

THE NEW AUDITOR'S CODE

Class VIII #18 - 6810C14: Transcript of Taped Lecture by L. Ron Hubbard.

[*applause*] Well here we are coming down to the end of the course. Down toward the bitter end of the course. I haven't done your folders today. So I don't know whether you will leave clean or not. [*laughter*] You will be happy to know that the two folders which were offered in lieu of the examination, on one of them the whole course's auditing was delivered by John Purcell in a matter of one hour, to a very well done. [*applause*]

Very amusing on that one, the pre OT said when he went to the examiner, "And when I started it I didn't even know if I was a Straightwire release." [*laughter*]

And on the other one, and on the other one, I knew a bug existed on the case, one way or the other. And I handed it out with a completely straight face, and what needed to be done was the full IV rundown, and I knew very well the case needed a repair action before it could be done. The auditor did start the session, and then suddenly realized he had better do a repair, so he ended off, did another C/S, and carried on with it, also to get a well done. [*applause*]

So, very good. Now let's see. What number lecture is this? (*Eighteen*) Lecture number eighteen. The Class VIII Course, Sea Org. And the date? The last time I looked it was the what? (*Fourteenth*) Fourteenth of Oct. AD 18. Very good.

This lecture starts out with a rewrite of the Auditor's Code. I apologize to those who have gone to a great deal of trouble memorizing the Auditor's Code. [*laughter*] But you must realize that the Auditor's Code was many, many, many years out of date. Because it talks about flattening three comm lags of equal length, and so forth. Whereas we have moved up into a different strata of approach, so the Auditor's Code has to be realigned into the field and area of Standard Tech. It now has, the Auditor's Code now has twenty five clauses, and is in a different form. It's in the form of an oath. And it's actually HCOB ... HCO Policy Letter of 14 October AD 18, which will be in *Auditor* 43. It's for you, and will be issued to you tomorrow. And it's to all auditors in the world, since it doesn't just apply to Class VIIIs. And you having a copy of this can drive it home a bit.

So, I'll read it to you, and take up its various points. It's the Auditor's Code; Auditor's Code AD 18. In celebration of one hundred percent gains attainable by Standard Tech, it begins. And then it says, "I hereby promise as an auditor to follow the Auditor's Code. Number one. I promise not to evaluate for the preclear or tell him what he should think about his case in session." Now that clarifies that. [*laughter*] The other one, you could tell a fellow he needed auditing. But the word evaluate is, very often gets in the road of an academy trainee. He doesn't quite know what it's all about, so he just passes it by.

Give you an example of evaluation. "No, that's not the cognition you should have there, it's... " Well God, these things do happen you know? I mean, these things do happen. Somebody doesn't understand this, and wild things happen. "I don't think that you have completed the List because you should put *drug fiend* on it" in Listing & Nulling. [*sniggering*] I have actually seen auditors sit and suggest items for a pc's List. Now it's quite one thing to make a prepared list, and if it's it, it's it. And if it isn't it, it isn't it. But it's quite something else under Listing & Nulling to suggest that the preclear put down three or four more items. He's Listing "**Who or what has Suppressed you?**", and the auditor says, "You should put your mother on the List, and you should put so on, and you should put so on." I know it sounds absolutely impossible, but it has happened in the past. "The usual reaction to this process is so and so, so now you should... " "The manifestation

which you're exhibiting at this moment is normally considered insane." *[laughter]* It can get pretty damn wild.

Now this is best understood as being an opposite to what was laughingly called psychoanalysis, developed in the late 90's, along with other oddities. And the psychoanalyst, he operated this way. He would say, after he'd had the fellow talking for one hour, or four hours a week for a year, to find out whether or not he could help him, why the fellow would finally remember somebody who had suggested some sexual action to him, which was the whole target of the year's conversation, when he was three. And just about the moment he would think of this, the analyst was supposed to jump up and say, "That! That's what's wrong with you, and now this means this so and so, and it means this and this, and it means that and that and that! Now do you understand that? Now if you're very careful after this you will be perfectly sane. That's all." See? "Now we can enter on the long one, which is five years at four hours a week." I'm not joking. That was standard procedure.

That went so far, and entered into this, and when I taught, I think it was something like twenty one psychiatrists something about Dianetics in Washington D.C., they were leading psychiatrists of that area by the way in the nation, these birds listened very avidly, only they could never get past the introductory lecture. They didn't, they didn't know that they didn't know, and they were in a very astonished sort of state. And they listened to this over and over.

And about the third lecture, which was I was just giving the same introductory lecture every night. And they were supposed to then have some Dianeticists who were going to show them how auditing was done. And how you ran engrams. And how you really did this stuff. But they never got to that. They just got to this introductory lecture. They were sort of frozen state of astonishment. And finally, after three or four lectures, one of these birds, a psychoanalyst, he went back out of the lecture, and he went back and he used it. God knows. He used it. He'd never seen an auditing session in his life, see? But he used it on this paranoid that he had been dealing with for years, and he came back, and he was madly enthusiastic. Boy, this Dianetics really worked. "I used that return mechanism you talked about, and I actually got him returned to an area where he was lying in his crib. And, he had dirty diapers, and his father wouldn't change his diapers. And I could point out to him, right at that moment, that that's why he hated his father!" *[laughter]* What I'm telling you is actually word for word, verbatim, an actual incident.

Now that sort of thing can go on. And people are so used to giving advice and telling people what to think that the reverse is quite different from what was normal procedure. So therefore it leads the line. "Not to evaluate for the preclear, or tell him what he should think about his case in session." And it is a very necessary bit. If you ever want to see some preclear spin, it's, it's on that one. He can spin. And that is why, by the way, in psychoanalysis, one third of the patients in the first month of processing committed suicide. And it's probably just this evaluation plug. And then the analyst said, "He came to me too late." That was his standard response to this. They always came too late. I think if they'd come at the year of one year old it would have been too late.

What is not generally known about older practices is they did not have the target of making somebody sane. They didn't have any of these targets. They didn't have the target of making somebody brighter, or more sane. They concluded that a person, once he had an IQ, he had an IQ, and it was never going to change, and it never would change, nothing could change it. And you would ask these birds what they were doing all this for, and they really didn't know.

So you therefore find it's rather difficult to understand them, and the point of difficulty in understanding is a very simple one. It's because you are assuming that they have a goal or target of making somebody sane or making somebody better. And they don't have that goal. What goals they have God knows, I have interrogated them many times. The only trouble is, when I talk to them they generally go into an hypnotic report of some kind or another. They go, *gong!* And so forth. Weird. They, another practice that was in that field is most of their practitioners came from institutions.

And they would take somebody who was an institutional case and he would become interested in the subject, and then he would be trained. And that is, was, it. Now you think I'm joking, but that happens to be the truth. I counted noses on them one time or another in a certain area and found they'd all been institutional cases. And many of them go back into the institution after they've been practicing a short time. That was what psychoanalysis and what they call psychiatry and so forth was all about. It wasn't a question of making anybody better. I don't know. It seems to have been some kind of a dramatization. Perhaps a dramatization of R6, 'cause there is a psychiatrist in R6.

But I will point this out to you about this particular area – I will point this out. That the word psychiatrist is misused and mis-named. And has been borrowed falsely, and is falsely used. So is the word psychologist. That is false, a false name, which is improperly used. Because the word *psyche* means soul in any dictionary, and a psychologist is a student of the soul, and a psychiatrist is one who treats the soul. Both of those groups using those two terms at this particular time, alike say in psychology they don't know what it means. That's a fact. That's in the textbooks. They don't know what this word means. And they do not treat the soul, but in the next three minutes of play, invalidate it. It came in with a Professor Wundt of many a year ago. 1879, Leipzig Germany. That man was, the whole modern psychology actually came in with this fellow Wundt. And he said man was an animal. And he had no soul. And they called it psychology. Do you see? So the word is a complete misnomer and they have no right to it.

Similarly, the word psychiatrist is a complete misnomer. They have no right to it. Nowhere in the world is the title psychiatry legalized. That is not legally held by anybody. They hold the title by reason of a medical doctor internship. And in most laws, anyone who is permitted to administer medicine is permitted legally to treat the insane. So the medical doctor who administers medicine is the only one who is actually permitted to treat the insane. These other fellows have to have a medical certificate. The medical doctor, by the way, would very happily get rid of all of these boys. He doesn't want them. That is actually the state of mental healing as it is.

Now it shows you that we have to put this in an Auditor's Code, right up to the front of the line, that there have been fantastic abuses in this particular field. So therefore, therefore an auditor in training should understand that thing pretty well. And I have found auditors being trained at level zero and so forth, who had been over it, who had read it, who didn't know how you could invalidate anybody, or how you could evaluate anybody. And these fellows, these fellows were doing it. One way or the other.

Now one of the ways of evaluation is by an expression. You can evaluate by expression. You can hold your nose or something, you know? Or frown in some peculiar way. And the preclear now knows he isn't doing correctly.

Now, the second one, is "I promise not to invalidate the preclear's case or gains in or out of session." Now invalidation is the think level of hitting. If anybody has any idea of what invalidation means, it's a think level of hitting. And instead of hitting the fellow you

invalidate him. Instead of taking a maul to his skull you say "You are a bum." So it's not very difficult to understand. But if you go around telling people their cases are bad, they aren't doing well because their cases are bad, and that they haven't had any gains and so on, you can fold them up pretty badly. I've seen them very, very badly folded up, and I've seen where invalidation of case, coming up on later sessions, was a very heavy hold up on the case.

Now you can find other things wrong with a person, rather than to invalidate his case. "Yeah!" you say, "Well the reason you aren't doing well is because your case is in terrible condition, and why don't you get it fixed up?" Very often husbands and wives will get involved in what they call Scientology fights, and start using terminology and invalidation of this particular line and so on. And if you're very wise, don't do it. But particularly that's something an auditor mustn't do.

Now, three is "I promise to administer only Standard Tech to a preclear in the standard way." That puts you in the running. Now I decided I'd give you some big choppers, you know? Some big teeth that you could come down with.

Now four, "I promise to keep all auditing appointments once made." Now the reason that that is in there, is I have seen some cases have a very bad time of it, and I know of one case currently that is having a very, very bad time of it, simply because the auditor said he would be there to audit him at such and such an hour, and he drifted in late, and this guy started to self-audit, and all kinds of wild actions have occurred from that particular point forward. It is a bad Code break. After a pc has sat around for a half an hour, waiting for the auditor, his case is so damned stirred up that there isn't very much you can do about it very often. He's, he's impatient, he's angry, he's ARC broken, he's this and that. Well the reason he gets this way is he puts his, sort of his case on a time schedule. Alright, it's supposed to be, it's supposed to be nine o'clock and the auditor's supposed to be there at nine o'clock. And he's supposed to be there at nine o'clock, and so his case is all ready to fire at nine o'clock, see? And then the auditor doesn't arrive till nine twenty, and the case actually will be found at this moment on a protest or on a stop. And they're actually very hard to audit when appointments are not well kept. But you notice it says appointments once made. So the reverse of it, of course, is damn it: *Don't make appointments you don't think you can keep.*

Alright, number five. "I promise not to process a preclear who has not had sufficient rest and who is physically tired." Now the background of this, is one time I drew a coordination back in the Wichita Dianetic Foundation. A tremendous influx of institutional cases were being thrown at Dianetic orgs way back when. A Dianetic auditor of those days got so that he could process a psychotic standing on his head. It was easy as pie as far as he was concerned. They all cut their teeth, because for some reason or other a great many institutional cases came in, and there was no proviso that they shouldn't be audited by Dianetics at that time, and so the Foundation did audit them. And it was a very bad show. And it messed things up most gorgeously. It wasn't that the cases weren't handled, oddly enough. Those cases were handled left and right and center. But very often they were sent in as bird dogs. And they were sent in to spin. They had already received some post-hypnotic suggestion under drugs that they were to go to a foundation and then, when audited, were supposed to spin. This isn't me talking through my hat. That's what was supposed to happen to them. And we had one case where the parents of the girl showed up about forty eight hours later expecting if the money had been accepted and that she was being processed, and the girl had spun, and that they could then, you know, lay it in with an egg, an axe. Well, they were so stupid as to send in the lawyer's check as her

payment. And this girl came in and nobody could figure out where she came from. And she was obviously spinning madly. And so, no sign-up was done of any kind whatsoever. They put the money aside to be refunded and sent the girl off to a motel or something like that to wait for somebody turning up, because they figured somebody would turn up. And in forty eight hours, sure enough, her parents turned up. Wrath, you see? "What have you done to our daughter to drive her crazy?" Well you see, we hadn't – nobody had done anything to her daughter.

Nobody'd touched the daughter, but she had spun. Not because she was refused auditing, but because she'd been set up to spin. Don't think that post hypnotic suggestion and that sort of thing was not known to these guys. They knew all about this. And I've seen at least two or three cases directly attributable to this.

Now therefore, every once in a while a case like that will show up. Now the funny part of it is, not that they're bird dog type case, just the psychotic. And you don't detect it. After all you're not supposed to be able to detect it. And these next two are the only times I've ever seen them spin. So I've done a coordination. I've done a coordination. And that one, physically tired, and six, "I promise not to process a preclear who is improperly fed or hungry." And those characters only spun when they either hadn't had anything to eat or when they hadn't had any sleep. And that is the trouble with a psychotic: they can't eat, and they can't sleep. Those are the two things they have a great deal of trouble doing.

And if you process one of them when he hasn't eaten and he hasn't slept, you'll have very bad luck indeed. I'm not saying you should ever process one. But I'm just saying, whereas, if you can get them to sleep and you can get them to rest, and you can get them to eat something, oddly enough they can be processed. They very often present no more problem than other preclears.

People are worried about electric shock. The only reason we say anything about electric shock, electric shock cases coming in. It's not that we can't process electric shock cases. They've been given the old yo heave back into R6, where electric shock is gorgeously advertised. The psychiatrist is supposed to electric shock people. He does in R6. See? And the society's just dramatizing this, don't you see? Well it's tended to put the bird into R6 to a marked degree, and the rest of it is, is he is already under some tremendous mental duress of some kind or another. And very often, still while you are processing him, unbeknownst to you, still under treatment. And you get the wildest *bing-bing* of mixed therapies, which is also in this, and so on, and there just isn't any therapy involved with it. It's just a method of punishing somebody.

It's like the fellow who was asked, a psychotic who was given a prefrontal lobotomy, and he was exhibited to a medical convention, and somebody asked him on the side, "Well, what have you learned all about?" They were just talking about what a marvelous recovery it was. The guy was a screaming mad man, you know, all this. And the psychotic, who apparently hadn't been talking to anybody or other, said out of the corner of his mouth in reply, "I've learned to keep my mouth shut." [*laughter*]

So anyway, it is the no sleep, no rest, is the time he'll spin. Now if you want to really put length of time in a session, process a perfectly sane person who hasn't had any sleep for about twenty four hours. You're going to have a long session, because the body is a sort of an electrical machine anyhow, and it starts to drain down anything he can put out. And it's a, it's a hard fight. It's a hard fight. It lengthens the time in session if he's had no sleep. And also, if he's ever going to get into any trouble or make an error in the session, now he's likely to make an error in the session, and so is the auditor, why it goes in sort of

deep. And it's very hard to repair. So the wise thing to do is to size up your pc. Has he eaten? Has he slept? "You haven't. Well very good. Come back some other day when you have." And that way, you keep it up, and keep out of trouble. Probably all the trouble you'll get into with pcs is right in those two. You know, insufficient rest and they haven't eaten.

If you were to process somebody in the morning before he'd had his breakfast, or before he'd had anything to eat at all, you'd find out his processing reactions were quite different. Processing has something to do with the electrical currents of the body, or something like this. And a fellow who hasn't eaten apparently isn't doing enough with his oxygen or something. It's tied up with basal metabolism. And you could get very technical about the whole thing. Actually there's a way you can test one of these on one of these meters. If you ask the guy to take a long breath [*breathes in then out loudly*] while he's holding onto the cans, and if you then get a long fall, he's eaten.

But if he takes a long breath [*breathes in then out loudly*] and lets it out, and the needle doesn't drop, don't audit him. He hasn't had anything to eat. Or he's very physically exhausted. Interesting, huh? It's just an interesting phenomenon.

It's not that the machine accurately measures basal metabolism or something like that, it's that it does react in that fashion. Did you ever see a preclear yawn and then see a long fall? That's why you should put yawn in your administration. Also cough. Naturally cough would fall because there's a physical convulsion with regard to it. But you don't often notice that the yawn produces a fabulous amount of surge. Well if it produces a large surge you know your pc has eaten and he's slept very well, in spite of the fact that he's yawning. There's somebody yawning now. Ok. Those two, those two, when I see those two violated and so forth, my hair stands on end.

Because it means that the auditor who violates those two is one of these fine days going to wrap a preclear around a telegraph pole. And one day I noted in an auditing session that the auditor said at the end of the session, which he'd apparently known all along, that the gains weren't very good because the preclear had only had one hour's sleep in the last twenty four.

He'd apparently known this the whole session, and it hadn't affected his judgment as to what gains to expect. He shouldn't have expected any gains at all. But what stood my hair on end is the person he was processing had just come to my attention as once upon a time an electric shock case in an institution. Brother, he didn't know it, but that auditor was riding right along the edge of that cliff in a motorcycle at ninety miles an hour, the rocks falling down into the chasm with every spin of the wheel. Nuts! So, best way to stay out of trouble in that direction is, has he eaten? Slept? Good. Fine.

Now, here's the next one. "I promise not to permit a frequent change of auditors." The funny part of it is that you will find, that after you've been through about three auditors on a preclear, he may very well get sort of nervous and queasy. And the lower the state of case the more nervous he's going to get. And he, well a wog just starting out, he would feel, if you gave him on his first sub-zero levels, if you gave this guy three auditors in a row he'd feel he'd have to get anything he was going to say off to them all over again. He'd have to tell each one about himself all over again. And it'd make a rather hideously anxious sort of session. "Does this fellow know me or doesn't he know me?" And then he would also go so far as to think maybe he had to do all the processes over again too. There's all kinds of kooky things happen. So insofar as possible, particularly the worse off the case, insofar as possible keep the same auditor. Now this mostly gets violated in review.

Now let me show you this oddity. Review gets the worst cases. It's only the case that's messed up and in trouble that really gets into review, right? So he has a review on Monday with auditor A, Tuesday with auditor B and Thursday with auditor C. Well now if it was all on the same cycle of action more or less, you would find he was very confused indeed. You've actually impeded his case gain. And once more, if you did this to a psychotic without knowing he was one and so on, he would probably spin. So it is actually better, in review, if you've got three auditors in review or something like this, or more, it is better to wait 'till that auditor. It is better for the review receptionist to see who was auditing him last time, and put him on that auditor's schedule, and know when that auditor's going to be free, and tell him to be there then. Not to backlog him, 'cause it can be done in the same afternoon.

This is, this is just good sense. But it's something you should caution a receptionist or somebody who isn't used to scheduling people, and so on, that doesn't mean anything to them. They just throw the folders around this way and that, see? It's something to caution them about.

Now it's not good enough to maintain on duty one auditor who does one session a week, just because somebody started a session last year and you can't change the auditor. It's not a good enough reason not to give a session because that auditor's no longer in the organization. That's not, it's not good enough for that. Well what I'm talking about is, is a frequent, a *frequent* change of auditors. Every time the guy gets a list, why he gets some different auditor. He's always being audited by a different auditor. And next time a different auditor. You can unstabilize him. And actually, your processing is so swift these days that it's very simple to schedule the same auditors. Simple, simple, simple. And the only reason you've been shifting auditors around in a class and so on, is to give one another practice. And so on. And to that degree it's tolerated. It's actually been too much, done too much, right on this class.

So that was number seven. Number eight, "I promise not to sympathize with the preclear, but to be effective." Notice this is changed. Now masked under that is a custom and habit which Saint Hill gets into periodically. Saint Hill does alright lots of the time. But every once in a while I've noticed that amongst the students, all missed withhold become ARC breaks. They won't pull a missed withhold on each other, all they'll do is run ARC breaks on each other. In other words, as students, sort of their mutual rudiments go out, don't you see? So you can ...

I've seen this go and happen, and then be busted up, and then happen again, and then go again so many times that it's a natural sort of phenomenon. A certain group starts to get sympathetic. It's what they do. See? So, they smash up each others cases actually.

Maisie Ann, day after day has had this howling missed withhold from her instructor. Her supervisor, see? Day after day she exhibits the manifestation of an ARC break. Day after day the guy who is auditing her pulls an ARC break because he sympathizes with her, because he realizes that anybody should be mad at that supervisor. It's on a "you poor thing" basis. And will actually go on and continue to pull ARC breaks. But there isn't an ARC break in the lot. It's a missed withhold. And the person doesn't recover.

Now if you start, there's a lot of this on record. If you start sympathizing with the pc about how badly his mother has treated him, or something like this, or sympathize with his hard lot, you're actually admitting that you can't do anything about it.

Because the three cycles of doing something for somebody who is having trouble are first and foremost, be effective. Cure it up. Handle it. Well if you can't cure it up and handle

it, you can make him comfortable. That's the second stage. If you can't cure it up or handle it you can make him comfortable. And if you can't make him comfortable you can sympathize with him.

It's that low grade an action. So instead of sympathizing with Maisie Ann about how bad off it all is, and how she's being treated, and so forth and so on, be effective. Maybe she is being badly treated. Well don't stand around and sympathize with her. Make sure that the ethics is in better in that area. And if, if it's her, well make sure she gets audited and somebody pulls the missed withhold. You know, be effective. Don't stand around on the beautiful sadness of sympathy.

When auditor's start that, boy, you can just kiss your gains goodbye. And your students no longer start making wins in the academy, or at the Class VI course. Pc's start going up in smoke. Actually it's a marvelous method of putting somebody at effect. "Oh you poor thing." Same thing as saying, "You've been overwhelmed." Same thing as saying, "You are the effect." Do you see? "You are the effect."

Alright, number nine. "I promise not to let a preclear end session on his own determinism, but to finish off those cycles I have begun." That means that if a pc blows the session the auditor is remiss for not finding, noting when it happened, the ARC break, and not handling it before it resulted in a blow, not noting and finding the missed withhold that is going to make him blow. Do you understand? Those are the only reasons a pc ends session on his own determinism. At the same time, that precludes that the auditor's TRs are going to be sufficiently smooth so that he can even be understood, and so that he is auditing. Remember it is an Auditor's Code.

It's a very bad thing to let a pc end a session on his own determinism. Actually you can see an ARC break coming that is going to wind up in a blow, for as long as an hour and forty five minutes before it happens. Doesn't speak of a very alert auditor. Certainly it's detectable ten or fifteen minutes before it happens. It never happens suddenly. And it's a flagrant session ARC break which is handled with the List 1. So what the hell? I mean, the auditor wouldn't be very effective if some preclear blew session. And then when the preclear blows session, he's just left parked, right there. And it's either got to be picked up by somebody else, or something effective has got to be done in some other quarter, and so on.

Once in a while a preclear'll walk out of session just because he can't stand it anymore. There are silly auditor errors pulled by some complete, untrained bird. Like, four auditing commands, which are all different, all spewed out in a row, with the pc trying to answer one or the other of them, and then refusing to tell the pc which one he's supposed to answer. I mean, the outness of this kind of thing on a very, very unprofessional co-audit level and so on, can be pretty kooky. And sometimes a preclear would end session just on a matter of self preservation. But, this understands that the auditor has within his power the ability to continue to handle and continue the session. And it is an Auditor's Code. Not an amateur's.

Ten, "I promise never to walk off from a preclear in session." Now this is one of the serious things that has happened from time to time. The auditor simply gets up and walks off. Leaves the preclear sitting in the middle of an engram or an unfinished cycle or something like that. The auditor gets up and walks off. Yes, it has happened.

Eleven, "I promise never to get angry with a preclear in session." Now that I have seen spin pcs. And it's about the only time I've ever seen a pc spin. The auditor became furiously angry with the preclear in a session. He must have been some auditor. He was

up in Spokane or some place. And this pc, this pc traveled a couple of thousand miles in a total spin to get to the organization and get the thing handled, and so on. But all that had happened, he'd just gone into a rage at her in session. She wouldn't answer the auditing command, and for no reason at all he went into a rage. ARC broke the auditor or something. But it can have very serious consequences.

Twelve, and here's a new one. It is, "I promise to run every major case action to a floating needle." Gone is your old three equal comm lags, and so forth. Number twelve, "I promise to run every major case action to a floating needle."

And thirteen, "I promise never to run any one action beyond its floating needle." That catches it both ways and the middle, doesn't it?

Number fourteen, "I promise to grant beingness to the preclear in session." It doesn't say, I don't promise to go on tip toe around, whenever I'm around the preclear when I'm out of session. Let me read that one again. Fourteen, "I promise to grant beingness to the preclear in session." It's modified. It's *in session*. But I have seen auditors treating preclears as though they were still in session when they're out of session, and I've seen preclears sort of hanging the auditor with the fact that they're his pc out of session. It's unfair and goofy in both ways. And so on.

I've even gone so far as to occasionally tell a preclear who tried to continue the session after the end of session, "You are not now in session." And they sometimes blink, and say, "Yeah, that's right." I didn't say, "Bugger off." But I might have. That's in session. It's in session. Sometimes you get a pc hangs himself around your neck. God help us.

Fifteen. And this is a different and a new one. "I promise not to mix processes, the processes of Scientology with other practices, except when the preclear is physically ill, and only medical means will serve." Boy that is open to a lot of interpretation I imagine. But the net result of all of this is, that before you could have misunderstood it to the degree that the guy couldn't possibly have had his leg set if he was being processed. You see, an extremity of that character could happen. You'd better have arteries tied up and legs set, because bodies are rather inhuman things [*laughter*].

It doesn't mean that when a preclear is sufficiently ill, and he won't recover, that you shouldn't process him at all. Doesn't mean because he's being given medical treatment you should abandon him. I'll tell you something funny in this particular field. The original experiments, way back. 1945. The original experiments on this line determined that function monitored structure. In other words, *function ran structure*. That was a big lesson. Actually, endocrine compounds like hormones and so on, could be given to somebody. Well that's physiological. I mean, you know? You can give him hormones and so on. Well he should have responded in some fashion to this. And then, after they were mentally unburdened of their problems or troubles, it would work. But it wouldn't work. In other words, the wild variable was that hormones and certain preparations, and by the way it was undertaken with people who were just released from Jap prison camps who had been starved during the better part of World War II in Japanese prison camps. And they were coming in to Oak Knoll Naval Hospital. And it was very difficult to handle these boys, because they were very badly deranged. They had been subjected to brutality, the like of which nobody ever heard of. And they weren't really treated as prisoners of war at all. They were just absolutely inhumanly butchered. And these fellows were carrying a terrific amount of mental stress, so that on some of them you would give them preparations, like amino acids, which is the acids of protein, so maybe they could begin to digest their food again. Or something like that. Wouldn't work, you know? Wouldn't work. Wouldn't work.

Now you go along and let them tell you some of their troubles, or *ah*, give them a sort of an orientation, you know. Make them realize they are back in the States now, and that camp is behind them, you know, sort of bring them up to present time. Give them the same amino acid, give them the same hormones, [*snap*] they recover. Visibly true, but it determines the mind runs the body, the body doesn't run the mind. Now older theory was that the convolutions and contortions of the brain, malformations of genetics, and other things like that, is what monitored sanity.

Damn little to do with it. Because there's enough coordination there they could imagine that they were associated. So this is, this is interesting, this is interesting from this standpoint, because it brings you up to this one. The guy's on penicillin, but his lumbosis won't cure up. He's got pneumonia. He actually can be on penicillin and it isn't handling the thing. He isn't getting any better. Or he's getting better very, very slowly indeed.

Now he was so ill, before he went on any antibiotic, that he couldn't stir. But now that he's on the antibiotic he can stir around a little bit. Do you follow? Now, this magic can occur. Now that he can pay attention, he's not running a high fever, or something like that. But he isn't getting any better. He's come up just that little bit, and he's stuck right there. You can audit the engram and the penicillin works. I've seen this. I've seen this and done some work with this.

It's the most miraculous thing you ever cared to see. I mean, the fellow's been hanging fire for three weeks and they're starting to step up the penicillin to a million units an hour or something like this you know? He isn't getting any better. He doesn't improve. They continue. This is all, anything, you know, and then just run the engram of the illness, or put in his Ruds, or something like this, and all of a sudden, *wham!* All cures up in about four hours. So what it is, is sort of a *penicillin assist*. It's a reverse flip. You say, "Well you shouldn't audit a person under drugs." You shouldn't audit a person under soporifics, which are sleep, sleep drugs. You shouldn't audit a person under those that produce wild euphoria, or *whee whee hey day*.

You shouldn't process him when he's on that kind of drugs. For the excellent reason that the processing somehow becomes part of the trip. So you try to process him later, why then it restimulates this, and he gets into a sort of a fog. It's wild. It's kind of a mess. He has sort of a processing engram. You know? And he's somewhat hypnotic when he's on this stuff. So that you say to him something or other something or other, he's liable to come out the other end of the session without remembering a single thing that happened in the session. That's expressly the type of drug.

I have people come around and say, "Maisie Ann has been on tranquilizers for fifteen years, and does she have to come off her tranquilizers, because she has *petit mal seizures*, so that you can audit her?" I often think the tranquilizers didn't do her any good, they haven't even got her tranquilized. Look at her, man. What the hell's the difference? You're talking about some tiny thing. As far as penicillin is concerned, or stomach pills, or something like that, forget it.

Processing won't do anything with it, or to it, or apart from it, or anything. It doesn't have anything to do with processing at all, because it doesn't produce an hypnotic state. Doesn't produce a lowered thing that leaves you at the end of the session with a sort of psychology engram. You got it?

Alright. Number sixteen is, "I promise to maintain communication with the preclear, and not to cut his comm or permit him to overrun in session." There's one for you. That puts it right where it lives, boy. It doesn't say *maintain two-way communication* with the preclear

in session. Nobody really understood that anyhow, 'cause that wouldn't make much of a session.

But it says, "I promise to maintain communication with the preclear, and not to cut his comm or permit him to overrun in session." So an auditor reading that has to find the point where you stop his talking without cutting his comm. And that's an interesting one to learn. And it is a thing. There is an exact point where you do this. And it's very easily seen and very easily understood. Not very hard to. But if it's not pointed out in any way to the auditor, he's not likely to have much of a grip on it. He's liable to cut his comm, cut the preclear's comm without knowing he's cut comm. You see?

Alright, and permitting a preclear to run on for another page and a half after he has passed the F/N is just the best way in the world to knock it in the head.

Number seventeen, "I promise not to enter comments, expression or enturbulence into a session that distracts a preclear from his case." Now, that covers about it all. You can't, not supposed to enter comments, like, "Yeah boy, that's sure great. Yeah, you're really doing groovy." Anything, you know? Expressions includes facial expressions. Or enturbulence. That means dropping cans, E-meters, auditing report pages, opening and closing drawers, looking for Kleenexes, and so forth, and it also includes having odd objects on the auditing desk. It's a distraction. It also includes making the environment safe enough to audit in it. So that you know that the environment is not going to be interruptive, 'cause that's going to enter an enturbulence into the session.

And this is one of the main reasons for a false auditing report. You get an auditing report, looks ok, the preclear falls on his head two days later, this has been what has happened. That's been what happened. That's very heavily the facts. Now number eighteen. That is to say the auditor's entered, without putting it down, he's entered comments, expression or enturbulence into a session that distracts the preclear from his case.

Alright. Number eighteen, "I promise to continue to give the preclear the process or auditing command when needed." I have seen, in actual fact, the maddest thing. I'll add to that in the session. "I promise to continue to give the preclear the process or auditing command when needed in the session." Now I've seen what that exactly means, is I have actually seen an auditor give the orders to run back into an engram, and then shut up. I've actually seen this. Not just once. I don't know why, and I don't know what they do, and they haven't got any explanation for it at all. The guy never comes through with the second command. Never says, "Go through the incident." Something, just ... some freeze.

You know? They freeze somehow or another. I've seen it a couple of times. And either the person just went blank, or was himself sufficiently distracted, or didn't know what he was doing, but boy, does it leave a preclear to scramble for himself. Two minds put him down there and he's got to get back on one. And it's definitely a very hard thing on a pc.

Nineteen, "I promise not to let a preclear run a wrongly understood command." Now if he answered it as a wrong command, and then you caught it and then you corrected it, you'd be in violation of number one of the Code. You'd now be evaluating. He thought he answered it right, you told him it was answered some other way. So therefore, it means that the things have to be cleared, and they have to be correctly cleared. You say, "What is the definition of that?" And the individual then gives you some definition which is the wrong definition, and then you turn around and give him the right definition, you are going at it all backwards and upside down. So I guess you jolly well better have a little old slip of paper to hand him, and have him read the definition. "Now this auditing command I'm

going to give you is ARC breaks. And **A** is for affinity, and that means ..." You're going to have to go into the business of training some preclears. It'd be nice to have a little book that explains all of these words, wouldn't it? This is what it means.

Now when you catch up on your homework, preclear, I will audit you. Now the only difficulty with that, is after the guy read the book he has some F/Ns while he was reading it. So you'd have to check for it, if that happened. But that is one of, one of the major sources of no auditing gain. Pc didn't know what the hell he was being asked, see? He had the words, and totally evaluated some other way. They were weighted. You know, he had the weight of the words all different.

It's like the child's dictionary comes up and says, "Source is the starting place." He couldn't run the process on that. *Source* is not the starting place. It would be the point of origin, or it would be the originator. Or where something was begun or dreamed up or mocked up. And then a guy could run it.

So *No Source* becomes a thing that doesn't have a starting place. "Well that's a race horse wandering around in the pasture." He isn't at the starting gate, don't you see? It's easy.

Ok. Twenty. So the way to get around that nineteen, on the wrongly understood command, and you notice it's wrongly understood command, is bring your preclear up right. I wouldn't even bother to bring him up right in session. I'd say, "Study all these definitions so I can audit you."

Now for years we've had to educate preclears, only nobody ever admitted it. Have to educate him into what's going to happen, what he's supposed to say, what he's supposed to do, and so on. When you don't do this I see some of these preclears running around being psychoanalytic subjects. I have actually had, I have actually had somebody sit down in the session and start to run a psychoanalytic session on me. Not a psychoanalytic session, a psychoanalytic I don't know what the hell they call it. Orgy. Wing ding. Actually. And they start to tell you about their, not just even the words they're using. "Well when I was a little child, I did have an awful lot of trouble. We had a lot of hired men around and about the place, and each one of them violated me in turn. There was Joe, Bill, Pete, Tom, Oscar. Now, you see, now these ..." And I'd say, "What's going on?" "Well, don't you want to know all about this, and so forth?" And I'd say, "No, I don't want to know anything about it. Have you ever told anybody else about these thing?" "Oh yes, we always talk about these things." "Who's we?" "Me and my psychoanalyst." very good.

"Do you remember a time when you first heard that you should have some psycho analysis? That's very good. What was the date of that? Very good. Alright. Now what is the duration of the period? *[laughter]* Very good." I never, I never monkey with it, boy. I never monkey with it. That is a former therapy getting in your road. And it would read on your seven resistive cases. Well you don't let anybody act like that in a session. Either educate them or scan it out, boy.

It does take the cooperation of the preclear. I don't know if you've ever noticed that about auditing. Then there was the auditor who was the only one in session who ever got any gains. *[laughter]*

Alright, and here's another one. "I promise to estimate the current case state of a preclear only by standard case supervision data, and not to diverge because of some imagined difference in the case." *[laughter]* Now I'm putting wee-pons {*weapons*} into your hands. The weapons.

Alright, twenty two. "I promise never to use the secrets of a preclear divulged in session for punishment or personal gain." Now you know the old one of that, there, is "Never use Scientology for personal gain", but I'd see auditors all over the place getting rich and everything, and organizations getting rich, so it can't be well interpreted. But this is what people worry about.

Now, now, you will probably see somewhere over in an Ethics code appear another one. "A person who knowingly waits until he's in session to divulge evidence of a crime is culpable." Because then you'll find nobody's ever confessing unless he's in session. But anyway, regardless of that, this is what people worry about. They worry about, the world worries about this. They think that if we have such power that we can get information out of people like this, they actually have had reporters and things mention it to me very recently. "What about all those hundred and thousands of cases you have at Saint Hill, and all those tremendous secrets you have on people, and all of this kind of thing?" So they worry about it.

They think people are entitled to their secrets. In actual fact I wouldn't give you two bits for the whole collected lot. *[laughter]* You know, man has a lot of crime mixed up with vanity. Some pc, see, that comes in, and boy he gives you this long criminal record, and so on. I feel like asking him sometimes, "Are you bragging or confessing?" *[laughter]* You know it's the truth. Because it's not worth all that. It's not worth all that. Only in their zone and area it is. We have become more blasé.

Imagine though, imagine though, in the nineteenth century how a fellow was made guilty his entire life because he had once seen a photograph of a lady who was naked to the waist. This corrupted his entire life. I don't know.

The main - the main thing about it is, see, the value of the withhold is this, and we could be jumped on for this. So I've included it in the Auditor's Code. That's the only reason it's there. We actually don't do anything about it. Actually there was one hell of a crime committed not too very long ago. And it wasn't owned up to, and it was admitted in session. Actually nothing happened to the fellow. He was not punished for it in any way. Now, now goes the continued story. He wasn't punished for it in any way, nobody did anything to him, and so on. Do you know that he went ahead and tried to knock himself off? He then tried to mete out his own punishment in the thing. And right this minute is in hospital, having undergone an operation he didn't need.

He was getting well. And it all traces back to waiting until he was in session to admit to a crime; no punishment was given him of any kind whatsoever. It was a very heinous crime. No punishment was meted out. So he started meting it out himself. And that's what he's doing right this minute. And there is no other explanation to it. It's not a guilt complex. It's just he's making sure he gets his throat cut for it, 'cause he knows doggone well it should have been. But it was handed out in session.

Well the world worries about this, what happens to this. And I have actually seen a pc actually made very, very ill where his auditor suddenly trying to make him guilty in session for what he's doing. And I have seen a pc folded up for being charged with something which was divulged in a session. And it, after all, the Auditor's Code is an attempt to maximize case gain.

Without overts – without ... we now know that it is only where Tech is out that Ethics has to go in. You got it? You get Tech in on the guy, why it's just silly to try to get in Ethics. Why? It's reverse end to.

Alright, number twenty three, "I promise to see that any fee received for processing is refunded if the preclear is dissatisfied and demands it within three months after the processing, the only condition being that he may not again be processed or trained." Now we've had this a custom for some time, but it might as well appear in the Auditor's Code, because a lot of auditors are not bound by this. It's a wild one, actually, because the truth of the matter is, is every time that I have been around and somebody was talking about money being refunded, not on any auditing I was doing, but money should be refunded for the training or processing, or something like that. And you gave it back to them, without even this last qualification, that he may not be trained or processed again, and so on, it's very, very rare that the person will take it back. I've stood around and gone to a whole fuss to make sure that somebody's money was refunded.

And it was almost impossible to do, and when it was done and so forth, why they went around sort of hang dog and sheepish about it, and it made a mess. But this is something no other profession could do. This is something nobody else on the planet would dare do. The manufacturer is forced to do it with his products, but nobody in the field of healing has had enough answers. So it's a total dare.

Now, if we have that in the Auditor's Code we can start to insist that it be practiced in the field of medicine. And we can hold it up as something which is applicable to professional Ethics in general. And it could go so far as, "Well if the patient dies there is no reason why the family should receive a medical bill, of course." It is a fantastic propaganda weapon. And the truth of the matter is, you're far better off to do this. You're far better off. If you were individually practicing and some pc comes in and says, "That didn't do me any good whatsoever." You're probably practicing on somebody who is PTS, who is connected up, messed up, she or he is a seven resistive case to begin with, they're not going to do you any damage at – *I mean*, not going to do you any good at all, anywhere. The best thing to do is just promptly say, "Alright. Sign this waiver that you're not supposed to be trained or processed again anywhere. Good. Here is your *dough-dough*." Right now. *Bong*.

You find the person's, "Wait a minute." In the first place they do it sometimes just trying to get even with you. They got a missed withhold or something of this sort, so they're trying to get even with you somehow. And they don't mean it. The number of people who would accept their money back on the condition they were never trained or processed again are so few, but it is not something another profession could do. They wouldn't dare. All the money'd have to be returned. You actually can throw that down the throats of people legislatively. "When other professions are willing to adopt a clause of this particular character, then they can talk about being Ethical." Until then they had better not talk about us. Defense line. And if all auditors stood back of that as a defense line it would be a very good one indeed.

Now, twenty four, "I promise not to advocate Scientology only to cure illness or only to treat the insane, knowing well it was intended for spiritual gain." That's actually not to get anybody off the hook and not to agree with any Laws or anything else. It's, boy do you go in the soup when you try to go any other distance than for gain for the individual himself.

Ok, and number twenty five is, "I promise to cooperate fully with the legal organizations of Dianetics and Scientology as developed by L. Ron Hubbard in safeguarding the ethical use and practice of the subject, according to the Basics of Standard Tech." That should straighten out a lot of it.

So that is the new Auditor's Code, good, bad or indifferent. Right now there is a code of reform which is being put together, but that would be the Code of a Scientologist. And I

don't know what results are coming in on this on a code of reform, but it is a very interesting project which will probably be adventured upon again somewhere up the line. And the project is writing every prominent man, or every professional man in the entire community, giving him a description of Dianetics and Scientology, of the various things it has done and oppositions it has met, and what it can do, and asking him for his advice in the usages to which it could be placed, and asking him for any recommendations he'd have as a reform of its practice.

And there's some fantastic number of these things being mailed out. There's about, oh I don't know, there's about three million, or something like that in the United States, and some vast number in other areas. And the net result of all of this will eventually be codified into a code of reform. But it will be the Code of a Scientologist, or in practices or organizations. And very doubtful if anything would be added to the Auditor's Code. It just sort of blows the criticism that's been going around.

And at any time you find the subject's under criticism it is a very good approach. Say, "Ok. What do you want changed?" Nobody can complain about that.

The Auditor's Code which you have been going by, of course is fundamentally correct. And as you see it has not actually been invalidated, it's been put in a different form. And it has been brought up to date. So that the floating needle, and so on, is included in that.

Alright, so much for that. I hope you agree with that. I... [Yes]

Very good.

Now there is, it's one thing to freeze a subject. A guy by the name of Augustus, whose real name was I think Octavius, whose real name was probably Bastardus, or ... , who was kicking around about the time of Cleopatra or something. Anyhow, he was all mixed up with some jerk, some epileptic by the name of Caesar ... It's all sort of confused in mind at the particular time, because I wasn't in Rome at the time. But this bird Augustus, he called himself, which meant top dog or something, he froze the boundaries, he froze the boundaries of the Roman Empire. And he said, "Rome hereafter must not expand." And he's the man who killed Rome.

All you have to do is say in this universe something may not expand, and from that particular moment on, it stagnates and will eventually fail and fall. Which was a woeful fact. Actually he said, "Every eldest son had to serve in the footsteps of his father." So that nobody could get out of any profession his father was in. The boundaries of the empire must not expand any further than they are, but we will hold it at that point. Of course, immediately it started to crumble. He had a lot to say.

It is a very, very bad thing to totally freeze something in this particular universe. Now I'll point out to you that what we know, however, we still know - And that is that we know the Basics as we come up the line. It is absolutely amazing how little this Auditor's Code has changed in fifteen years. But here is this minor change. It is adapted to the increase of technology. The net result of an unchanging, absolutely never to be varied, situation is, of course, stagnation.

But something can continue all the way from standard basics. In other words, you can have certain standard basics and develop on top of those basics. More can be found out about what you already know.

We have an already workable path. That path is very workable. It is very swift. I reserve, and I wish to impress this upon a Class VIII student, I reserve the right to release further advances of technology. I can assure you that they are not going to invalidate the things

you already know now, because everything which has been developed has been developed forward along the exact lines which you see them in now.

But let me give you an example. This morning I was doing the research on VIII, and I was very fascinated with a horrible circumstance which took place. And I immediately checked it up with two other auditors that I respect on the ship. And I checked it up with these auditors as to whether or not they'd ever really seen this phenomenon. And all of a sudden an explanation fell out of the hat about something, and I found out they had both been wondering about this also.

And I collided with it, because somebody sent me a new E-meter and it is not a new E-meter in design, it is simply that somebody changed the manufacturer. And the new manufacturer, before he can release or before they could accept this meter, I of course have to give a pass on it. Well I had actually already given a pass on it. I hadn't been able to detect any vast difference in this meter. But I had noticed that the needle of the meter was a tiny bit thinner, and probably the movement of the meter itself might have been a little bit smaller than in other meters. But I had not noticed anything more than the fact that the meter was very lively. It was lively. It's more lively than the original Mark IV.

So, I hadn't paid any attention to this, and yesterday my meter ran down, or had to get charged up or something like this, and somebody put this other meter, which is the prototype. It's not the meter which I would normally use anyway. It was the prototype. And they put up the prototype on my desk for my use, for checking something out. And what do you know? I turned the thing on, and I checked over something, and I thought you know, that should be a release point of that action. And I got an R/S! I got a wild rock slam. Now I looked at this meter again, and it wasn't tuned up in any peculiar way. But I suddenly recognized why I hadn't been aware of it before I'd turned it on and used it, that it had a terribly faint, light, very, very thin needle, which is off pattern, don't you see? And, so I looked at this, and I thought, "What am I looking at here? Why should I R/S? This is sort of mad." And so I said, "I better check out if there's been an invalidation, because R/S, invalidation, they go together." So I checked out, and sure enough there was a tremendous read on an invalidation. And I thought, "That's really remarkable. But if it's a tremendous read on the invalidation, why doesn't it R/S?" So I went and synthesized again the exact point and situation on the track which had made it R/S. And it held for a moment and then it R/Sed again. And I suddenly realized that invalidation would read, of course. It was a float. It was a floating needle. It was a floating needle and the invalidation was I'd invalidated a floating needle. But on this very, very light meter, with this very light needle, with my case section where it is, I've stopped floating; I R/S. I get a half a dial wide R/S. And what it is, is a reverse pop rocket read. The R/S begins with a rocket read, which is backwards from right to left. And I get a backwards rocket read as it pops.

It pops like that, and then pops the other way. And that's all it is. It's just a, it's quite remarkable, but it took a different meter to demonstrate the thing. And so I asked one of the other auditors and he said, "Oh yes." And I said, "What cases have you seen something like this on?" And one was a III, and one was an OT VI. An OT III and OT VI.

Alright. Now the datum that suddenly emerges here, this meter was tuned up rather more sensitive than a meter normally is, and was in itself a much livelier meter. So if you were to turn up a standard meter to maybe one hundred and twenty eight on its sensitivity switch knob, and then to tune it up to four or five, or something in that particular range, in the OT sections, I think you will find out that you get – your floats become reverse rocket reads. And if you watch this carefully there won't be any doubt in your mind about a float, in the upper sections.

Now to give you a little more data on this, found out recently that auditors didn't seem to know that after an individual was Clear that his thoughts read on a meter. And you notice it's only recently that we have had to do anything about this. The thoughts read on the meter. You ask the fellow some question on the meter. All he says, you know, on a Green Form. And all he says is, to himself is, "No I don't think that I ... " Says this to himself. And you get a long surge, *pow!*

Now an auditor who didn't know this, but in auditing a pre-OT, he would think the thing read. So actually what you have to do on anybody above Clear, is you have to be wary of the fact, is their *thinks* read. No matter what they think, it'll read. Particularly if they're thinking *against* something. If they're thinking a negative of some kind or another, up against the Bank, or against the auditor, or against the meter, or something like this, you will get a read.

So that makes a case above Clear, actually some cases down at Grade IV, this lively. But very few. But a lot of auditors would just keep on buying this, you see, from Clear on up, that every time they had a read that was a positive. You could wreck cases that way, so we're having to teach people how to get in suppress and false. And because auditors have done this in the past, a good thing to get in *false reads*. And it cleans up a lot of cases, right? Alright, now we have had a case or two in the upper OT sections recently, who have appeared before the examiner with a wide, wild R/S. And to show you how odd this is, we have somebody who was comm ev'd because he R/Sed on something. And in no case was it an R/S. There is such a thing as an R/S. But it is not what we think it is.

A float at a certain high case level, with a certain tune up of sensitivity, actually behaves at an accelerated line, it looks like an R/S. Now the least you could tell about it, even with an ordinary meter, is the person should start rocket reading, and reverse. This is a sort of a pop. The needle pops backwards from right to left. And you can usually really tell if you tune up your meter right, why your floats become absolutely unmistakable, because they begin with a pop.

Now as the guy goes on up the lines this phenomenon begins to increase. And if your meter is already set up to read this pop, why if you were auditing somebody at OT VII or OT VIII, I can assure you that his float would be a rock slam.

Well, in supervising your folders, and so on, I have learned some new things, and so on. I'll continue to learn them, I'll continue to publish them, and I'll continue to make sure that you receive them. I don't expect a tumultuously changing future. I do expect a very successful one.

And as we move it on up in the line up, we will undoubtedly have things which we notice, which can be incorporated. And when they work out uniformly to the better good of all cases, they will themselves become Standard Tech.

Very good? Thank you very much.
