

COURSE OUTLINE

A lecture given on 2 January 1957

All right. We had ACC 15. And ACC 15 was just about the best ACC we ever had, without any doubt whatsoever.

The case gains during that ACC were not as spectacular as they might have been. They were not as spectacular. And the reason they weren't as spectacular is very, very simple: We did not stress havingness. At that time, we did not have the Havingness Scale in full. And the auditing which was done was good, and it stressed, almost totally, procedure and Learning Processes. And there was very little havingness done. Havingness is a very broad, complicated subject. It would take a full ACC to cover this one subject.

However, in this ACC we're going to cover communication, control and havingness. That's the total of our coverage.

Now, auditing procedure is the reason you're here. Procedure. That is the essence. The most important thing that an auditor does is procedure, which is actually his conduct of the session. There is nothing more important than that. There is no technique more important to you than procedure. But there is nothing in Scientology more important -- nothing anywhere in Scientology more important than havingness. So, if you said „*procedure*,“ you would be covering communication and control. And if you said „*technique*,“ you would be covering havingness -- in essence, the Havingness Scale.

You see how that breaks down, then? I say communication, control and havingness, by which I mean the Havingness Scale. It means a little bit more than it used to mean. And communication and control give us procedure. And the Scale of Havingness gives us technique. And that's the whole works.

It's very interesting, very, very interesting today that the whole of Scientology in its operation and action can be treated with such simplicity. It's sometimes almost fatal to somebody's sanity to shove him this much simplicity. But how I'm going to talk to

you on this subject over the next five weeks, at the rate of an hour's lecture a day, just on communication, control and havingness, of course to us looks, at this time, impossible. But it probably looks to you impossible in six weeks to totally cover this subject. We're going to have to make it complicated enough so that it doesn't collapse on you completely.

In actual coaching, you will find that the communication and control factors absorb nearly all of the attention. Because teaching a person to audit, in terms of procedure as they exist today, is to teach him to audit to such an extremity of perfection, he could be half dead and stand on his head and he would simply do a good job. And when I say extremity, I mean extremity. And two or three of you who were here in the last unit know what we mean by extremity of control. But I don't think they would have imagined that such an extremity could be reached without having taken the 15th ACC.

Now we, of course, have gotten warmed up on the subject. We can teach you to audit to such an extreme of control, the preclear won't even twitch a muscle -- unless we want him to. The preclear says, „*Well?*“ The auditor says, „*Yes?*“

It's quite interesting. Very few people are willing to control another human being to this extent. Therefore, it takes a little learning -- takes quite a little learning.

Now, the truth of the matter is, why anybody has to learn about the human mind comes to us at this stage of Dianetics and Scientology as an incredibility. But when we realize that none of this material -- and I mean none of it, in terms of its relative importances -- was known before 1950, and when we realize that all of the six years of complexities which pursued, each one of them isolated principles, most of which had not been before isolated... Oh, I know that psychoanalysis and rat-ology and stuff like this had said some things, but they also said many other things.

I had somebody telling me one time, „*My goodness, this fellow Krishnamurti, he just covers everything Oh, man!*“

I said, „*You got a book on the subject?*“

And they said, „*Yup. Yup. Oh, yeah.*“ Boy, they had a library.

„*Well, you break me out one book.*“

They broke out one book.

And I said, „*Let's turn to something there that's covered in Scientology.*“

Well, they found a chapter on time. What beautiful profundity. What gorgeous obfuscation. But the statements he made were wonderful. Each one, taken as itself, was a masterpiece. There's no doubt about this -- if you knew Scientology.

I said to this person, who had been studying Scientology for a very long time, „*You say that Krishnamurti has said something there that has been said in Scientology.*“

And this person said, „*Well, almost. Well, look at that sentence there.*“

I said, „*Yes. Look at that sentence there. Now let's backtrack two paragraphs and find out what else he said.*“

And what he'd said two paragraphs before were exactly contradictory to that. And there were several sentences in between, and what he had said there was not punched up at all. In other words, its importance had not been selected. Yes, there were truths. Yes, there were truths. But complexities had collapsed on these truths to such an extent that they could no longer be identified as truths.

And everyone studying that was put on to a marathon of tremendous quantities of data -- tremendous quantities of data -- any datum as important as every other datum. And this brought about a complexity, so that even if they had recognized truths in the middle of these paragraphs, the complexities would have collapsed upon them and they'd have been wiped out. These sentences were beautiful. They were contradictory. They were not clear. And even where a great truth had been delineated, it was given no more importance than fifty other truths in the same series of paragraphs. Do you understand that? So that everything in Scientology has been said, at one time or another, by some philosopher somewhere -- that's true, you see?

Saying something witty was not the task of getting Scientology together. As a matter of fact, I have tried not to write with tremendous poetic aesthetic. (I can write that way. It's my business; I ought to be able to.) Because I found out that the gorgeous poetry only added an obfuscation. When somebody had very little to say, and said it beautifully, he could trap everybody. And when you add too much aesthetic to something, you only complicate the trap.

So I've tried to say the things in Scientology as clearly, as distinctly as possible. And in addition to that -- in addition to that -- have uniformly sorted out the degree of importance that a datum had in relationship to other data. And that is the important work of Scientology: It was separating out the important datum which keynoted other data. In other words, we have been looking for, and discovering, those data amongst these floods of data which evaluated and took apart the floods, knowing that what was wrong with people was the flood.

Now we have found the dikes. What were the central postulates from which all other postulates proceeded? What was the exact state of existence? What is exact delineation in the field of spiritualism? What exactly is the mind? What exactly is a body? From whence did these things come? To what are they going?

Now, those statements have been made and those questions have been asked for fifty thousand years, I'm sure. But for somebody to come along and say, „*Space is a viewpoint of dimension. And this is the definition of space, and all other considerations of space are subordinate to that consideration*“ -- that is doing something different.

Now, the only reason I'm talking to you about this is not to tell you how good Scientology is. You know that. Just trying to tell you that this course will give you many, many, many things. And if it doesn't give you a simplicity of understanding of these principles, and in giving them to you, it doesn't put you in a state where the complexities no longer collapse on these simplicities, then we will have failed in this course.

But the people who fail in this course are myself and your other Instructors. You don't fail in this course.

That doesn't mean that you mustn't assume a certain degree of responsibility for all these things. But it's up to us to put it across to you. And if you give us a nice, happy smile and say, „*Yes, yes I understand,*“ and walk away in a complete pea-soup fog, you'll have done us in. You see? If you don't understand something, say so! If you don't separate something out, say so! If something isn't clear to you that is supposed to be clear, if it doesn't expansively delineate great quantities of data and elucidate enormous numbers of your questions, then we will have to cover it some more. And we must know what those things are.

Although the elementary truths of existence are themselves incapable of being misunderstood, they do bring about a flood of complexity. Because everyone has appended to these basic truths other postulates; other stable data is connected to them. Amongst us, these basic truths are fundamental and pervasive. All of us are operating upon them. But once we step very far away from the simplicities, then we add our own eccentricities to these things. And as a result, what is basically very clear can easily become collapsed upon by material which we know not what of. And that material which we know not what of, we must at least be able to sense in your ability to understand and carry forward these simplicities.

Now, I tell you, the simplicity, just this one, single simplicity -- communication -- to somebody working for Ma Bell, means Boolean algebra, calculus, electronic formulas, mathematics, ad infinitum. It means relay switches, if you please. It means solenoids! Only, how this means communication, we wouldn't know.

There is a book written by somebody I happen to know, who is a very, very brilliant man. Very brilliant, this fellow. In spite of his background, his training and his education, he is still capable of independent creation in the field of machinery, which is an enormous tribute. This is the most overeducated man you ever met. And he wrote a book one time called *The Formulas of Communication*. And the first page is totally devoted to summation signs in integral calculus.

Evidently, just the thought of writing something about communication so confused him that he went directly into mathematics. Just ran away from the whole thing, put it all over into symbols. Never made a statement. Never made a definition. The word communication doesn't even appear until three chapters deep, and yet that's the title of the book. That's a very brilliant man. He knows more about communication than any man ever could possibly know -- abstractly, mathematically and every other way -- but he can't talk. He stammers! Fascinating! Utterly fascinating. He knows all about communication, except what it is.

Communication could be such a fabulously complicated subject that we could sort out nothing but classes of communications here for a year. Classes of communication; modus operandi and means of communication. We could sort this out for a year without ever coming to the end of the list. Communication.

All right. We'll just take an example here. Here is an object which is lying against a table. There is an element of communication present here. The object is in communication with the table. No matter if it is straight up against the table, there still must be understood to be a little space in there, since we can move the object. So therefore, it must be communication. And immediately we're off on the subject of gravity: Why is it sticking to the table?

Now, instead of examining communication, we go off on the subject of gravity. What is the influence of gravity? Then because we can't explain that, we invent a something we call a „*graviton*,“ and we introduce this mysterious particle. And then we say there's some sort of an electronic field that emanates from wood or from earths, that wraps itself around metal in some fashion, and so we get a continuous collapse of this object onto the other object. Are we talking about communication? No. We're talking about gravity. Get how this could be, though. We could start in to talk about communication and wind up with impossibilities on the subject of gravity.

All right. There's a light burning in this room. You know there's a light burning in the room; you can see it! You obviously are in communication with that light. So we say communication with the light, and go on and talk about power rates. See, we say, „*Lights. Light bulbs. Light bulbs cost nineteen cents. They are fed by current which is developed at power plants, which shovel in coal, which is laid down by ancient beds of trees which have been crushed in the earth. And isn't paleontology an interesting thing because there are animals in there too.*“

Now, that's what I mean by data collapsing. We say „*communication*,“ and then we never say a word about it. We're off into fossils, the history of Earth... And here we go, you see? Now, that's how these subjects are normally taught. That is why we can adventure, in six weeks, to teach as much as we're going to teach -- because we're not going to talk about paleontology when we pretend to talk about communication.

All right. We had many of these simplicities already isolated, and many of these simplicities you already know. But I would adventure to say you probably don't know them to an extreme of simplicity.

Communication, to you, very possibly has something to do with verbalization. Verbalization is an added complexity to the subject of communication: symbols. Communication without verbalization is such a simplicity that many people, looking at this, almost collapse. You think I'm exaggerating now, but they can actually sit there for half an hour or so and say, „*Let's see, communication without words... meaning being communicated and no words being communicated. Let me see, how would I say so- and-so without using any words?*“ And worry and worry and worry about it.

What's happening? All this time they are maundering, words are asserting themselves as the communication media. And so on the simplicity of a transmitted meaning -- just that and no more -- words then begin to collapse, and they worry about how to communicate without words. Well, where did the words come in there? -- how to communicate without words. Yeah, but they keep worrying because they're using that little phrase there „*without words*.“ Why worry about the words? It's just an obvious fact that communication is taking place.

We say, how could we relay this idea of „*I am thirsty*“ without saying „*I*,“ without saying „*am*“ and without saying „*thirsty*“? They're liable to go further afield than that and get into sign language. But in essence, everybody to whom we say „*I am thirsty*“ must first be able to read our minds so that they know what to fit the words to. They have to go through the most complicated process you ever heard of to use words. But if anybody says communication is carried forward with words, the moment he believed that, he'd stop talking.

If I assumed for a moment -- I'm fairly good at this sort of thing -- if I assumed for a moment that you didn't know what I was talking about, and that I was talking entirely over your heads, an odd thing would probably occur: My next words would probably be relatively meaningless to you. You would cease to grasp meaning if I merely said words without saying any meaning. You got the idea? Now, there's one that would really get you figure-figuring on it, wouldn't it? -- because it's such a simplicity, that training and other things tend to collapse on it.

Now, you take somebody who has studied Scientology and Dianetics for quite a while, and you find something very peculiar here: You'll find that this person is sometimes harder to teach than somebody you just dragged in off the street. Isn't that interesting? Why should this be? And that's only because the Scientology he knows collapses upon the simplicity he is now given. And Scientology is pretty powerful stuff to collapse.

The fellow off the street has mere cobwebs to collapse on what you're teaching him, you see? But this other fellow has really been (to be colloquial) beefed up. He collapses in terms of solid-lead bricks. What he knows already in terms of simplicity, themselves hold back a considerable amount of communication in terms of confusion.

In other words, he's adapted certain ideas in Scientology, and he's found these are very serviceable. He's found out that they worked. He has proof in the form of pre-clear reaction, and so forth, that he has success; that these things are true. And then, we try to teach him a very, very simple truth -- simpler than all the rest of these things -- and man, that's doing something now. That's doing something. I'm not saying it's difficult to do. I'm just saying that it is sometimes a bit tumultuous, sometimes a bit chaotic. That's all I'm saying.

An ACC student is actually capable of feeling stupider than any FICA student was ever smart enough to know he could be that stupid about. So this we must understand. This we must understand.

Now, one of the things that happens is that an HCA-level course cannot be taught at this level of simplicity. You just might as well machine-gun somebody; just kill him in his tracks. You would put him on a total comm lag. If you said to him, „*Well, I really don't know why you're here to learn auditing. The truth of the matter is, all auditing consists of is communication and control, and all the techniques consist of is a Remedy of Havingness and you've got it. Now why don't you go out and audit somebody?*“ You're so far afield.

He has vaster mysteries to combat. He knows very well that all mothers are good. He knows very well that psychiatry always recommends religion, and therefore there was a God, and there must be, because look at all the churches. And how does that reconcile with the factor of communication? Well, it doesn't even join up. He's in the safe state of being so far afield, you can't even restimulate him.

With an ACC student who has been over the jumps for quite a while, he actually is moved up into a position and category where you give him one of these simplicities, they mean something. Get the idea? But what collapses on these simplicities? What he already knows.

Now, the road out is the road through. You have to increase somebody's knowingness and give him a toleration of increased knowingness before he can do anything -- before anything can be done. If a person believes it is wrong to know, this is the big stumbling block. Therefore, he can't learn. So you'll find that in order to communicate with somebody and in order to control somebody, you have to also handle his learning rate. You also have to handle his ability to learn. Data collapses on him only because he won't look at it. He is unwilling to have the data present itself. And as a result, he resists this data because he believes it is harmful to him in some way. It even gives him a physical sensation. You give him some datum, he partially snaffles a little bit from the corner of this, thing, and all of a sudden he's got a horrible pain in the back of his neck. So he knows learning is dangerous.

Well, one of the factors of control is controlling the rate at which the preclear can learn. You expect him to get cognitions. Well, if you're never going to assist him to increase his learning, how do you ever expect him to cognite? By some necromancy? He's going to sit there in the chair, and this automaticity of cognition is something you, an auditor, are going to depend on utterly without knowing anything about what happens?

Now, you tell an HCA student this and it'd just bowl him right over. He wouldn't be able to figure this one. He'd say, „*Then it'd be impossible to get anybody to cognite.*“ Because he's just got through learning: „*Gee, you run this process just so long and somebody cognites. And he gets the idea of what's wrong or what's right, and he feels good, and he cognites. And that's how long you run the process -- until he cognites.*“ See, he's got that idea; he's done a splendid thing to get that idea. See, that's fine! Except, listen, if you're going to wait for an accidental cognition on the part of somebody who cannot learn, in a lot of preclears you're going to wait for an awful long time.

The man feels this phenomenon of collapse of knowledge. You give him a simple data and all the complicated data starts into restimulation and collapses on it -- puts him into an enormous figure-figure. He knows every time he learns something significant he gets a phenomenon of things falling in on him. He learns this in some vague way.

You have to teach him that it won't kill him. That's all you have to teach him. And there's a specific procedure -- not a technique -- by which this is done, and it's called Learning Processes. Big argument: It is a procedure and it's called a process. Very

simple. Tell somebody, „*One, two, three. Now you say, 'One, two, three.'*” He says, „*You mean you want me..* “

To teach the man to receive a communication, there are several tricky, simple techniques of this nature. To teach him that he needn't necessarily resist your questions, there is a procedure known as Q and Q: You say, „*How are you?*” His reply is, „*How are you?*” You don't let him say, „*I'm fine* “ He has to say, „*How are you?*” Almost kills him after a little while. For a little while it's fun, and then it begins to be rather brutal. You say, „*How far away is that light?*” He says, „*How far away is that light?*”

Now, how rough can you get on Q and Q? Well, it's enough (on an HCA level) to get somebody to say to somebody, „*How far away is that light?*” without getting very much of a specific response. But if we go on much further from this, we get on to this:

You say, „*How far away is that light?*”

And he says, as his Q, „*How far away is that light?*”

And you say, „*No. No. How far away is that light?*”

And he says, „*How far away is that light?*” See?

How far away is that light? The response, of course, is *How far away is that light?* Now, that's an extremity, isn't it? But why is it extreme? Because it's simple. It is an exact rendition. That's it. Q and Q.

So you have your learning procedures, which are part of the communication-control procedures. These are quite amusing. You're going to have a lot of fun with these as we assign them. You say, „*One, two, three,*” to the preclear; he's supposed to say, „*One, two, three.* “ And you say, „*Seven, eight, ten.* “ He says, „*Seven, eight, ten.* “ You say, „*What did I say?*” And he says, „*Seven, eight, ten.* “ Your ultimate in communication, of course, is „*What did I say?*” he's supposed to say. Got this? Total mimicry.

If you ran this on a total mimicry, it'd be quite interesting. But if you start running something on a total mimicry, you have an awful hard time with an auditing session. Because anything you say, he says! You say, „*It's end of session now.* “ He says, „*It's end of session now.* “ He knows very well that he'll be wrong if he says or does anything else than a perfect mimicry.

There's High School Indoc, where you take your preclear and have him audit you. That's a funny thing: you take your preclear and have him audit you. Well, how does he go about this? Well, he goes about this, and all you do is try to stop him. People do all sorts of strange things. They sit down in the middle of the floor and cry. They get hysterical. Sometimes they just laugh. Sometimes they won't even go on. Sometimes they just get apathetic and say, „*You know, I can't audit. I've just realized that. I've just had a major cognition. I've been at it..* “

Well, there are many ways to attack these simplicities, in terms of communication, to get them across. But in final essence, you have communication and control as the procedures... And you know procedures aren't techniques. A procedure is what the auditor does with the preclear, and a technique, of course, is some specific mental,

thetan -- body manifestation which can be addressed from the field of thought. That's all a technique is.

You can have the most wonderful techniques in the world, if your auditing procedure be poor, nothing happens, just nothing happens with the preclear. Even worse than nothing. So, procedure is about 60 percent of it. At least.

Now, you take somebody who's auditing, who is a little bit unwilling to control another human being. And he says, *„Live and let live. That's my motto, you know? We want to keep up ARC in the session, we want all this to be agreeable, we want everybody to be happy.“*

So he's running 8-C: So he says, *„All right,“* he says, *„Now, touch the wall.“* And the preclear touches the wall. And he says, *„That's fine. Let go.“* Preclear lets go. And he says, *„Now you see that wall over there?“* He says, *„Well, walk over to it. That's fine. Now touch it. That's good.“* And the preclear touches the wall with his left hand -- one finger.

And the preclear says, *„You know,“* he says, *„I'm getting a little tired walking around. Do you mind if we sit down and have a smoke?“*

Auditor says, *„Have to keep everybody happy here.“* So they sit down and have a smoke and... That'd be pretty bad. As a matter of fact, you wouldn't get any recovery on the part of somebody.

All right. Let's take the next stage:

Auditor says, *„All right. Touch the wall. All right. Let go of the wall.“*

And the preclear says, *„You know, I... I really work better with my left hand -- left hand.“*

„Well, all right, then we'll use your left hand. All right, now touch the wall. Good.“

„You know,“ preclear says, *„I'd feel a lot better touching objects.“*

„All right. We'll touch objects.“

Seven hundred and eighty hours of this -- no change. That's just an unwillingness to apply an extremity of control, and is the reason why we teach an extremity of control in the ACC.

You'll be taught to do things in the ACC that you will never be expected to do in a routine auditing session. But, oddly enough, if you can't do them you'll have a pc failure somewhere along the line and you won't be able to explain it. You'll say, *„I ran the right process. I know I did. I know I did. I know I did. I know I did. And I worked a long time, and I was very nice to him, and I did everything I could possibly do to help him out, and he just didn't change. Didn't change.“*

Yes, observably you did everything right. But you were not willing to move in on him to the degree that you could. If you were just willing to move in on him to that degree, and you conducted the session exactly the same way that you conducted it, you would get a result from the preclear.

We put a preclear in a terrible position. We put him in a terrible position: We make it impossible for him not to get better. See, we make it impossible for him. We give him

full power of choice on everything except his auditor's activities. He has the fullest power of choice over everything the whole wide world around, except one fellow: his auditor. And no power of choice where his auditor's concerned. Absolute zero.

You've got to remember that. Got to be able to differentiate between giving the pre-clear a power of choice and giving the pre-clear a power of choice over the auditor. You give him a power of choice over the auditor, and the auditor at that moment loses his ability to heal that pre-clear. Loses his ability to heal that pre-clear! No, I'm afraid the auditor has to be an inexorable, irresistible force, meeting a movable object.

Therefore, you yourself have to have a considerable amount of certainty in order to operate at all. You have to have a considerable amount of certainty. So therefore, you have to have a little experience. And you must always -- be willing to apply a complete extremity of procedure.

Preclear, each time he faces the wall, turns around and looks at you to give you an acknowledgment. He's supposed to be running 8- C, which has to do with confronting walls.

You have to be perfectly willing -- completely willing -- to reach over and take hold of his chin, push his face over, confronting the wall, each time he turns his face away from the wall to tell you he's done it. Well, that's not really done socially. You just don't walk around, taking hold of people's chins and turning them this way and that, you see?

The funny part of it is, if you're willing to hold him down on the floor and take hold of a handful of hair in one hand and his chin in the other hand, and make him face that wall in spite of all protests -- if you're willing to do that -- you never have to do it. Get the idea? If you're actually willing to reach over and take hold of the fellow's chin and move his face in against the wall, there's something he senses about all this. And you quite ordinarily don't have to do it, don't you see?

That's why I tell you that it isn't necessarily true that you use all the procedure you will be taught here in auditing pre-clears. It isn't necessarily true. But it is certainly true that when you finish with this unit, I know all of you will be perfectly willing to. I don't say you should work in the direction of increasing your willingness to handle and move around pre-clears, and so on. I won't tell you that. I just tell you at the end of the course you will be able to do it.

All right. Now, I'm going to give you something here that was developed by the training staff. I don't guarantee that these are all parts of auditing, but they are certainly important parts in auditing. And there are a great many things that you might think are important in auditing that aren't; and these data might clarify and classify that for you a little bit.

The main points of auditing: (1) pc; (2) the auditor; (3) the auditing environment; (4) the auditor's ability to be -- not just an auditor -- willingness to be... anything; (5) the giving of a command; (6) acknowledgment of a command; (7) communication bridge; (8) processes; (9) goals; (10) Auditor's Code; (I disagree with the position he has this

in) (11) control; (Should be much earlier) (12) auditor attitude; (13) attention; (14) two- way comm; and (15) auditor's ability to decide.

Now those, more or less, have been worked out, and each one of these points has been subject to a considerable contest between students and Instructors. That's why these points are here. So these evidently are the points which one is expected to know at an HCA level. Now, understand, I told you that was an HCA level.

Well, I tell you that these main points of auditing are reducible in this course, in this fashion: (1) pc; (2) auditor; (3) auditing environment; (4) communication; (5) control; (6) havingness.

Now, on an HCA level, you'd be expected to know these fifteen, don't you see? So we assume that you know all these fifteen right this minute. You know how to give an acknowledgment. You know how to give a command. Well, I'll just go over that -- I'll just go over that very rapidly here.

You know what a pc is. You know what an auditor is. (This is getting awfully ridiculous, isn't it?) You know what an auditing environment is. You know what an auditor's ability to be is. You know how to give auditing commands.

You could all stand some improvement on this, by the way, but you've got a good idea of it. Anybody could stand some improvement on giving a command. I've heard practically no auditors who were 100 percent letter-perfect on giving commands. But you know what it is -- duplicative aspects of it, and so forth. You know, of course, that simplicity -- never give a second order before the first order is executed -- which is the essence in giving commands in auditing or in life. Don't give two orders without getting one done. Confusion is defined as „*a concatenation of orders given before any are executed.*“ That's a confusion.

You know how to acknowledge, which was (6). And (7), you may or may not know everything there is to know about a communication bridge -- almost always have to cover this.

Part of a communication bridge, of course, is you change processes when the process is flat. You have to know when a process is flat in order to use a communication bridge. And a process is flat when the comm lag is at uniform intervals or when a cognition is achieved or when an ability is regained. One, two, three. Boy, that is as precise as something you'd build with a Meccano set, you know? It's when the communication lag's flat, when the preclear gets a cognition (which is a cognition, not a rehash of the bank. Cognition is different, you know. There's a secondhand sort of cognition that isn't a cognition), and the third is, of course, the ability is regained. You ran this process on this fellow who couldn't walk, until he walked: the process is flat -- unless you set up a new goal that you want him to fly with. the same process. Then, you see, it would be unflat now because he can walk but he can't fly.

(8) would be a knowledge of processes. And there are lots and lots and lots of processes -- just tons of them. A knowledge of what a process is; you'd have to know some processes, and so on.

(9) goals. You have to know about straightening out goals. There's many a preclear has walked in and been audited for hours and hours and hours, without ever having had his goals straightened out even vaguely. Didn't know he was supposed to get something out of auditing. Didn't have any hope that auditing would ever do anything for him. He was just there to be audited.

Now, I've spent five hours just asking somebody an interesting question: „*What are you being audited for?*“ It's an interesting process, all by itself „*What are you being audited for?*“ It's a goals process, you see? Every time he tells me some reason he's being audited, I evidently don't buy that and tell him, „*Yes, yes, yes. Well, what are you being audited for?*“ And he starts dreaming them up after a while, and he starts inventing reasons to be audited, and so on, and it's quite interesting. He just deaberrates himself like mad. But it's a simplicity in terms of goals which is not tolerable by lower-level preclears. They simply go mad and fall through the floor or something. They'll just tell you over and over, fixedly, „*I'm being audited because.. I'm being audited because there are.. Saint Bernard dogs bite me all night long!*“

„*Well, all right. Fine. Now, why are you being audited?*“

„*Well, I'm being audited because the Saint Bernard dogs bite me all night long!*“ See? He's just stuck. He's not a case that you can run such a process on. So, goals are something that you attack only when it's feasible to do so, but which you always keep in mind -- in the background a little bit that there's always something about the preclear and goals. Always.

You could have him „*Mock up a future. Good. Mock up another future. Good. Mock up another future. Good. Mock up another future.*“ The only reason a fellow is in present time is he doesn't have any future. I mean the only reason he's stuck back here in present time, if you get the idea, is he hasn't any havingness on the future. If he had the havingness of his future, he would be up into that portion of the track.

And we get (10) Auditor's Code. And of course, you know your Auditor's Code. Boy, if you want to get murdered in this unit, just forget the Auditor's Code. The Auditor's Code was primarily developed in units such as this. It belongs peculiarly with the ACCs. It belongs everyplace else too, but peculiarly with the ACCs. The only time we've ever had somebody have trouble with preclears, really, was when the Auditor's Code was flagrantly thrown overboard. We get it thrown overboard once in a blue moon.

All right. (11) he has here as control. And for our benefit... Ah, only those of you that were in the 15th ACC would know anything about this. I mean, it's very easy to say control is start, change and stop. Very easy to say control is this and control is that; but doing control on an extreme level opens one's eyes very thoroughly.

Someday, why, you're standing down on the street corner as an old lady starts across the street, and you decide that she's running into traffic. And she shouldn't be crossing the street at that moment, so you just have her step back on the curb. (You're forty feet away, you see?) And she simply stepped back on the curb; didn't have any-

thing to say about it at all. If you were really good at control, you wouldn't care what you were controlling, or whom.

All right. And (12) is auditor attitude.

And (13) is handling of attention -- the preclear's attention. Very often preclears look like they're giving you attention and they aren't at all; they're auditing something else somewhere else. Which is quite curious.

(14) is two-way comm -- when to shift into two-way comm. If anybody blows a session on you, you failed to introduce two-way comm. This person actually blew, actually went to the door and said he wasn't going to be audited anymore by you, then you must have been about five minutes late in getting in there with two-way communication. There must have been signs that told you that you should have used two-way communication, and those signs must have appeared minutes before you started using it. And a very intelligent use of two-way communication carries a session along with great smoothness. Somebody who would blow all sessions everywhere still stays in session.

At the right moment you ask him, „*Well, do your feet hurt now?*“ Hasn't got anything to do with the process.

And he says, „*Well, no. No. They're feeling pretty good now.*“ You don't care anything about whether his feet hurt or not. But you knew that there was just a little tension building up there, things were getting just a little bit automatic, or you were getting a little bit unreal. And so you just used some two-way comm to put the session back together again. And when you use two-way comm intelligently, you don't have bad things happen to preclears.

Modern techniques -- they can blow up on these modern techniques, by the way. They can just go boom! You run something like Stop-C- S on somebody that's just... Pick some bird off the street. You know, you saw him walking down the street, and every time he passed a house, why, he said, „*Fascists!*“ You know? And he walked down the street, and he looked up the next time and he said, „*Fascist!*“ and so on. Just find some average citizen and grab him and start running Stop-C-S on him. He'll plaster himself all over the ceiling.

Well, that's because two-way comm was omitted: You didn't tell him what you were going to do, you didn't give him any warning, you didn't give him any chance to relax or inspect his environment or his future, or anything else; you just slammed right straight into a process. And, of course, that process is capable of overwhelming anybody's psyche -- whatever a psyche is.

Now, (15), the auditor's ability to decide, here. Of course, his decisional ability must be high. He must be able to decide which to do what, when. He must be able to decide the technique to use, what's going on here, what he should do about it, and that sort of thing.

There's another one that you could add to all this, is not to be in a state where you have to audit people because... See? That's a miserable state. That's a miserable state.

You know why husband-wife teams don't work, by and large, is because one of them is so accustomed to the other one's aberration that he has to audit her or she has to audit him on wasting crullers, or something of the sort. You know? Becomes a life-or-death proposition, the cruller part of existence. And that absolute, gripping, obsessive necessity to get that session -- get that out, always winds up with never getting anything out except an argument.

The truth of the matter is that you don't have to have an aberration on how bad man is to be a good auditor. It's quite the reverse: you're a good auditor if you don't have one. I've told you many times -- you've heard me many times say that if you didn't really have to audit people up or down, and could do either, you're terrific. You'd be fantastic. With what relaxation can you dance the tightrope. There's no pressing emergency, necessity level on it.

You get some preclear whose money you have to have, you get much the same reaction. You've got to get the result! And that's the person you never get any result on. It isn't necromancy. It isn't that you press too hard. It's that you cater too much to the bank -- you pay too much attention, you got too many curves thrown at you, and you think you have to follow each one of these down, and so on.

All right. Now that, in essence, is the state of this instructional curricula... curricula. (We're probably going to have several curriculums.) So these curricula will obtain to truth as much as possible. And the truth is that an auditor has to know communication and control, be able to administer an extremity of procedure with great deftness and relaxation, and he has to know the most important series of techniques and be willing to use them. Of course, the most important series of techniques that we have center around what we call the Havingness Scale.

Well, that's the length and breadth of this course, and may you never be the same again.

Thank you.

Thank you.

[End of Lecture]