5412C13

6th of 35 talks to students on the 9th Advanced Clinical Course given in Phoenix, Arizona between December 6, 1954 and January 21, 1955

CONDUCT OF THE AUDITOR

A lecture given on 13 December 1954

We haven't covered, in the last unit that you all went through, several points. The points that we haven't covered are very easy to cover, however, and these appertain unto, mainly, conduct of the auditor. Why, there's hardly any one of you present who would dream that his conduct in the auditing chair could be better. That's obvious. And I would be the last one to state that my conduct in the auditing chair was the ne plus ultra, but it's better than yours.

Now, an analysis of an auditor's conduct exists in the Auditor's Code 1954. It's a very, very good thing to make people aware of this Auditor's Code 1954. Every time we have found a preclear getting into, you know, bad condition - he's suddenly in bad condition or something like that - we trace back over everything that happened there, everything the auditor did and the condition the preclear was in, and we always find several factors of the Auditor's Code had been violated.

Just one all by itself apparently will not completely dish a preclear. But two, three, something like that, all happening at the same time and you're liable to have a spinner on your hands.

It's just as vital as this. And this is all under the subject of auditor conduct.

The Auditor's Code is auditor conduct. But part of that code is preclear condition, and it's actually sort of a misconduct on the part of the auditor not to look over the condition of the preclear, see, before he audits. So there's a couple of steps in there that refer to preclear condition.

One is sleep, but this is covered today in *„Don't do auditing past ten."* And the other one is food. Now, it's very rare that an auditor actually asks the preclear, *„Have you eaten lately"* or *„What have you eaten these days?"* Mostly because, you see, that's a little bit of a social breech - it actually, in social intercourse, it's really none of our business whether this fellow is starving to death or not. It's not an ordinary, routine question. Let's say that you're auditing a neurotic, and if you omit to ask that question, you're liable to get halfway through 8-C or something like that and just have this guy spin. Now, the E-Meter, of course, is something we don't use anymore.

An E-Meter registers the behavior of energy. So it will register the behavior of a stimulus-response mechanism such as the reactive mind.

But we're not interested in those significances or particularities. However, the E-Meter can be used, if you have one, in a very peculiar fashion.

You ask the preclear - you tune up the electrodes - you know, I mean, the hand grip - so that he's registering, and then you ask him to draw a deep breath and expel it. And you will watch the needle - on almost any E-Meter - you will watch the needle dive. The needle will dive. And if it doesn't come back right away, or if it doesn't dive - ya-ayh, the basal metabolism of the preclear is shot.

Now, you would be amazed how many people basal metabolism is shot in. And you, actually - that just simply means the oxygen-carbon burning rate of the body - you would be amazed what would happen in a morning session if you don't eat breakfast. You don't eat breakfast, and if you were to make this basal metabolism test on one of these E-Meters around here - . And by the way, I put an E-Meter around here for the use of these units which has a beep meter on it. I want you to see that beep meter manifestation. It's a real good thing to observe. You pick that up. Make sure we go through that.

It's an incredible thing that one human being can monitor energy in another human being.

But also at the same time show them this basal metabolism thing.

You don't eat breakfast. And you know you won't register on a basal metabolism. It'll go twitch. And a psycho goes that way all the time-twitch. He does that all the time. But you don't eat breakfast, and here it is nine, ten o'clock, something like that, and your basal metabolism is shot.

Now, we could, but don't have to, draw the inference in between these that a person should not be audited when his basal metabolism is in such bad shape. Now, we can infer this just because a psycho and a person who hasn't eaten have the same meter readings. But if this was - if this was all, why, we would skip it. We would skip it. We wouldn't pay any more further attention to it. Just because that happens to coordinate is no reason why it would upset auditing.

But there's another factor. We have learned that when basal metabolism won't register, when the fellow's just practically got zero, auditing doesn't seem to do him a bit of good. Isn't this peculiar? And we checked that test after test.

In one of the units where we were taking some tests on this, we had the interesting experience of having the three cases that didn't make any progress to amount to anything in that unit - not traceable to auditing but traceable to the fact that these people didn't eat. You see, here's what happens. The body, lacking proper fuel, will start chewing on facsimiles. And the awareness of awareness unit puts out a little bit of energy, and the body goes cheeoooow. And it isn't that food will ever make anybody sane. It won't, not even vaguely. But absence of it to a body that is accustomed to it will bring about a greediness for facsimiles, which an auditor would have to work a long time to overcome.

However, there is a process that could be run even on this person, and that's Remedy of Havingness. Now, something very weird; I've never made this experiment so as to be any kind of a conclusive experiment, but in just two cases that I tried it on, very cursorily, no breakfast was eaten and we got a BMR test, you see, and then found out that was barely a tick. Then we remedied havingness on these preclears like mad, and we got a BMR reading. This is very fascinating.

Well, I can't say that's conclusive because I didn't carry forward what I would dignify as a series such as ten or fifteen tests. I did a medical series of two tests.

But it just indicates as something there that you should, in the first place, discover what your preclear is eating. Now, let's say you're working for HASI, and you're getting preclears that you don't have any former cognizance of; you know, you're just - all of a sudden you're handed a preclear.

You start auditing this person. This person might be from a long way away - we used to discover this in the old Foundations - be from a long way away, and had invested quite a bit of money in auditing, you see, and travel expenses and that sort of thing, and aimed to get by that week on a few cups of coffee and some sandwiches. Won't make any progress. Won't make any case progress. It's really aside from the fact that every time this happened and we had trouble with the preclear - the preclear started to spin or something of this sort - we traced it immediately to no eating.

Now, the other coordinating factor that goes along with this is the fact that a psycho won't eat. The main trouble with them is they won't eat.

The psychiatrist - oh, I had a psychiatric clown one time who rushed up to me when I walked in the sanitarium, he says, *„You know that patient you put in here"* - I didn't put any patient in there, some girl's husband had put her in - he says, *„I'll have to give her an electric shock, I have to give her an electric shock, I have to give her an electric shock,"* you know, standard psychiatric parlance.

And I said, *„Why, what's the matter?"*

„She's not eating. She's not eating."

„Well, what's electric shock got to do with it? Will that make her eat?"

„No, but she's not eating. Well, she'll starve to death."

And I said, *„Well, if you give her electric shock, will she then eat?"*

„That hasn't anything to do with it.“

We had quite an argument. I remember this point very vividly. I was running - running a process on a preclear the other day and this blew as a lock of *„no answers.“*

But the psychiatrist will try to give people electric shocks or do something weird and peculiar every time your patient stops eating. They see this as one of the big signs. They have at least learned to note this *„no eating“* as a very poor manifestation on the part of the psychotic. So can we note it as a poor manifestation on the part of the preclear. Whether the preclear's psychotic or not, the failure to eat will affect auditing.

If you do have somebody who doesn't seem to be able to eat, and if you are very conversant with all the processes we have, you would know that you could, probably, just run something like 8-C, which actually does do a Remedy of Havingness, and get them back to eating, or if it was very desperate indeed, you actually could waste food, you know, Expanded GITA on food, and bring them up to a point of where they could eat.

But I remember that it is a manifestation of mental imbalance - this *„no eat.“* Now, your preclear who merely skips breakfast, may be under the pressure of having stayed up late, you see, and so on. Just normal course of human existence. He actually doesn't recognize that he is in poor shape. If he had to run down the street, for instance, to catch a bus or something like that, he'd find his breath very short, and when he got on the bus, he would start to worry. You get how this works out, see.

I mean, the guy doesn't eat breakfast because he's in a hurry or something, and he rushes to catch his bus-a lot of physical exertion, you know - gets on the bus and he starts to worry. The old mock-up starts to pull in these facsimiles, see - slurp, slurp, slurp, slurp. And the next thing you know, worry-worry-worry-worry-worry-worry-worry-worry - don't go to work. Now, reversely, then, he will get it on this way: He'll get a stimulus-response mechanism - when he starts to worry, he can't eat. He'll also get it on the basis of when he starts to worry, he has to eat.

We've got a preclear down in Texas that is on compulsive or obsessive eating. He calls it *„this horrible gluttony.“* He is just eating, eating, eating, eating, eating, eating, eating. Well, I don't know, he seems to have worked out some kind of a mechanism there, you see, so that, why, if he eats enough, then he won't pull in any more facsimiles on himself and so it won't hurt. That's what it adds up to. But this individual - let's just say he's routine, physical, mental condition, average sort of guy - just by failure to eat breakfast will discover him worrying.

Now, I ran into a series of seven ulcer cases that were - oh, they were having a terrible time. This was a series, a good series. I plotted out all the factors that were in common in this person - these people's lives. And the factor most in common was *„row at the breakfast table.“* This was definitely in common in these things. Upset condition in the home and so forth. There's another factor in common: Ten, ten-thirty, eleven o'clock on the job, these people were doing an awful lot of fussing, 1.5ing and worrying. See, it's just a stimulus-response proposition. Their home was antipathetic, too, and they didn't do any eating in it. And this constant and consistent no-eat, of course,

eventually pulled in something like AAs and other factors and old gunshot wounds, and the next thing you know, they had holes in their stomach.

What is the exact mechanism here. The individual doesn't eat, the particular area that protests the most is the stomach. We find the stomach, and other organisms, pulling in facsimiles, you see. And of course, on a stimulus-response basis, they would get those things which most closely agreed with the area.

Fellow has been shot in the stomach and he's hungry, why, the thing to do - the thing to do is to pull in the gunshot facsimile and eat it up - actually eat it up. The situation is very simple to see. This has a lot to do with auditing, and that is one little point in the Auditor's Code which an auditor might not pay very much attention to mostly because it isn't on a stimulus-response basis.

The other things in the Auditor's Code that are of definite interest to people of your experience is this business of running every comm lag flat. That's now part of the Auditor's Code because it's definitely detrimental not to do so.

We used to say this in another way: Don't give a second command before the first command is followed. Now, that's a shadow of this, isn't it? Tell the fellow to walk over to the wall and he keeps sitting there. So you say, „*Well, touch the floor,*" see. Well, he didn't execute the first command and we gave him a second command and you will find him in a fine state of confusion.

Well, look at this as another phase of this same thing: Keep giving him the command „*Touch the wall,*" until he does it with ease and alacrity.

Now, this interposes on you, and you'll want to know, and students will want to know from you, what are the limits of alibi here. Because there are questions that you can ask which will produce 150 hours of communication lag. There definitely are questions you can ask.

One such question is „*Where would a fat man be safe?*" which was asked of a fellow one time, and gee whiz. Talk about a comm lag. It just took him forever before he finally got in there and made himself a reply.

All right, there's a point of jurisprudence here, then. Supposing your auditor does ask such a question, and this produces such a lag. Well, what's the auditor do? Well, number one, he shouldn't have asked the question, but having asked it, he's sunk. And this you must convince a new student of. That he-having asked the question, he's sunk. That is, if he's getting a terrific communication lag on this question, that's just too bad, that's all. He did it. Let's make sure first, however, that it's an answerable question. But let's say he made an answerable question and he got a communication lag, and he was only auditing this boy two hours anyhow. And the whole two hours goes by with that comm lag.

Well, the auditor did it, so actually it is up to the auditor to track that case and keep in touch with the case. You know, in a general sort of a way. Call him up in the evening and ask him if he's got the answer to it. Call him up in the morning and ask him if he's got the answer to it, and so forth, until he all of a sudden gives you the answer to the

question. It actually isn't vital that you ask the question a second time. If he can answer it once, you'll find out that the major upset will come off of it. He will experience quite a relief.

But of course, a real good auditor would then ask it again, wouldn't he? So we can just find this question which you asked this fellow - you said, *„Where would a fat man be safe,"* and 75 hours later you checked with him, you know, he answers it. He finally answers it and he says, *„At the meat packing plant."* This isn't even sequitur, but it's perfectly logical to him for some reason or other. That's where he'd be safe. It is up to you again, really, if you were really doing a good job of auditing, the second he answered it to ask him the same question again. I can just see you now 4 or 5 months from now still calling this fellow up occasionally to find out what the next answer was. Because the next comm lag is probably going to be - if the first one was 75 hours - the next one is probably going to be 30 or 40, if not 150.

So it tells you the liabilities of Straightwire and 8-D. That's 8-D, *„Where are things safe."* It tells you the liability of these things on people who haven't had a considerable amount of Two-way Communication and little stuff. You'd run into such a case, by the way - *„Something you wouldn't mind remembering. Something you wouldn't mind forgetting"* - you would run into an awful lag.

But, by the way, this is not necessarily true. There are others - probably a long sequence of questions that - I could probably sit down and remember some of these questions that produces awful communication lag in almost anybody. Anything that strikes straight at a woman's identity as a woman, you see, would be that mass of complication, you see.

I asked a woman one time just in - oh, we were going along just swimmingly. We were evidently doing fine with ARC Straightwire; we were just getting along splendidly. And I asked her, I said, *"All right, now"* - I don't know what was wrong with me; I must have been doped off or something - I asked her that question. Now, I was asking her what other things are this and that and so forth, and I said, *„And what are women used for?"*

And you'd - I'd never expected to find a lag - and maybe on another preclear I'd never get the same lag again - but boy, we got ourselves a communication lag. One of these 100-hour communication lags. And it was just up as far as the session was concerned.

Well, in view of this fact that you have to smash a communication lag flat and flatten it and so forth, then it rather tells you that you shouldn't adventure too deeply into the deep significances on Straightwire on preclears that you're going to see shortly and seldom.

It tells you that you ought to stay in there with processes which will readily get a case into fairly good condition, like 8-C or Opening Procedure by Duplication. If you've got a couple of hours, by the way, you can run Opening Procedure by Duplication and get its first comm lag off of it, but if you try to run it for a half an hour - there's no - there's no sense in running it for a half an hour - you won't even - you won't even show up a comm lag. The guy could usually do it for a half an hour. At 40 min-

utes, 50 minutes, something like that, he starts to show the strain, and the next thing you know the social machinery goes crunch and the gear box tears out, and it makes it about a 2-hour process just to get a comm lag.

So we have another manifestation here. The individual can do a process and has tolerance for a process for a certain length of time, and then it's going to show up into a comm lag. But this is - this is again just comm lag. It's nothing else.

And if you were to run Opening Procedure by Duplication for - you're going to run this fellow for 2 hours, see - you run Opening Procedure by Duplication for 1 hour and 45 minutes. And oh, he just went along with well-oiled wheels, no squeak - nothing, everything going fine. And in 1 hour and 45 minutes he hits his first comm lag - crunch! It's going to take another hour, isn't it? Anyway, and so there you've shot your auditing schedule all to the devil.

Well, usually when people go crunch on Opening Procedure by Duplication, they really haven't had enough 8-C. That's the way it works out normally. So it looks to me like the only safe process that you could run when you weren't going to get your hands on a preclear again right away would be 8-C. And that's pretty close to true. It's the only safe process. But of course, the preclear will go crunch on 8-C, but they don't go crunch as badly, and they snap out of it more quickly. 8-C - you get comm lag off of something in 8-C usually in a very few minutes.

So, selection of the process here has a lot to do with whether or not one can follow the Auditor's Code there, all right?

So this here imposes judgment on the auditor. Well, don't ever let a student walk into it blind thinking he could just audit anything at random, you know, and get away with it, because you can't audit anything at random and get away with it.

You take some preclear that you're going to be in contact with and you're going to be giving a 30-hour intensive to or something like that - sure, you can leave him in a comm lag. Sure. Sure, you can leave him in a comm lag. End of the session came and they were still comm lagging on the session; you only had it vaguely flat. And you gave him some 8-C to bring him on up to present time and so forth - you know where your error would be? In not starting the next session with that question. And there's where changes of auditors are very bad, is when this condition occurs, and then you change auditors and the next auditor doesn't know this, you really just wind the preclear up on the track very neatly - very, very neatly.

You gave him a session. At the end of the session he was still comm lagging, but you had to wind it up because of the end of the session. And then Joe Jinx gets hold of him the next morning and runs a little bit of 8-C and starts on some other entirely distinct process.

And then we find out that this person - this is what's wrong, really, with change of auditors - then we find out that this person has suffered at the point of auditor change.

Well, the real intimate mechanism of suffering at the point of auditor change is not simply the changes of personalities involved. It is that the last auditor did not clean up, and the new auditor didn't inquire and finish up.

So that part of the Auditor's Code becomes relatively easy to get around if we do keep in mind that all you have to do is ask the preclear what was being run. But remember, this is a variety of Straightwire, and you'll get comm lags on that too - *„What was being run?"* And you'll finally plow up what was happening by the other auditor. And then carry on that other auditor's process only long enough to take out the remaining comm lag that was in it. Now, that would be the only trick on changing auditors. So there's something to know about changing auditors isn't there, right straight out of the Auditor's Code.

You get a preclear who has just been audited. The thing to do is give him a little Straightwire on his last auditor until you actually do show up what was occurring. The only thing that can go wrong with this is that the preclear occasionally is an obsessive liar and will give you the weirdest kind of a story you ever heard of. Well, now let's take process lag. That is the next point on the Auditor's Code which is of tremendous importance - process lag.

How long does it take to run a process flat? Now, let's say that we can run an auditing question flat by repetition, repetition, repetition, repetition, and get that communication lag so it's not too long. But what about the whole process? Now, this one question probably belongs to a whole process. Well, that would be like running 8-C flat. Only the way that is stated in the Auditor's Code is *„Run a process as long as it produces change and no longer."*

Well, how long does it take to discover whether or not a process produces change. Well, actually, you might be able to find it out in a hurry. But you won't find it out in a hurry with Opening Procedure by Duplication. And very often you won't find it out about Opening Procedure of 8-C. This is a curiosity here. You can run Opening Procedure by Duplication for an hour with producing no change, and then an hour and 15 minutes and you start producing more changes than you can readily handle.

Same way with 8-C. I've seen people go through 8-C just like little wound up soldiers. Just, oh, wonderful, just walking around. Evidently what's happening is the auditor must be moving every muscle in their body. Then all of a sudden the fellow starts to wake up and say, *„You know, somebody is walking this body around this room."*

So, on 8-C and Opening Procedure by Duplication, we would have to keep our weather eye out.

Now, if we were very experienced, however, do you know that it is not true that it is not detectable. It is detectable. You can detect it. It's mainly experience permits you to do that. You see this fellow going on in a lackluster, machine-process type of process. You just watch this happening, and you know what's going to happen. Sooner or later he's going to wake up. And you can detect this, in other words.

I ordinarily can detect it simply when I start talking to the preclear. I simply categorize it as oh-oh. And one of these things will sneak up.

Well, we get to the other side of this picture. You know, you can run a process - I can't but - that's a funny one. That's true - I can't - I can't run a process on and on and on and on without continuing to produce change of one kind or another, see. But I've had this reported to me and I have observed this, so I have to include it in this little talk I'm giving you on the Auditor's Code.

And that is that a process is often run by an auditor much longer than it produces change in the preclear. Now, once more, this is something I have picked up by looking, not by experiencing. I can always make Opening - this isn't because I'm a good auditor. I am, but it isn't because I'm just trying to hold myself up here as an example; it's just the only example I happen to have on this score. We look this over and I can always do something to the preclear to make a process produce change. I can put more two-way communication into the process. When - I work it slightly different - to spare saying exactly how this is. When the preclear stops changing, I start putting more two-way communication into the process. And he starts changing again.

Well, I suppose just discussing it here, the answer really is there in front of your face. The auditor and the preclear get together and they start running the same two-way communication, the process itself will go flat.

But when a process goes flat and it isn't producing change and the communication lag is perfectly good and it is shifting, why, in the Auditor's Code it says you go on to another process.

Now, we had a boy here that I turned over to a couple of auditors who should have known better. And this fellow was fed some 40 hours of Opening Procedure by Duplication. But he was permitted to do it on a sort of a grind basis - *„If I had somehow or another get through this, I will then be able to get on to something more, and it obviously will do it."* No, the only person that'll do it there is the preclear, not the process.

And these two boys produced their maximum change with Opening Procedure by Duplication at the end of 15 hours. They did Opening Procedure by Duplication 15 hours, and at that time, the preclear was in very, very stable condition with regard to duplication. And then they went on and they did it, for God sakes, for another 25 hours with no change whatever in the preclear.

Well, I traced this over and I found out one of the reasons why no further change occurred in the preclear: There had been an Auditor's Code break at about 6 hours - about 6 hours deep into Opening Procedure by Duplication - which they never permitted this preclear to talk out. You know, wouldn't let him discuss it. Wouldn't listen to this sort of thing. And it was hung up there.

Well, the sin on their part was to waste all this time. If they're going on and on and on and on and on - another process, you see, probably would have found the Auditor's Code break or it would have done something that would have shoved the case forward. But there was no sense in - whatever the conditions or upset had been, we don't care about that. They could have run Opening Procedure by Duplication from hour 13 to hour 15 and found no change. But they should have been smart enough to have detected that there was no change going to occur furthermore. They shouldn't even

have had to run from 13 to 15 to find out there was no change. But the process was flat, and yet they went on 25 hours. So don't let one of your students do that.

Normally a process, I have found, hangs up and stops working on a preclear - particularly we're talking now about the six beefiest processes known to man. We're talking about these six basic processes. They're pretty beefy. And if they're done right and produce no change, there's something wrong someplace - usually with the auditor; we know with the preclear.

All right. Now, where we get this clause in the Auditor's Code, then, we re just sort of putting that in over a big manhole that is open and that everybody can see anyhow - we're putting a sign, *„MANHOLE.“*

It would be very hard to maintain a two-way communication with the preclear and do something like Opening Procedure by Duplication or 8-C, any of its parts, maintaining a two-way communication with the preclear in whatever condition, without discovering a change. This would be real hard to do. But auditors manage this, so it is in the Auditor's Code. And when you - when you teach this process, when you teach that part of the Auditor's Code, you will find that you are into a lot of quibble and argument with some students. You're into a lot of quibble, a lot of argument concerning this.

Because they say, *„Well, I ran Opening Procedure by Duplication for 20 minutes, and it didn't produce any change, so it's against the Auditor's Code to continue the process“.* This is something on the order - it takes an hour for that process to bite.

But here in the Auditor's Code, we find - we find the condition present that if you want to get real snotty, real nasty as an Instructor, you can enforce it to the letter, to the hilt and it will function. In other words, you can just demand utter, slavish, literal interpretation and obedience of the code without any further argument and you'll get into lots less trouble.

See, you just crush. And you will save more of your students from spinning. You will save them from more bad auditing just by that. That is the Auditor's Code; there's no further argument with it. It is a code of morals, arbitraries. It isn't even based on reason. It's just ideas that Ron dreamed up one day and there are a couple of other auditors around that agreed with him, and so therefore he says the whole field has agreed with him, and that is the way it is. And the CECS has shot auditors for disobeying a comma in it. You know, crush.

[Ed. Note: CECS was the Committee of Examinations, Certifications, and Services at the time of this lecture]

Where, as a matter of fact, it is not a crush code at all. It is a code which is itself built upon knowledge hardly won over many years of auditing experience.

It's not even - it's not, by the way, built on theory. It's built on arbitrary observation. There's no theory in it anyplace. It's just that if they don't do this then preclears spin, so we'll put it in a code that they've got to do this.

And however, to anyone with experience, this is something which demonstrates itself by judgment. That doesn't mean it's any the less effective. But it is demonstrated by judgment. And an actual interpretation of the code by judgment is far, far better than just a literal, slavish following of the code. Understand it. Know what it is about.

Now, let's take this business about process lag. All this *„Don't work a process any longer - ,"* so forth. Well, if you know your processes, of course, you know you're going to work it, you know how long it's going to take for it to produce a process change, and you've got enough sense not to run it another 80 hours beyond that time.

We haven't, in running this, ever let up on it particularly, but an auditor who is trained in this has just pulled a boo-boo - no, not - I beg your pardon, it's not a boo-boo. It was a *„My God!"* He thought he was doing Mimicry with a psychotic preclear. The psychotic preclear got mad at him, so Mimicry immediately dictated that he become ragingly mad and much madder at the preclear. Well, that's quite cute, isn't it?

When we find that on the part of an auditor - we practically murdered the boy. We shot him from guns. He should have known better than this.

Let me say a word on that. I'll tell you again. Never mimic the bizarre, the strange or the unusual in a preclear. Never mimic the bizarre, strange or unusual. Mimic the average, the expected, the agreed-upon behavior of the society. And you'll find out that you are appealing to that last little one-eighth of an erg of power left in the preclear.

And this is agreeing with the awareness of awareness unit - the - that is, the average conduct, the - so forth. And you validate the other by mimicking the bizarre and strange and unusual, you're just giving force and power to his entities and his circuits. All right. He got mad at his preclear. This preclear was spinning so we knew something was wrong. This preclear hadn't been spinning the day before, and this preclear was spinning, so the explanation for one and all seemed to indicate that something bad had happened here. And we finally got a few cross-examinations going and we discovered what had happened.

That wasn't all that happened, but that was merely a flagrant disobedience of the code - very flagrant. You see, he should have been able to have determined that this was wrong simply because it is in the Auditor's Code. It says never get angry with the preclear. Mimicry or no mimicry, he should have determined that it was wrong simply by that.

Well, all morals codes have their shortcomings. All codes of morals - there are arbitraries, there are shortcomings. You find times when it is necessary to get around them and so forth. And you'll find out, however, in training students that you leave the door open one-eighth of an inch on this particular morals code called the Auditor's Code, and they promptly push it open about 2 feet. And then it's wide open. There goes all the sanity in the bank. So it's a good thing to just keep the door shut tight on it. It's been very closely written to agree with the reality of auditing. It is the reality of auditing.

Where we have difficulty with a preclear, you can say this uniformly: If the preclear has had code breaks with existence - preclear's in trouble, he's not Clear, he's not exte-

riorized - he's had code breaks with existence. What code breaks? Auditor's Code breaks.

If this works so effectively in an auditing session, then for heaven's sakes let's recognize with great clarity that these must be fundamental factors which are aberrative in the society.

If you want a dissertation on Scientology and what happens on the fourth or third dynamic that aberrates people, just look at the Auditor's Code. Must be a coordination there. See, we just say that arbitrarily. We don't inspect it any further. We learned in 4 years of auditing that all these things would spin preclears; so therefore we're working on people who have been spun; so therefore this must be what the society does. Just like that.

And we could be real, real, real dizzy about this and say, *„Well, the only thing we have in Scientology is the Auditor's Code. And this explains everything. And all you have to do is memorize the Auditor's Code and you can let the Axioms and everything else go. And if you knew the Auditor's Code, why, then you would know exactly what aberrative factors existed in the society and exactly what aberrated people."* And you'd probably go on with some very long dissertation on this subject. Very cute.

Where that code is concerned, this is probably very truthful. It probably, however - being an arbitrary thing built solely upon observation and entirely lacking in theory - it is the most untheory thing, the Auditor's Code 1954, that you ever ran into. There's no theory behind it. There was no theory utilized in putting it together. Just observation. That's all. No thought involved. So of course it isn't organized. And it'd be an interesting experiment sometime just to teach somebody the Auditor's Code and tell them this was what was wrong with society. And that you run these things out of the preclear or remedy them, and you would then have a preclear who's in very good shape. Maybe it's true. Might be true.

But the Auditor's Code came under my perusal here a few months ago, and I recognized that we had long since been drifting on that horrible thing, an unwritten code. See, we knew what was bad and we knew what was good. But it was an unwritten code, and we didn't have the straight rendition on this code at all.

So I put together these factors which I'd been keeping notes on about 2 millimeters to the left, south-southeast of the medulla oblongata - long notes - and wrote them up. And here in writing Dianetics 1955! I suddenly found out that there was another factor there. There was number 16, that is, *„Maintain a two-way communication with the preclear."*

Well, let me say a little bit more about that one particular factor, maintaining a two-way communication with the preclear.

The darnedest dissertation on communication you ever saw in your life is Dianetics 1955! I mean, it just goes on and on and on; it takes it apart, it stretches it, puts it back together again and weaves it into new and beautiful mats. It takes them apart and makes scrap paper. And it pushes it all together into a solid plastic block and pulls it

apart again. And it's about communication, 1955. It's about nothing else - communication and time.

Affinity and reality are mentioned with the most incidental flick of the index finger that you could imagine. The rest of it, all 50,000 words of it, are devoted to communication. Now, shows you how important communication has become.

A couple of the boys the other day got wildly excited. They just got through watching me audit for the tenth or twelfth time. And I used to say that there are probably a lot of things that I do that I don't know I do, you know, that probably have some bearing upon the case. And I've actually attempted occasional - occasionally an investigation of auditors who were getting results and auditors who didn't get results to find out what factors were present, you see, in the one that weren't in the other one.

Well, so far this has been an absolutely dead end - I mean, just a completely dead-end alley. There wasn't anything I was doing except maybe being friendlier to a person.

And these two guys found something - they found something which is fascinating. Never noticed auditors didn't do this. Well, these two boys went out and they immediately prepped up a couple of staff auditors to do this. And immediately their cases started to make 7-league boot strides. It was that important - cases just kind of hanging on.

They found out that I acknowledged every action and every reply of the preclear. I always acknowledged.

Of course, that's just the natural thing you would do. No, it's not, evidently.

So the preclear walks over and touches the wall and looks at you, and you say, *„Okay, go over and touch the other wall.“* I don't audit that way.

He goes over and touches the wall, and he looks at me. And I say *„Okay.“ „Now go over and touch the other wall.“* He does. He looks at me. And I say, *„Fine.“* When I audit a group, and the group's sitting there and I say, *„Okay now? All right?“* and before I start on a new chain of commands, I give them 4 or 5 *„okays“* sometimes. *„Okay, okay.“* Wake them up, you know; wake them out of it. Pry them out of the process. I'm about to change the processes and I want to give them plenty of notice without giving them

So what I do is acknowledge what they've been doing, see, *„Okay, okay, okay.“* Well, I'm not setting myself as a example. As a matter of fact, the mothers of the town I was raised in, Helena, Montana, would faint if they ever recognized that I ever got set up as a model for anything. I'm sure they would have shot their progeny if they thought this had been the case.

But in this particular case, there was a missing, a missing factor, and this factor was acknowledgment. So we put that in under two-way communication with the preclear. We could phrase number 16 of the Auditor's Code 1954 which reads, *„Maintain a two-way communication with the preclear“* - we could rephrase it and make it even more sharp by saying, *„An auditor must always acknowledge the action or execution of the preclear.“* You got that?

The auditor must always acknowledge completion of an act or a recognition by a preclear. When a preclear does something or says something and completes an action, the auditor must acknowledge.

We find poor preclear is sitting there waiting - if you please - the preclear is sitting there waiting for the auditor to okay it. And the auditor doesn't, so the preclears are being hung up in auditing sessions. They're hanging in auditing sessions, and that is really the only reason you ever have to audit out the auditing. This is amazing, isn't it?

Now, here's one of these little, insignificant, tiny, tiny factors that went along the line and has been going along the line quietly and unobserved here for 4 years - 5 years, really. Just been snoring along. Always done this; never audited any other way. And Barrett and Steves got their long noses into this situation just on the outrageous postulate *„He is probably - he is undoubtedly doing something that other auditors do not do. Now, what is he doing that other auditors do not do?"* They were reading the first book or something of the sort, and it said this in it.

Remember? Trying to find out what you're doing, so you can tell somebody else what you're doing. I mean, that's the big contest. And here 5 years after the fact they find this, evidently, totally insignificant little point. Well, it came up, obviously, because they had just had a tremendous dose of new theory. And that was that the answer is the more important - the answer is the more important thing in a communication. The scarcity of answers gets a guy eventually to a point where he's solving problems. You see that?

In every language of which I have any cognizance, and I have no real knowledge of any language, maybe, except English, but I do have across-the-street, embarrassed wave at several tongues. And in these answer, solution and reply are homonymic or synonyms. This is apparently very close in to the human race at large.

So, there's something germane there to these things.

All a fellow is looking for is answers. That fellow in the session is looking for answers. Then, theoretically, you not acknowledging - he goes over and touches the wall, you see, and then you just tell him to touch another wall - this poor guy is looking for answers, and doggone it, you didn't give him one. So he winds up the end of the session scarcer on answers than he began it.

Well, now this is what we've been auditing uphill against. Now, that's a horrible thing to realize, isn't it? It's just auditors. I've been watching auditors, training auditors. Never mentioned this. Nuts.

All right. Now, let's just look at this and find out that you can get more darn wins this way than you could count. You can get a tremendous number of wins this way - tremendous number.

Now, there are many ways to run answers. But amongst them is not silence. That's not amongst them. Silence is not amongst them. A quantity of silence evidently could do nothing for nobody nohow.

In spite of the 14-day fast they used to tell me about when I was a kid and which I've experienced - you merely get lightheaded after a while and kind of goof off. You get so scarce on answers in that 14 days that you go nuts though you think you're in fine shape. And you join a monastery like I did.

Now, what on Earth here - that we could go so long without hitting this point. Now, here and there, here and there an auditor has been doing this. And they're your real sharpies. See? They're the people, people write in and say, *„Gee, I was audited by Joe. Man, I feel fine. "* They're your sharpies. So I hate to push sharpies and me and others out of the „only one" classification here, but actually they were maintaining a two-way communication with the preclear. And people who would or could maintain a two-way communication with the preclear could get results, but particularly those people that would acknowledge.

The preclear says, *„Mmm!"* You know, he's going, *„Abba-abba, and my mother would be safe on the moon and my mother would be safe in the cellar, and my mother would be safe in a coffin. Vmm!"*

And the auditor says, *„Well, give me some more places where your mother would be safe. "* Rrrr! - wrong clue. *„What happened?"* he's supposed to say at that point.

„What's the matter? What happened?"

„Well, the darnedest thing, there's a skeleton came out and it was carrying a red light and a green light. And it put on a cop's hat and it said „..." You know, standard one."

Now, the next boo-boo that the auditor could pull there is after he's told you all this about this skeleton, the red light and green light and so on, and the auditor listens - he doesn't listen too long. He distracts the preclear's attention if this is going to go on forever. But he does listen to it out because it might make a lot of sense. He doesn't change the process by reason of listening.

But the next boo-boo that could be pulled is, the auditor - the preclear having spoken, the auditor then giving the next auditing command. That's a real boo-boo. The auditor at least says, *„Well, what do you know. Okay. Is it all right now? All right. Let's find some more places where your mother would be safe. "* See?

Two-way communication having been maintained, a sufficiency of answers is existing in the session so as not to increase the scarcity of answers on the preclear who is, basically, simply scarce on answers. And that's that. This is big stuff.

So that line 16 in the Auditor's Code probably should have a little subhead on it. It should have that little subhead and probably be written that way again. Only the book is on tape; you can't dub any additional phrases into tape. So part A would be *„He must ask for any data this preclear seems to have suddenly grasped"* and part B *„He must acknowledge the preclear's completion of an auditing command or delivery of data"* - verbally, that he has to acknowledge. So that'd be parts A and B. It was said someplace or another? Well, it's been completely forgotten.

Well, we've got our Auditor's Code today. And I know it's very strange for me to be talking to you people about Auditor's Code particularly, but remember we've got a

brand-new Auditor's Code. And that Auditor's Code is a compound of experience, conduct in the auditing room.

Now, in a unit of this character, people we have are very accountable for the Auditor's Code. Extremely accountable. A lot of arguments, auditor-preclear arguments. You find the session should have been going on and it's not going on at all; the auditor and preclear are sitting there arguing about whether or not an Auditor's Code break has occurred.

Well, that's an Auditor's Code break for the auditor to argue that an Auditor's Code break has not occurred. That's the one thing an auditor mustn't do, is engage in a big argument about the thing. Okay, so a Code break has occurred. All right. We will do something about it. Fine. We will continue to run the process. That's what we will do about the Auditor's Code break. Don't validate those code breaks, guys. Just don't repeat them. The auditor, he merely has to say, *„Okay, I'll do better next time,“* - anything like this - and continue with the process. And the code break not being validated, you will find preclears who are motivator hungry will be less and less anxious to have code breaks pulled on them.

Okay. So much for this here Auditor's Code. We'll see if we can follow it real closely. Look at it in operation. Maybe some of you might be interested in finding out whether or not this is the fourth and third dynamic, and second dynamic upset that finally winds a fellow up in the first dynamic. Just Auditor Code breaks on fourth, third and second dynamics.

Okay.

(end of lecture)