

DIRECTING PC'S ATTENTION

A lecture given on
18 September 1962

Well, that's very nice of you. Thank you very much.

Well, this is what?

Audience: 18 September AD 12.

Eighteen September...

Female voice: 12 AD

... AD 12.

You realize your chances of getting out of here Clear actually occur in the first six weeks of your presence here. Somebody sighs. Some old student sighed. It was too true wasn't it? You don't think it was true. He—he came Clear and he hasn't been the same since.

Male voice: That's right.

Yeah well, I'm here now. I'll fix it. I'll fix it. I know what you got overts on. You didn't take me seriously did you?

Male voice: Yeah.

You should have!

Well now, on the boat—when I was down in the cabin working like mad, and other people I won't name were up swimming and dashing about the decks and looking athletic and enthusiastic—a remark was made to me that on the first night back with all the data I had to give you, “Well, you'll probably be here till 12:30.” I wish to disabuse you of this particular fact and say that why don't I just make this a ten, fifteen minute lecture and then we all go home. Wouldn't you rather do that?

Audience: No.

All right.

Well anyway I will give you some of the data, tonight. But it might take till 2:30. Anyhow, that's...

I probably should tell you something about what happened over in Washington but I couldn't get it into a five or six hour lecture schedule. This was very adventurous. I left here tired; I arrived in Washington tired; I finished the congress tired; I finished my stay in Washington tired—always looking forward to this next moment when I was going to get some rest, you see? And then finally came back to Saint Hill, tired. I have never done so much auditing, looked over so many goals, done so many Dynamic Assessments, talked to so many people. And few people who were at the congress, were aware of the fact that I spent most of the congress off the stage auditing. I was making very sure we had a goal to announce by congress end, you see?

And also we were straightening up some of the organizations in the States. The best way to straighten things up is an E - Meter. And I'd like to give you a tip: Instead of reaching for an

argument, reach for an E - Meter. That's a nice tip. And if you followed that tip more often, life would run like a summer dream. That is so overbearingly true.

For instance, amongst the adventures which assailed me on—this rapid passage was a fellow coming into my room in 1827, just as we had all the baggage stacked up in the hall, and insulting me. He said the one unforgivable thing that mustn't be said to me, on the subject of how I was responsible for everything, everyplace.

And I promptly barked, growled, headed him backwards over stacks of luggage—it was very disgraceful, I mean, cameras and briefcases went in all directions—and he got out the front door and I hooked him back in the front door on the realization that this was not a way to resolve a case. And so I hooked a hand around his neck and threw him back into the house, and hooked the hand around his neck the other way and threw him into my room, and gave him a good shove in the chest, and he sat down.

I opened my E - Meter case—it was all packed; we were just about to leave for New York. We were going to leave for New York at two o'clock and something came up. And then we postponed it till three and something came up. And then we postponed it till four and something came up. And I think this happened at five.

Anyway, I just sat there and pulled his missed withholds. Put the cans in his hands, put on my auditor hat and, just as though nothing had been happening, just sat down and pulled his missed withholds. Just like that. One right after the other. And cleaned three buttons in the space—I don't remember what the auditing period was but it couldn't have been more than about half an hour to thirty—five minutes.

And I cleaned three buttons. And I wish to recommend this to you as an auditing job. Three buttons clean in about thirty or thirty—five minutes as follows: “What have we failed to find out about you?” (meaning all Scientologists everyplace), “What have I failed to find out about you?” and “In this session have I missed a withhold on you?”—all three clean, slick as a whistle.

He was giving me nicer and nicer answers. The answers were sweeter and sweeter. And he was more and more pleasant. And I think somebody out on the other coast had given him a twenty—five—hour intensive to clean up these buttons, but hadn't ever scratched them. That's interesting, isn't it? And at the end of that time ran a Security Check on him.

This is in the last five minutes. Told him that his goal was in opposition to Scientology after I had done so. This was a—this was—the last minute was a Dynamic Assessment. And told him his goals were in opposition—his goal was in opposition to Scientology, and that was why he'd been acting that way, because that's what the meter said.

And he said, “Well, what do we do about it?”

And I said, “Well,” I said, “You go on and get yourself some auditing, and I'll see to it somebody finds your goal somewhere along the line.”

And he got up and shook me by the hand and he said, “Thank you, very much.” He said, “I'm going to make you a good auditor.”

Now, the number of hours of administrative time that this person had already occupied on various lines in various places had amounted to a minimum of fifty or sixty. And if you don't like administration, use an E - Meter. Get the idea? And when you use an E - Meter, get something done.

Now, that may be a novel thought. That may be a novel thought. When you use an E - Meter, get something done. I see that lands more or less on deaf ears.

An E - Meter is not something that you should spend lots of time on; an E - Meter is something you should do something with. You can do a great deal with an E - Meter. Somebody's busy arguing with you left and right, somebody's busy knocking your head in, somebody's getting very uppity and monkeyed up; well, you're lucky if you can get to him with an E - Meter. You're very lucky. Because sometimes you can't. Such as the building you're sitting in is illegal, and Town and County Planning are corresponding. Now, I'm sure this will take a great many hours to settle. But if I could get these cotton—picking monkeys on the other end of an E - Meter, I'd pull the withhold fast. We might even arrange it. Oh! Well, that's another story.

Anyway, Scientology is to be used. It's for use. It is something you can use. And it isn't something that you pick up and use in an auditing session, necessarily, but it's something you can use all the time. But when you do decide to do something Scientology—wise, well be effective and do it. Yeah, that's all—just do it. And most of the rules which are laid down in auditing and in clearing are all devoted to keeping you from doing ineffective things. These rules are a path of effectiveness.

Now remember, men have been talking to men for a number of millennia, ever since they came out of the trees. And they've been talking. And they've been doing a lot of talking. Some of them are still in the trees. In fact, I saw a psychiatrist the other day wearing a swallow—tail coat. And, he had to. And, the general position of talking and discussing and so forth has been that it has been a waste of time.

Now, how is it in auditing that we can use talkingness and suddenly something happenesses, see? How come? How come this occurs?

And the rules by which you audit are the rules of an effective path to an accomplishment—of reaching someone, of bettering someone, of obtaining agreement and improving existence. But it's a highly circumscribed path.

Now, if you were to—if you were to look over a great many activities in the past which were supposed to cure people or supposed to make them sane or supposed to make them happy or something of the sort, you would be amazed at their numerousness. They're just almost without number. We know a few of them as the witch doctor, the rrrrh psychoanalyst, the Aesculapian school of healing. These things—I could go on and on and on and name and name and name and name and name, and you'd all come down to something quite interesting, is that it had to do with talking to somebody about something or listening to somebody about something. That's been assisted from time to time with puffs of smoke and pinches of pepper as in the case of the witch doctor—juju horsetail flies with fleas in them. All of these things have a—have a talkingness, a reachingness, an effort to reach connected with them.

For instance, by the simple expedient of scattering fleas all over somebody with a horsetail fly, the juju doctor creates a confusion into which he can put his implant. You recognize that it's—fellow wouldn't pay much attention to what was coming in; it would just go in at that moment.

The—well, most old witch doctors had to learn how to scream, and you got an interrupted scream. They'd scream loud enough to kick your eardrums in and then say something and then continue the scream. And the patient thereafter didn't know they had stopped screaming, but of course had a sandwiched implant, with the statement in the middle of the scream, you see, being an implanted suggestion of some kind or another. Usually, in that stage of medicine, the suggestion was something on the order of, "You're going to die."

There's always been a talkingness and a reachingness. In other words, we found Axiom 10 operating throughout efforts to overwhelm, efforts to heal, efforts to control, efforts to make sane, efforts to better, efforts to become better. All of these various things have Axiom 10 running through their midst.

Now, how is it that we in Scientology can suddenly come along and, by certain applications of this same talk that has been going on since time immemorial without effectiveness—with this same talk, being effective? How do we do this? That's something to think about, isn't it?

Now, many a student misses this. They miss the fundamental of auditing—the most fundamental fundamental there is. Auditing has to do with the communication formula, and when a person says something and somebody acknowledges it (if the statement is truthful and the acknowledgment is received), can blow, erase, eradicate, deintensify mental charge. It's on that fact alone that auditing works. Auditing is based upon that fact. There is no other erudite fact on which it is based. It's Axiom 10!

Now, it actually isn't what's said by the person who is being treated. It actually isn't what's said by the person who is acknowledging. It, to a very marked degree, is what is said by the person doing the treating in the first place. This causes a momentary restimulation, and that restimulation is picked up by the pc, recognized, verbalized and blown by the moment when the acknowledgment is received. Somebody has heard him.

Now, that's your—that's the cycle of auditing. The question or the command directs the person's attention to a certain area of bank; and the person, perceiving that area of bank, responds, and knows he has responded when he is acknowledged and receives that acknowledgment. And that is the cycle of an auditing command.

Now, it is to maintain a purity of cycle that you find most auditing rules growing up. These rules occur to maintain the auditing cycle. And techniques specify what is to be restimulated in what sequence. Now, if you've done that right and you know what button should be hit and what responses should be given, you only need add to it repetitive question and repetitive response, order of question—that is, the sequence of questions asked by the practitioner, each one followed by the same cycle as I have just named—to obtain a state of Release or Clear or Theta Clear or Operating Thetan.

In other words, it's that magical formula which leads all the way out, and don't you forget it. That is the only reason anybody goes out. It is not the charm of the practitioner, the nameplate on the E - Meter; it's not that the person believes or disbelieves Scientology—because let me point out, I think the fellow—you'd say a fellow who has been yanked around by me and javelined all over the front hall would not be in a very receptive state. In fact, he'd be in a very repressed state of some kind or another to audit. Yet, the exact button processed on the person relieved the state. In other words, the auditing was greater than the wooling.

Now, what—what might somebody come to believe? Well, if you want a list then just take all the asinities that have been written in the books of philosophy on any planet in this universe—take the lot, make your list and you'll get how many departures there can be from the auditing cycle. And that's an awful lot. So there's really not much reason to go into it.

A salesman depends on some kind of a cycle in order to sell. He says to somebody, "Here is an automobile, buy it!"

And the person is supposed to say, "Okay. Here is my check."

And then the salesman is supposed to say, "Okay, take it away." And do you know, most cars are sold on that simple a formula. Guy's already seen the car, he wants a car, he walks in and he says, "Do you have cars for sale? Is that car—is that—that purple car in the window for sale?"

And, the fellow says, "Yes, yes, we just have one left."

And the fellow says, "All right. Oil it and grease it up. I'll drive it out the rear door."

Actually, that's what would more or less be called the majority of sales.

Now, a salesman believes, of course, he has to sell the car. And that is what cancels the majority of sales. Now, that even goes so far in some places which have done a cycle of action on the subject of business which is gone into a fine games condition, where the seller will not permit the buyer to have the product. Now that can be attained too. I remember one time spending an hour and a half in my office, selling an Addressograph salesman on the idea of selling us, a machine.

Well, that's because aberration is entered into it. But there are certain cycles of action that go along with selling. And there are certain cycles of action that go along with teaching, which are quite different than these auditing cycles of action. And then there are all these varied cycles of action that have turned up in philosophic tech since time immemorial. Zen Buddhism—that gives you a stack of them that gets nobody noplacé. By the time it had gotten out to Japan, they didn't know much about Buddhism. I say that advisedly because I'm no authority on Zen Buddhism. I'm still sane.

Such practices try to handle some ramification of Axiom 10—all of them. And they all go off in different directions.

Now, you get this fellow that's been a salesman for the last twenty—nine to the twenty—ninth power lives, and you make him an auditor. You try to make him an auditor, you see? So he sells the pc engrams, and the pc takes them away with him too. Hell sell clearing, and the thetan's lucky to get away from there with any body left, because it goes from nowhere. In other words, he's trying to handle a cycle of communication which is pertinent to some other field. And he doesn't see that auditing is its own cycle of communication.

Had an example called to my attention the other day. Pc comes in and he says, "Well," he says, "I've been up all night, and uh—I been auditing myself, and uh—I kind of messed up and uh—so forth, and uh—tsk well, that's it."

And the auditor flies into the D of P or the Auditing Supervisor—just breaks off the session right there at that point—and says, "Oh my God! I can't possibly audit this fellow because he—you know what he's just told me? He's told me that he's been auditing all night, and what can you do about that?"

Aaaaah. Ow! Do about that? Everything about that that can be done has already happened. The pc has told him. You get the idea? I mean, everything that you're going to do about it has already occurred.

Well, an auditor who will do that is on some other communicationcycle. See? He's trying to sell planets or something—He's not auditing. I don't know what he—I don't know what he thinks auditing is if he does something like that, or what is supposed to happen in an auditing session.

I have run into students, sometime ago, who actually thought the E - Meter fell on the sound of their own voice. We've been curing this up. In other words, when the auditor spoke, the E - Meter reacted. I think that's marvelous, you know? Because it shows no comprehension of the auditing cycle. Because this immediately lends itself to some weird, old past track idea of some kind or another, whereby it is the practitioner who wears the case of the patient, and by speaking about it gets it to react on the meter, and now that the pc or the patient witnesses it, becomes well.

Now, I hate to burden your wits with that one, but I'm just showing you there's another cycle of action.

Now, you've seen characters laying on hands. Well, this is not a disgraceful activity. As a matter of fact a Touch Assist is always welcome. But how come this communication cycle of

“We lay on the paw and draw the pain out of the wound, and experience the pain in the paw, and then shake it away like a dog coming out of the water.” You’ve seen that, haven’t you?

Well, it’s an interesting cycle of action.

Now, we take somebody who of course is totally addicted to another cycle of action of some kind or another and never sees the auditing cycle of action, and what do we get out of this? After he reads the E - Meter, see—got the E - Meter there and he says “Have you sinned?” “Now he’s better.” Do you get that? It is totally—totally possible. This sounds utterly mad.

But I’m only calling this to your attention because the basic of auditing is an auditing cycle of command which operates as an attention director—call it a restimulator if you want, but it’s an attention director—eliciting a response from the patient to as—is that area, and who knows he has done so when he receives from the practitioner an acknowledgment that it has occurred. Now, that is the auditing cycle and any Departure from that auditing cycle will wind you up in the soup.

Now, that auditing cycle all by itself is sufficiently powerful to get gains no matter what button you direct. Let’s be very, very, very puristic about this. Let’s remove all significance from it as an action and see if anything happens to the pc! Let us tell him from where he is to get the idea of looking at his left ear, and thank him, and get the idea of looking at his right ear, and thank him, and get the idea of looking at his left ear, and thank him, and get the idea of looking at his right ear, and thank him. Well, what happens is he’s not going to wind up without ears. But the mere fact of directed attention and the acknowledgment that he has directed his attention—just that fact all by itself—operates as a therapeutic action. See, there’s no significance in the command. It just says, “Inspect your right ear; inspect your left ear,” see, and that just run bang, bang, bang, bang.

Now, just doing it once might not be observably therapeutic. Doing it twice, probably not. But here is a new thing that enters into it: repetitive. The repetitive action. Duplication is added to the communication formula, which contains duplication anyway. So of course, you’ve taken the apparency of duplication—pardon me, you’ve taken the apparency of communication and increased it enormously by the fact of duplication. This fellow really knows he’s being communicated to now, and he can direct his attention better and better and better and better. And he knows something is happening because somebody has told him so every time the acknowledgment occurs. ‘

Now, what occurs this way? The person will become aware of some other being in existence, will become aware of mass, will become aware of the fact his attention is easy to shift or hard to shift. Various things will occur. His awareness of these things will increase and his attention becomes free. It becomes freer and freer and freer. Now, the thing is limited because he wots not of what he’s looking at. Nobody has asked him for any sense to it. It takes longer.

Now, in essence, those are your CCHs. It’s the nonsignificance of directed attention, and those of you who are still trying to read all kinds of significance into the CCHs should just tear that little chapter out of the book and go over in the corner quietly and read it, because the CCHs present different ways of directing the pc’s attention with minimal significance. And of course, your worse—off pc does very well on them, because he finds out that there is matter, energy, space, time, and somebody else alive in the world. It’s probably one of the greatest cognitions that an individual can have, if he doesn’t know it. It’s almost with horror that he realizes it for the first time.

How do you suppose the great criminal manages to live with himself? How does he manage to live with himself? It’s just that nobody else exists, so therefore it doesn’t matter what he does. And there he goes.

How are you going to get this fellow out of it? Well, you can’t tell him, “Think of the significance of this or that and the other thing” most of the time, because the significance

would never arrive. He—this he could not duplicate. He cannot duplicate the significance of looking at it—the significance of looking at a significance. He can't do that. But he can duplicate the relatively nonsignificant action of simply directed attention.

If you want to make some pc feel like he's being hypnotized when he isn't, set up two bottles in front of him and tell him to look at the left one, and then tell him to look at the right one, and then tell him to look at the left one, and tell him to look at the right one, and tell him to look at the left one, and tell him to look at the right one, and tell him to look at the left one, and all of the sudden hell get some weird feeling of becoming hypnotized. Of course, he isn't becoming hypnotized; hypnotism is running off. And if you do it for a little while after he first begins to feel that he's being hypnotized, he'll realize actually what is happening. He's waking up. Sleeping Beauty.

Now, there you see a new idea in the communication cycle. It's a communication without significance, beyond the significance of what the attention is directed to.

Now, many an activity has directed attention, but not duplicatively. And that is one of the secrets of Scientology processing and why it works. Duplicative. One of the reasons this was never discovered was because most people can't take it. It's the practitioner who can't take it, not the patient. Therefore at HCA level we like to have a lot of Op Pro by Dup, and somebody comes through and says, "Well, should Op Pro by Dup be run just during the auditing periods for three days in order to get in—or four days in order to get in eight hours of it, or should it be run all at once, or should it be so, and should it be so on?" You see, they're so starved for significance they won't just do Op Pro by Dup. I don't care how it's run; run it! See?

But of course, every time the fellow says that he cannot walk over to the book one more time, at that moment you assist him thither. It must be run. And where everybody is busy worrying about how it's run, they very often neglect that it must be run. If you ever wanted to see a Scientologist natter, find one that early in his career was run on Op Pro by Dup by consent of the pc on this basis: The pc says he's getting tired so the auditor says, "All right, sit down and take a rest." The pc says he can't tell just now, so the auditor lets it skid. And boy, what's happened there? The cycle of action is entirely and completely mishmashed. You don't get the intention of the practitioner expressed in the direction of attention of the person it is being run on. And therefore, then, you don't get the acknowledgment—and it's very weird.

But there's a very basic action, and you could do this in a single—action basis. But it doesn't make space and it tends to make the guy feel kind of stacked up when you say, "You see that black spot? All right, look at that spot. Thank you. Look at that spot. Thank you. Look at that spot. Thank you. Look at that spot. Thank you. Look at that spot. Thank you. Look at that. . . ." You haven't got two points, so of course you've no space. And the odd part of it is this black spot will start to look closer and closer and closer and closer, and the guy will begin to believe he's kind of being pulled out of his head toward the black spot. Because he can't make space, so therefore he doesn't know where he is.

So two is always better. And then of course, two adds to the element of duplication. We got a two—pole universe and we've got duplication going and here we go. Op Pro by Dup becomes a killer.

But recognize that you could direct attention repetitively, in a duplicative fashion, on and on and on—in almost any fashion—and achieve a renewed awareness on the part of another being, for yourself and for the world around him. See? It isn't—any other significance in it than just that. There is no further significance in that action than that. There is actually no further result in that action than that either. Somatics will turn on and off and you'll think he's getting rid of lots of somatics, and you'll run to them—run into them later on, to the place where he is going to. And there they'll be waiting on the track again. But that's beside the point. The person has become aware. He's become more aware and to that degree he has enormously improved.

Now, this does very interesting things in terms of improvement. It improves IQ, it improves alertness, it improves soggyiness of one kind or another in life. It'll do all kinds of things. You could write up a bill of—a bill of health on the thing and put it on a slab board outside, that a lot of customers would be very, very happy to come in and get that to happen to them. But it's an elementary purity. Op Pro by Dup.

Other activities, as I was just about to say, have done repetitive commands. Various activities have done this. There is a one—command process which is used over in the heights of the Himalayas which deletes these things, and that is “Regard your navel.” The command is given once and twenty years later the fellow is still sitting there. It's not optimum auditing. It's called an auditor comm lag. But recognize that as a cycle of action of sorts. Recognize that. Somebody writes down in a book “What you want to do is regard your navel.” All right. So the fellow says, “Fine. I'll regard my navel.” He's got one auditing command and one navel. And he gets stuck! Because the acknowledgment is missing even for that one command. The author of the text never comes out afterwards, through the pages of the book, and—sort of breaking the fellow's attention off as it's staring downward—and says, “Thank you very much.”

You go around to somebody—if you want to produce a shock of magnitude on some monk of Tibet, why, learn this in Tibetan. It'd probably get you past many monastery doors. They'd be so flat on their backs after you said it that nobody would stop you. And that would be “Thank you very much for regarding your navel.” Guy has been waiting for it, you know?

Now, if you—you see that then the—there are different cycles than the auditing cycle, and it is very easy to fall into these other cycles because men have been in them for a long time. There's lots of them on the track. There's an enormous variety of ways to handle communication. There's, for instance, a cycle—there's a cycle that might go something like this: “Hello dear.” Bang! You see? The acknowledgment comes with the greeting. Well, we see this in less domestic ways on such a thing, “Halt or I'll shoot!” Bang! You see?

It's like the captain walking past the guardhouse one day and new sentry said to him, “Halt or I'll shoot. Halt or I'll shoot. Halt or I'll shoot.”

And fortunately before he got the last syllable completely out the captain reached over and shook him and said, “Hey, what's going on? What's the matter? What's the matter?”

“Well, sergeant said to say that three times and then shoot.” Well, that's another cycle of action.

Now, wherever you've got a—a communication line set up, you have some kind of a response system on this line and it'll go through some kind of a cycle. There are some marvelous cycles. I wouldn't spend any time studying them particularly. But if you know there are different cycles of communication or action, then you'll see that it is a unique cycle. The auditing cycle of action is unique. And frankly you could sit down and study it for quite a while with a considerable amount of benefit. You could say, “What is this thing all about?” You utter a command or ask a question, and this directs the pc's attention; and then you'd realize that the question or command (also unseen) directs the attention of the pc by pulling the reactive bank up around the pc's ears, which is operating independent of the intention of the pc, and is more responsive to the practitioner than it is to the person.

I can always make people's somatic strips go tearing around. It's very fascinating. Any outsider has more control of a person's reactive bank than the person himself. Of course it's on that additional point that auditing is to some degree based. This fellow sits inside of his skull and he says, “I'll restimulate it and then I'll as—is it, and I'll restimulate it, and I'll as—is it, and I'll restimulate and I'll as—is it, and I'll restimulate it and I'll as—is.” Odd part of it is it has some workability, but he gets stacked up after a while, you see, because he actually isn't as—ising some of it and never notices when he goes off of it. He isn't a good director of

his reactive bank, because the common denominator of the reactive bank is other—determinism.

So auditing basically requires a practitioner. That is because an otherdeterminism handles the other—determinism of the reactive bank much more easily than the individual himself. Did you ever think of that?

So when the auditor isn't following through the cycle of action of auditing—the cycle of an auditing command—then nobody else is going to adjust the bank for him. And an auditor who won't help him out by adjusting the bank for him, of course, is leaving him in the soup; and the pc feels like he's getting no auditing.

If you go ahead and study the cycle I've been talking to you about in this lecture, you will see most of the mistakes of auditing. You will see how these things grow and come about: first by a habit pattern from other eras and scenes and activities, and second by not recognizing that it is a set pattern that you're following. There is a set pattern. It is very set. Auditing has a very precise cycle. And if that cycle isn't followed, auditing doesn't occur.

The next thing that you should recognize about this is that a pc whose attention cannot be controlled cannot be directed into areas of significance which don't (reactively) want to have any attention directed into. Let us say this pc has a goal "never to look." And you're busy trying to find a goal "never to look," only you don't know what the goal is. Oh, coo ! I invite you to try to find this on a pc whose attention you, the auditor, does not—do not control. You see what would happen? The bank has more authority over the pc than the auditor.

Now, this pc's attention can be directed so—and the auditor is skilled at directing his attention, not diverting it by dropping E - Meters or comments on the weather—and there is a point in the session when this ridge, or whatever the buildup is which sort of surrounds this goal, first appears over the reactive horizon. And it says, "never to look." And of course, the auditor has more control of the pc's attention than the pc's own bank. So therefore, the pc looks straight at it and tells the auditor exactly what it is. And you write down the goal "never to look" on the pc's list, and when it's tiger drilled you find it.

Now, a pc who is gloriously "out of session," we call it—that is, a pc whose attention is not being directed by the auditor—he hits this one and he obeys the bank and he doesn't look over there. Bank says, "never to look." That's it. Pc doesn't look over there. Do you see how it is?

Now, all goals lists contain goals of this character. This is not peculiar to one pc. For one pc to have this as a goal would be an individualism of one kind. That's the pc's goal. But all goals lists contain goals of this character. And you can almost—this is just a hazarded guess here—look over the list of the pc whose goal is not being easily found and you will find on it a complete absence of goals which command the attention to go the other way. There'll never be anything on it like "never to look," "not to talk," "to be silent." These things will not appear on that pc's goals list. And the pc whose attention can be directed by the auditor will have a great many of these on the list. That's just an educated guesstimate, not based on very much observation. But I'm just giving you just a look at it.

So you wonder why pc A's goal cannot be found and pc B's goal can be found. It again comes down to the auditor and to nobody else. There are no good pcs or bad pcs. There are only pcs. There are good auditors and there are bad auditors. And good auditors use a communication cycle and get it executed. And bad auditors monkey along and never direct the pc's attention. Therefore you have fast goal finding and slow goal finding. You have fast auditing and slow auditing. You have all the varieties of auditing which are presented to your eye by any group of pcs passing through an HGC or a private auditor's hands. That's the way it is.

Now, we say, “Well, some pcs’ attention is harder to direct than others.” And I say it’s still the auditor. It’s sometimes an auditor has to work harder than others. And that’s about all that you can say about it. If you look over your own auditing on the basis of the cycle of auditing, and if you look over any pc that you are auditing on the basis of “Is his attention being directed by me and can I count upon the fact that it is?” you will learn a great deal about what is going on, both with your auditing and with that pc and the relationships in between. Okay?

Thank you.