea?

So it isn't . . . a requisite to clearing is not "to be Clear." It's nice. It's nice. It's always nice when you're out in a storm to be in nothing but a Camper and Nicholson vessel that is fully equipped with all stabilizers and is fully proofed against everything, and so on. But at the same time, why some old hooker that you picked up in a back bay with half its bottom falling out, it'll very often ride storms too, you see. But it would be nice if you were in this other yacht but not absolutely necessary.

Well, anyway, the road toward making a good auditor is to get the auditor a subjective reality on the bank. Now, don't think that that is going to occur automatically by reason of straight auditing. That is not going to occur automatically. Because people can be audited for many, many, many, many hours, with no reality on the bank, without getting one. This has been demonstrated time and time again. And where Routine 3 is being terribly, unthinkably, ghastly, awful, slow, it's just that this particular facet of a case has never been hit. The escape mechanism of the case has not been triggered off. It is still very much in full bloom. And so the case, as he runs the processes, of course, never does take any kind of a tour of the track but is dealing with other things and you still got an escape mechanism going.

Now, the escape mechanism is not necessarily a difficult mechanism to overcome. It is . . . surrenders rather easily because it is based on another idea than that which degrades or aberrates a thetan. Escape is simply a method of handling a bank. That is all, it's just a method of handling a bank. It's not a method of getting aberrated.

Now, you can go *reductio ad absurdum* and trace it back and say, "Well, yes, and if he'd only stood and confronted it at the time. . ." But I'm sure that there are Clears and they will not walk out in the middle of Market Street and say, "Well, I should be able to confront all this oncoming traffic from the middle of the street." I'm sure they won't carry this on as a practice. They find themselves in the middle of Market Street in San Francisco, they will go over to the curb. Got the idea? Well, you could say, "Well, they're practicing an escape mechanism. They didn't stand there and get run over."

No, the deterioration of a case is based on another mechanism. The individual no longer has confidence in himself as himself and so he adopts another packaged beingness which could handle the situation. And then this beingness he conceives to be useless in the handling of life and it is not a solution, so he adopts another packaged beingness in order to handle life and then that one is thoroughly invalidated, why, then, of course, he gets another one and when that one is thoroughly invalidated, why, he gets another one. See how it goes? And your backtrack of clearing could not be followed by the idea of escape because that's much too simple a statement of the situation. A person can find themselves inadequate in numerous ways besides the fact that they are trying to escape. I know lots of things that a man would be a very foolish fellow and a thetan would be a very foolish fellow not to escape from.

When you're wearing a body which is inflammable, it is not good sense not to escape from fire. That is what comes under the heading of preservation of property. But the deterioration of self-confidence in being able to handle life in all of its facets and aspects goes down into a degradation, and it makes one believe that he now must have another beingness in order to handle things for him. And now he starts living life on an irresponsibility. And that being goes out and he gets another being on top, and that being goes out and eventually this goes into the life-death cycle that right now is so normal and usual on this planet.

Well, it's of course about as normal and usual as a girl in pink tights standing out on a . . . on a Buckingham Palace's flagpole. It is not at all usual. You don't have to kick the bucket every few years. This is not any part of your contract.

But life, invalidating the body and the beingnesses, the valences, gets down to an invalidation which says, "Well, the best thing to do is to chuck the mock-up." Well, that just marks a failure.

A person ages to the degree that they feel invalidated. And this could be stated processingwise: The age of a man in any lifetime is directly proportional to the accumulation of unknowns. Which, of course, is invalidation. You could almost measure the physical age of a person on this basis.

Now, of course this is exaggerated in childhood, and probably in childhood that is why you get fast growth. Kids have a terrific amount of unknownness, and they move up rapidly through this unknownnesses, and so forth. But you're getting proportionate aging. You're getting very rapid aging, actually. The change but . . . of six months in a child's life in his first ten years makes a considerable difference. Well, frankly, he's getting a lot of pretended knows and unknowns, and all that sort of thing. They're pounding at him one way or the other. But he's carried through all this with hope and confidence, you see, because he's going to grow up. And his growing up process, of course, doesn't necessarily carry with it all this validation of this confidence he felt. He possibly shouldn't have been quite so confident. Unknownnesses start to accumulate. Unknownnesses now that he has no hope of overcoming it. And these go on and on, and the unknownnesses get greater and greater and greater and greater, and he finally kicks the bucket.

Aging, the amount of gray hair, and so on. People are sometimes amazed at me. I get gray hair and then few weeks later I don't have gray hair and then I get gray hair, and then no gray hair, and so on. It's the Central Organizations that are doing it, you see, I don't... It's how much I know about their operation or how many not-knows they're running on me, see! Directly proportional.

Anyhow, all joking aside, I think you would do very well . . . if you're seeking to prove up the auditing skill and . . . of an auditor . . . I think you would do extremely well to just check into this factor of reality on thenness and what he considers a picture is, and so forth. And then use those processes I gave you, or some other process, similar, to whoop this thing out, and all of a sudden . . . straighten out his track, in other words. Do a track straighten-out activity of some kind or another, and you'll all of a sudden find his auditing ability will suddenly go zzzooooom! He won't necessarily get Clear, but at the same time he will clear faster. Get the idea?

Now, this pays benefit completely aside from auditing in that it permits an individual to experience more benefit per unit of time in auditing

Now, one of the ways you grope with this situation is in doing Goals and Terminal Assessments. The more valences a person is in the more goals he is likely to come up with or have, or the more submerged his goal is likely to be. But if a person is susceptible to invalidation, then you do have a coordination between roughness of case and length of time that it would take you to find the goal if you didn't take up the invalidation factor with rudiments. In other words, a person's goal is so easily and so swiftly invalidated that it plunges out of sight with the greatest of ease. So as the goal vanishes, you apparently then have many more goals than you should have, don't you see. But it'd be a susceptibility to invalidation.

Well, his susceptibility to invalidation is directly proportional to the number of valences he has accumulated, because of course the invalidation of valences . . . of self was what caused valences and then the invalidation of valences is what caused more valences, you see. So if there's anything going on, it is a basis of invalidation. If you wanted to draw a common denominator of all aberration, it would be . . . it could be said to be in the vicinity of invalidation. The person is as aberrated as they are invalidated . . . as they feel invalidated.

It wouldn't be proportional. You could take a whole line of men, invalidate them all equally, you'll find out they'd all react differently to the same amount of invalidation. It would be how much invalidation a person feels, not how much a person has. And you just breathe on some people . . . you're just passing by them accidentally and you just breathe; you don't even breathe at them . . . and they're promptly invalidated. You see how this would be. And some other fellow, you walk up to him and you slap him on the back enough to break his spine and you kick him in the stomach, and he looks at you admiringly and he says, "Come on and have a beer!"

I know that would be rather foreign to your experience in this particular lifetime, but out on the frontiers I've run into such men. I hauled off and hit a guy hard enough one time to knock him from one side of the ship to the other. He went on bragging about people . . . he bragged to people, "God, he sure can hit!" you know. Never bothered him at all! It was very invalidative of me, you know! It was quite a remarkable experience. Never occurred to him, you see.

Had a dog one time, his name was Al for "Albino." And crazy old Al was a malemute. Half malemute, half Spitsbergen. Pure white, meaner than mean, you know. Big, tough, strong. And my poor old mother used to try to make this dog do something, you know. And she would beat at this dog with her fists, you see, and she would push at the dog and she would maul the dog and she would drag at the dog and . . . of course, all this dog knew how to do was the second he felt weight against his chest he knew what you're supposed to do, you're supposed to pull. And if anybody was crazy enough to have him on a leash which had a harness on it, you see, you just . . . just the second you tighten up the leash he'd mush! And he could really pull! Of course, my mother weighed about 110 pounds . . . wringing wet.

And I have seen her just practically clean up on this Al, trying to get him to do something, you know. Trying to get him to walk on up the road with her or something out in the country, you know. And he's busy barking at cats or something like that. And all Al would do was stand around and laugh at her, you know. And he'd pant, and he'd just be so happy about the whole thing, "I'm getting some attention!" is about the only thing that ever registered on him. He'd just be so happy.

And when I first ran into Al one day, he . . . I was a stranger. He'd been around there for quite a while and I hadn't been home, and he showed, oh, 1,652 sharp wolf fangs, you see, and he came at me with a low charge, and he was ready to eat me up, and of course he meant to stop two or three feet away, you see, and just scare me half to death. And you learn about dogs, living in Europe and Alaska and things, and I just grabbed him by the jowls, you see, on the loose skin on either side of his teeth, and then using his impetus coming forward, then swung him sideways, you see, and threw him about twenty-five feet. He landed in the flower bed with a terrible thud.

And Al got up and he came over and he looked at me, and he spent quite a bit of time looking at me, and then he finally started to smile about the whole thing.

He had a very short memory. I was home every few months so I'd have to repeat the process. But we always stayed friends. Yep. By God he'd . . . you could just hear him say, "I swear by this Ron!" you know!

He didn't have any clue . . . he didn't have any clue of ever being punished; you couldn't do anything to Al. And he was about the healthiest brute you ever laid your eyes on. Now, he's probably still living yet. They sent him up into the woods to live with lumberjacks. I know he was at it for five or six years and just thriving. So you can imagine.

So from animal to animal, person to person, being to being, the factor of invalidation is entirely different. And, as invalidation is rather a common denominator of aberration, therefore you find the factors of clearing are registering on people differently, but more important to this lecture, that a person's responses as an auditor or as a pc measure up this invalidation factor to a large degree . . . but not so much a pc, much more the auditor.

An auditor who is terribly susceptible to invalidation has a dreadful time of it. If this auditor at the same time has no quick, instantaneous reality on the whole track, ah man, I feel for the person! This practically breaks the person's heart all the time. Because he makes a mistake, triggers the mechanism, the pc disorients, cusses out the auditor. Don't you see the cycle? Then the auditor being susceptible to invalidation feels very, very upset about the whole thing, feels it's very personal, takes up the ARC break, gets cussed out more, has pcs blowing session... The auditor's already susceptible to invalidation; this is practically killing him, see.

Well, the right way to do it is for the auditor to get some auditing in some kind of direction that gives him a validation of the track. Gets some idea of the track. All of a sudden his invalidability will decrease. But more important, his sessions all of a sudden will get very mysteriously smooth.

And you watch this happen. You watch this happen. It's mysterious magic. All of a sudden on Monday she can't audit, on Thursday, audits gorgeously.

See, on one Friday, why, this person, this fellow, gives a session in the Academy, and God almighty! God almighty! If you'd stood back and made a list of the number of flubs, you see, you just would have run out of paper. There was hardly enough paper in the Academy to list them all. Person gets an orientation on his own bank, gets a subjective reality of the track, gets out of present time, back into present time, gets ideas of pictures, gets ideas of these mechanisms. A few days later they give a session to the same pc . . person's been taught no more . . and all of a sudden they can pick up the session every time it starts bogging down. They're in there doing a job, and now they're know . . now they know what they are doing.

And I think this is the main factor that's standing in the road of a large percentage of auditors.

Thank you.