

Codes

Auditor's Code

A lecture given by L. Ron Hubbard
on the 15 April 1959

How are you?

Thank you.

How are you making out, huh?

Audience: Okay. Fine. All right.

Well, it looks like you are.

Today we're going to talk about codes. Now, this could also be an answer of what does an auditor do, or how does an auditor bring about results on a preclear.

And if we approach codes from this viewpoint, we discover ourselves in an excellent position of understanding. If we do not approach codes from this viewpoint of codes are the answer to how an auditor produces results on the pc and the public, the codes then simply become rules of conduct and relatively meaningless.

Now, these codes have been evolved. In the earliest stages of Dianetics, we find that the Auditor's Code was simply highly theoretical. But still, out of that earliest code, I still like to point out a thing which did not appear in the later codes – and that is courage, an auditor is courageous. This is quite interesting in that the only trouble you'll ever get into is when you lose your nerve. All you have to do is lose your nerve and pull out on the pc, pull back, stop the process, go into a dramatization of elsewhere-ness on the Reality Scale and you've had it! You've had it right then. You'll pull the preclear right in on top of you.

So first and foremost, an auditor should be courageous, and that is a salvage from one of the old codes and lineups from clear back in the early years of this subject.

Now here we have – here we have an example. I could say it's very nice if you would be courageous, and it's the nice thing for you to do. It is the proper thing for you to do and our public repute will suffer, or something of the sort, unless you do this. But as a matter of fact, you're the one who's going to suffer if you don't do this!

We've had a couple of examples in ACCs of an auditor suddenly wanting to be elsewhere while the pc ran into a hot one. And what happened? Those are the only auditors we've had who have been beaten up by pcs. Get the idea? That's it – they pull out.

Now, it sort of... works like this: The preclear, if he's getting well, if he's recovering, if he's straightening himself out is going through a large number of dramatizations of things he has done to other people. And of course, they ran, didn't they? They ran. So all you've got to do is flinch and it restimulates, on a pc's part, attack. Quite interesting.

So when you pull out on a pc, you invite yourself to be, at the very least, simply talked about badly. This is just a low level of attack, you see?

On the other hand, the most dangerous murderer, psychotic murderer that you could possibly find in an institution could undoubtedly be processed by you if you just kept your head and your nerve.

I recall one auditor had a paranoid schiz – that's what they call somebody, you know, when they don't know what's wrong with him. It's just a dirty word like any other dirty word. It has no technical significance. There's really no such thing as a paranoid schiz.

A paranoid schiz would be somebody who had everything against him Dianeticwise – that's paranoid. Schiz – who is split in two pieces. Now, you tell me how everybody can have anything – everything against him and yet be breaking in half. That's pretty good.

All right. Mr. Paranoid Schiz leaped off the auditing couch while being audited, drew a large knife from his pocket and looked fixedly, *knck*, and somewhat hungrily at the auditor. Now, if that auditor had made a move toward the door, that would have been that.

The auditor in this particular case said, "Well, close up the knife now and put it in your pocket and we'll go on with the process" and this dangerous psychotic did.

None of these problems – none of these problems, you see, are very difficult if you know the answers.

So, if it is something of a mystery to you how an auditor gets results with a pc, I invite you to peruse the Auditor's Code with this in view. How do you get results with a pc?

Now, auditing all by itself is beneficial. It wouldn't matter whether you said, "Gub-gub," instead of an auditing command, you see? It's still beneficial, will still work on a pc.

This is demonstrated, always to somebody's astonishment, in a communication course. And a communication course is going along and the auditor-student is saying, "Do fish swim?" and "Do fish swim?" you know, and so forth, going on with fish swimming, and all of a sudden gets a result on the other student. Well, he's very mystified because, obviously, the question of whether or not fish swim was not what was wrong with the person he was processing. No, it's his address to the subject, it's merely his address to the subject, and the repetition of the command and that he is getting an intention through to the other person. This all by itself has enormous value. Now, that's in the mechanics of communication.

Now, if without running a process, you can get results just by being an auditor – just that and no more – then it behooves you to know the best approach to a pc or the best conduct toward a pc, you see, because the modern Auditor's Code is entirely founded on data which has been discovered, noticed, located over the years by many, many auditors. And it has been found to be workable because its tenets are all selected on the basis of what worked and what didn't work. Therefore, the Auditor's Code gives you the answer of why processing works, and amongst other things, why self-auditing has very limited value.

Self-auditing has very, very limited value, but it does have some value. If you're out in the middle of the desert someplace and you sprain your ankle, you would just be very silly indeed not to sit down and run out the sprain. You understand, that would be silly. But at the same time, trying to make Theta Clear by self-auditing is one of the rummier things that you could try, because you would find yourself wound up in small balls in many directions.

The auditor is necessary to auditing. This too should be a part of the Auditor's Code, because many auditors omit it.

Now, we look at the character and beingness of an auditor, we see some danger of an auditor becoming much too cocky, much too overbearing, much too this, much too confident, you know? This could all be frowned on and one could say; "Well, the thing we should do is shut down the auditor a bit," and so on. Well, that is not the intention of this code.

Give you an example of self-confidence. There was a riot down in Dallas, Texas one time at a World's Fair. And the riot had been going on for some time and somebody sent for the Texas Rangers. And after a while, why, a big fellow in his sombrero and a gun on his hip came around to find out about the riot and they looked at him and they said, "But you're just one Ranger!" He said, "Well, there's just one riot."

Now, this sort of – this sort of cockiness and confidence is very far from discouraged. It adds up to what is known as altitude, which is another factor that sort of weaves its way around in one of these codes – altitude. It's merely an expression of confidence. Your beingness is excellent – quite certain. You know what you're doing. You're doing what you're doing quite positively. And you'd be amazed how many riots you could take control of just this way.

Well, that is attitude of mind. That is the number of wins you've had. That's the amount of confidence you have in your own ability and so forth. Well, therefore, it doesn't properly belong as part of a code. But that confidence, that courage – these things are definitely germane to an Auditor's Code in that if an auditor doesn't have these in his beingness, he tends to get very poor results.

By the way, there's only one thing wrong with the CCHs – CCH 1, 2, 3, 4 – those processes. There's only one thing wrong with them, in that in the hands of an indifferent, imprecise auditor who cannot make his intention reach the Pc, they do not work.

That's an interesting thing. We'll sometimes be combing over research results and we'll see that somebody was run on CCH for forty or fifty hours or something like this, and there was no change at all in the preclear's condition. If we go and find the auditor and we review him, we find he is missing in these quantities of certainty, courage, confidence, belief in himself. You see, those are definitely missing.

Well, if those are missing, we might as well forget about the rest of the Code because we start right back to what I said before, in order to get auditing done we have to have an auditor. And if we don't have somebody with a beingness and certainty there, in the auditing chair, we don't have an auditor and we don't have a session.

So there's a supposition here, when we go over the Auditor's Code, that there is an auditor. And that would say beingness, certainty, confidence, personal altitude and so on. These

things would go along with this. Given those things, then we can get into the rest of this. You understand that? All right.

If we had all those things and if we knew our business, most of the things in the Code would be unnecessary to repeat. Most of these things would be unnecessary to go over. Nevertheless, we keep them here, we keep them alive, we keep them in view because when any one of these nineteen rules of auditing are violated in a session, we get a preclear suffering to some degree from lack of gain.

Now, the way to keep a preclear from getting gain is just to close your eyes, spot one of these rules blindly. **Here's Twelve:** Always reduce every communication lag encountered by continued use of the same question or process. See, I just... If you want to really keep somebody from getting up, just hit the thing with a finger and – at random – and then do it. Not be guided by what the Code says to do, but do the mistake. You see?

In this particular case, fail – every time the pc got a comm lag, you wouldn't reduce it. Every time he started to lag between question and answer – your Instructors about half die at the thought of doing this. This would be a pretty awful thing to do.

A comm lag, you see, is the exact length of time between the question and the exact answer to that question. That is the lag. That's the time from the question to the exact answer to the question. We'll go into this in another lecture.

But supposing you said to the pc, "All right, now. Put a thought in that wall."

And he says, "Mmm-raaw-woah-mmmm-yhhh-rrrr-mmmm. Oh, seeef rraw-zzz-www."

You said, "Well, that's fine. That's fine. I see you don't – you don't seem to be able to do that easily. Let's get – let's get the light shade there to put a thought into the wall."

And he'd say, "Oh, hum-mmm-rrrr-wrr-dowrr."

And you'd say, "Well, don't seem to be winning with that either. I think the best thing you can do is spot your right foot."

Well, there are other ways to get murdered more pleasantly, let me tell you. It's not that he would do anything desperate to you but you certainly would not have accomplished anything in auditing.

So you could reverse this Code and do the reverse, and you would be absolutely certain to produce – probably the only way you actually could produce a tremendous decline in intelligence, mentality and personality would – simply turn this Code upside down.

Oddly enough, the processes of Dianetics and Scientology, and Dianetics and Scientology auditing, are the only things that can run a pc down. A pc is much harder to run down than to run up. It's very easy to run a pc up scale. It's very hard to run him down scale but if you reverse this Code, you'd manage it.

Now, here and there, tremendous data has accumulated around this Code. Here and there somebody who had a very difficult time in auditing has been carefully interviewed and gone over and put on a meter and spotted exactly what was wrong with the session – that was

the most wrong with this session. And then that has become a clause in the Auditor's Code. They're the isolated – carefully isolated things that happen that depress a pc in session.

Well, let's start at the beginning – the Auditor's Code.

And the first one is: Do not evaluate for the preclear.

What do you mean, "evaluation"?

It's very funny that some Scientologist who for some time has been the director, pardon me, the head of testing or the Director of Processing or the Registrar in a Central Organization, has had to sit there for a long time, person after person after person, week in and week out, and tell them what their tests mean. Now, this is all right for the public, you see?

A person comes in and they say, "What's this little curlicue down at the bottom here? Llll-dah-da-daz-daz. Says 'unstable.' What's that mean?"

"Well, I'll tell you. What that means is that perhaps your 'stability' could be improved somewhat."

"Oh, what do you mean, 'stability'?"

"Well, evenness of your ways. You're evidently not very even." See, we're off on our evaluation, You get that?

Well, this person gets over into an auditing chair – I've actually seen this happen several times! you see. Somebody's been on – every once in a while a public gets upset because posts change in an organization. They say, "One day there's this person on, then I write a letter and the next day there's that person on and what's going on around here?" It's the fact that Central Organization favored positions are the technical positions.

And people who are over into administration very often – very often want to be over in technical. And sometimes, people get a little bit tired in technical and they want to be over in administration. And then organizations expand and contract in size. And everybody's kind of wearing all the hats in spite of the fact that we have very precise hats. And we get mishmashes because people in these Central Organizations or in Scientology are practically the only people who can keep up with it. It's a very funny thing.

We just had an example of interviewing I don't know how many accountants. Some vast number of accountants have stood in a queue being interviewed to take over the Accounting Department and – which right now is almost totally unmanned except for a Scientologist doing a little bit of work on it at night, keep it current. And each one of these people, as is our custom, has been tested. And after the person doing the hiring was all through, this person found there was just one profile that showed a personality that we would care to have in the place. And it turned out to be a Scientologist who hadn't announced himself.

Now, you get over into administration, you have to handle the public. Don't you see?

They come in and they say, "I have terrible pains in my head. What is that?"

All right, that has nothing to do with the Auditor's Code. That's a casual conversation you're embarked upon. You can tell him anything you want to. Not your pc.

"Pains in your head? Well, I'll tell you, did you ever have a fear of knitting needles?"

Fellow says, "Yes."

"Well," you say, "There you have it. There you have it. Get the idea of a knitting needle sticking half in this side and out that side. Got that? Got that? Well, that's it!"

Person says, "No, that isn't it."

You say, "Well, that's just your hard luck."

And you say – you're telling him, "That's what the pain in the head is." See? It's this or it's that. This is how you are so depressed on this stability factor here, this is why you're so low on the line.

You can tell him, "Well, you had a hard childhood, didn't you? I can see it right here in my crystal – I mean, my OCA." Get the idea?

"Is it true that you hate women?"

"What do you mean? I don't necessarily hate women."

"Well, I don't know. It says here that you haven't very much empathy and so forth and... How about it? Do you hate women?"

"Uh, well, I don't know."

"Well, I think you do."

Totally not allowed in an auditing session. Don't you see?

Auditors sometimes, when they've been doing tremendous quantities of auditing, forget to shift their hats the other way.

Now, here you had an example of people who have been a Registrar or something like that won't evalu – they keep on evaluating for a PC. Then they get into session and they kind of tend to – all of a sudden, why the D of P, after they've been a staff auditor for a little while, you know, he's got them down on the carpet. And he says, "You know – you know those explanations – those explanations you were giving the pc for the engram I found very, very interesting. But you're wondering why the pc was trying to blow during the session. Well, that was why. You were telling him what his engram was all about, and it's up to him."

Well, the person says, "Oh, yeah, well, I'll get my hats straightened out, here, and – one way or the other."

Well, reversely an auditor can come out of session, go down and meet Joe and run right straight on through the line working with the Auditor's Code. But no, no – he's having dinner with a friend, don't you see? And he's bound by the Auditor's Code. Oh, no, he isn't bound by the Auditor's Code. The Auditor's Code applies to a session and that's it. Got the idea?

So he finds Joe is going on and on and saying, "Well, I don't know what I'm going to do. I don't know whether I ought to stick around or not because it just seems so fruitless – keep on arguing all the time."

And this auditor is perfectly at liberty to say, "Well, I think it's just because you've got a nasty temper. I think that's – you keep flying into people's faces and so forth. And that's why

they're mad at you and if you just learn to cool your temper down a little bit, why, you'll get along."

Boy, he couldn't do that in a session, don't you see? But he sure could do it in social intercourse because in the social world conversation is almost totally evaluation, see? But not in a session.

All you have to do is explain the pc's aberration to him, or explain the nature of his mother, or explain to him the factors which are involved in his case, and how these things have mounted up in his life, and tell him what they mean, and he's had it. And you've had it too. That's all – that's all you've got to do and *that's it*. This boy is not in-session, he's not going to get any gains, he's not going anywhere. It's something to remember.

Any part of this Code is something to remember. You ought to know it by heart.

Now, in handling a preclear, then, his case is his case. And his case is what he says it is, not what you say it is. Nothing like evaluation could be done while you're running an engram. It's just unthinkable to evaluate for somebody while he's halfway through an engram. Wow! Oh, boy! He's mired way down, he's in physical pain, he feels a great deal of duress, he's already snorty and out of ARC with the environment of the engram, which tends to make him out of ARC with the environment of the auditing session. And then you say to him, "You know, I think that last part you ran was dub-in." That's it! He's had it! Get the idea?

The funny part of this thing – this goes even further than this. If you tell him what the engram is all about or something like this, why, it just caves him in terrifically.

Now, you will see, just from this, why older psychotherapy practices failed so terribly. They were always explaining to people what their aberration was. Look at – look at psychoanalysis, huh. "Now, the reason why – the reason why you don't feel so well, Mr. Jones, is because you had that altercation with your sister when she was four. Yes, that's why. I've got that settled in my mind now. You're well now. That's it."

Well, of course the basic evaluation of "You were sick" or "You were well," these things cannot be practiced in an auditing session. But remember they are perfectly admissible outside of an auditing session if the person isn't your Pc. This doesn't bind a Scientologist up across his whole social activity. When it does, he finds himself rather uncomfortable.

Just out of plain viciousness sometimes, somebody walks in, says, "I have a terrible headache what's wrong with me?" I look at him piercingly and tell him. They're not my pc.

Now, sometimes this might cross your mind – you say the process that you select to run on the pc is an evaluation. You decided what was wrong with him and you ran this process on him. That does not classify to the pc as evaluation. Philosophically it could be classified as evaluation, but from what viewpoint?

So, let's get just a little bit further on this – the whole Code – and let's find out something about it. It's from a specific viewpoint, which is to say, the pc's viewpoint. Now, if the pc says you're evaluating, I'm afraid you are. Got it? If he thinks what you just did or said is evaluation, that's fine. But he sit there just as happy as a clam while you choose homosexuality as the center action of your process. And what are you doing, actually? You're saying, "This is what I think is wrong with you, son," see, and you're processing directly right straight

down the groove at homosexuality. And he sits there, perfectly happy. So it's not evaluation, is it? Because the pc doesn't say it is. He doesn't think it is, he doesn't say it is.

Just like an engram is what the pc runs, not what the auditor tells him it is. Similarly, that is an Auditor Code break which is viewed as a Code break by the pc.

Very often in session when I'm processing somebody – I'm in a terrific hurry, something like that, I evaluate for them, I invalidate them, I push their buttons. It's not from their viewpoint. Now, that may seem – sound very strange, and I don't recommend it until you're a real old hand at this.

But I've had a person going on and on and on and on and saying, "You've just got to process my mother because I know that's my mother – it's – no, no it's my mother – that's wrong with me – and my mother, my father. They were both Presbyterians and that could – and that's wrong – and that's what you've got to process.

"Shut up," I have said.

First, I've said, "Good," you know. "You – thank you, yeah, that's fine."

"And I know this is it..." and so on, so on, and yabba-yabba-ya. "And I've got it all figured out and this is what we got..."

"Shut up."

"Huhh!"

"Now, shall we get down to business?"

"Well, all right, if you say so."

You know – you know my favorite definition of auditing is: Auditing is what you can get away with.

Every once in a while some old-timer will come around to me real starry-eyed, and he'll say, "Say, you remember that process – that Concept Process that you ran once on so-and-so and so-and-so on a demonstration? You remember that process? And then you said afterwards that it was no good because it reduced havingness. Well, you know, you know, I ran that the other day for five hours on somebody and it produced terrific results and it didn't reduce havingness at all."

I always tell them, "Auditing is what you can get away with." It's true! He got away with it. That doesn't mean it's true. You get the idea?

There are a lot of rules in the game you can disobey. But I'll give you a clue about disobeying rules in the Auditor's Code. Know what they are and know how to follow them, and then you will be good enough to here and there disobey them. All right.

Number Two: Do not invalidate or correct the preclear's data.

Now, you say that's the same thing. No, evaluation is explanation, explaining to him something or other, something or other, something or other. Invalidation is something else. It is actually punching in – this is a Scientology colloquialism – punching in his anchor points, or pushing his anchor points in. Pushing in his anchor points. Invalidation means he isn't right.

Now, I'll give you a wonderful example of this. The pc says, "You know that wonderful run we had yesterday?" You know what the wonderful run was, it was 8-C. You piloted him all around the room. "You know that wonderful run we had yesterday and how much good it did me?"

And you say, "That's fine," you know, "Yes, I know."

"Well, I wish – I wish you hadn't have carried on 'Give me that hand' for quite so long."

And you say, "What?" You spent the former day, you see, running him on 8-C, and to the best of his knowledge and belief you ran "Give me that hand." Well, you say – it's only human to say at that moment, "What?" Yeah, but you're not human, you're an auditor. You want to cave him in, very properly and thoroughly? Say coldly, or warmly, "We didn't run 'Give me that hand' yesterday." Get the idea? That's an invalidation. It tells the pc he is wrong.

I'll give you another excellent example of invalidation. Pc was moaning and crying and weeping into the session at a mad rate about how he'd been abused. As a matter of fact, he probably had been abused. And he was running out an overt-motivator sequence on his mother. And he was getting down on – into the prenatal bank of all places – and everybody knows that's been discredited. Keeps occurring though.

By the way, the whole American medical profession has now accepted prenatal banks because of Dianetics.

Anyway, way down into the prenatal bank going real wog-wog, all mixed up with engrams, and the auditor says to him – complaining about his mother, you know – the auditor says to him, "Well, she probably had her reasons." That was the end of that session. See, he was saying his mother was wrong; the auditor said, "Mother's right." That was an invalidation.

All right, the pc says, "You remember that engram I ran in 63 B.C.?" and you know doggone well it was 565 A.D. If you say, "Oh, you mean that one in 565 A.D.?" – boom! The repercussion of this on a pc is far greater than it is in the social world. And the repercussion of this from the auditor is a denial of the auditor's goals. The auditor is trying to make this individual better, isn't he? And then proves him wrong.

Now, people who are trying for a total effect will very often use it – use this mechanism of correcting the PC just to cave the pc in. And these total effect boys can always be spotted because they instinctively do all these things in reverse.

All right. Those are the two "shuns," by the way. The one and two – the two "shuns," evaluation, invalidation. The HCAs, HPAs, old HDAs had to learn this. The two "shuns."

Number Three: Use the processes which improve the preclear's case.

There's a lot could be said about that. I give you processes, I tell you they'll improve a preclear's case. I come along in a couple of months and I tell you to run something else and improve the preclear's case. I'm right both times, but I changed my mind – somebody says – I must have changed my mind, No. Had later data or a better look, you understand? And so will you from time to time.

Be running somebody like mad on some process and so on and you're coming up the line and everything's going fine and so forth. Few months later, knowing more, being better at your business and so forth, this guy comes back and you say, "I know what I should have run." You now run it.

Now, that would tend to mean that you didn't run, the first time, the best process to improve the preclear's case, because the one that improved his case was the run – one you ran some months later. You understand? Don't bother with that, Research, as it's come up the line, has produced better and better and better and more consistent results.

As a matter of fact, one of the reasons why you find the public at large has had confidence in my research is a very simple reason. I've been at it for years. When any mistake has been made, I've been amongst the first to yell about it. And when any errors come up, I'm the one who said so. And in addition to that, we've kept right on improving people's cases better and better and faster and faster. And this has been a very – a very steep up-curve line.

Now, you'll run into this same thing. You'll run into this same thing as your experience goes along, as your experience in assessing people improves, as you get more and more capable of obnosis. Obnosis – a gorgeous word – observing the obvious. Learn to observe the obvious. That's called obnosis. You get better and better at obnosis.

A person who comes in on crutches is processed by you on a proper process, not a process that improves the crutches.

Now, here we have – here we have a matter of judgment entering in. So you should interpret such a thing as "use the process which improves the preclear's case, according to extant knowledge and conditions of the session." You could add those right on the end of it and you'd have it. "Extant knowledge and conditions of the session."

Now, if you've only got 20 minutes to process an accident victim – you know what would really improve the accident victim. You can tell with half an eye that this individual has been in an hypnotic trance for Lord knows how long, that he's totally overwhelmed, that he could never be cause, that he has various immediate things wrong with him that should be remedied in order to make him straight up. But he's smashed up and he's in pain and he's having a hard time and he's all rattled and disoriented. All right, you're certainly not going to open up on a process that'll improve the whole case of the preclear when all you're trying to do is improve his disorientation and general body dishabille. Are you? So it's a matter of judgment – a matter of judgment – conditions of the session.

Every once in a while, some Instructor with great enthusiasm forbids coffee-shop auditing. That's a certain type of auditing, it is practiced in coffee shops. Somebody sits down across from you and says, "Well, I learned something today in class and it was a very interesting thing. And all you do is think a thought this way, and then you think it that way."

And the other fellow says, "Ah, yeah, that's right. So it is. Uh-huh," and gives a few auditing commands.

Or somebody says, "I have a headache."

Auditor sits down across – "Oh, you've got a headache, huh? Well, feel the top of your head, feel your chin, feel your right ear and your left ear."

Coffee-shop auditing. An amazing amount of improvement is done in coffee-shop auditing. And there is never any advantage in trying to stop auditors from auditing, they just will do it. They just will do it.

So go ahead and audit. But be real about what you run. Don't run something that's going to take five hours or ten hours to flatten on somebody you're only going to have for fifteen minutes. Conditions of the session.

Furthermore, you could run a process in a very noisy, troubled environment and get away with it, whereas another process, you couldn't get away with. So it's according to the conditions of the session.

Always run the best process, though, to improve the preclear's case. And that, we have boiled down – that now understands [includes] the addition which I have just added on to it. And if you look at it again, yes, the process that would improve a preclear's case would be the one you could get away with in those conditions. That right? All right.

Number Four: Keep all appointments once made.

There is a thing known as betrayal. A betrayal is: One is coaxed to reach and is then prevented from reaching. That is betrayal, definition of. He's coaxed to reach and then he's prevented from reaching or he is made to withdraw, which is an extreme betrayal.

This individual is told, "Fight for your country, fight for your country, fight for your country. The Picts are coming, the Picts are coming. Fight for your country." You know, some routine war speech. "The king needs you."

You know, that sort of thing. Well, all right, maybe the king does. Fine. So you join up – fellow joins up. And he finds out that because he's five minutes late getting into the chow line, they throw him in the brig for 20 days, see? So, he's all full of beans and enthusiasm and patriotism, you know, and so forth. And then he finds out the only reason they wanted him there was to knock his anchor points in. Get the idea? So he experiences this thing called betrayal. Betrayal is a lead out and a smash back in. You see that?

Well, believe me, when a preclear has come up to a location where a session is supposed to take place, he has been made to lead himself out to this situation. And when the auditor is late for the appointment, the preclear suffers the mechanism of betrayal. Isn't what you should do, it's an actual mechanical fact. He's been betrayed.

Well, the weird part of it is, it's all out of proportion to merely being socially late. I've seen pcs just splintering their teeth into chips of enamel over this thing, you know? The auditor was consistently, all week long, ten minutes late for each session. Profile will show it, enormously. We have to get this fellow out and the next thing you know we're auditing – we audit this one auditor that was always late for an appointment. If a pc is rather rocky, if a pc's orientation leaves something to be desired, he begin to believe all sorts of weird things about his auditor.

"Well, I don't know. Maybe the auditor will learn these data from me and then turn me in to the police." Get the idea? Spooky thoughts come to his mind. "Maybe he's really after my wife," you know? And one of the ordinary ones is, "He's just after my money. He doesn't care about me, he's after my money."

Well, you can cause havoc, utter havoc in knocking that particular one in the head and forgetting about it. Just keep your appointments. Pc's supposed to be there at 10 o'clock, you're supposed to be there at 10 o'clock, be there at 10 o'clock. That's it. If you break your leg, be there at 10 o'clock. There's no excuse ever excuses late for appointment. It's different than a social condition. This person's laid his whole case out all ready to run at 10 o'clock. And then you say, "I don't want it." Betrayal.

Five: Do not process – this is the most disobeyed part of the Auditor's Code. Do not process a preclear after 10 P.M.

People are always processing preclears after 10 P.M. and every once in a while they get real sorry they did it. But you take a husband and wife team, something like this. They're both working. They don't get home till way late. She's got a headache, something like this. It's already 10:15. Auditing is what you can get away with. Just remember it is a Code break. And don't feel real amazed, because of the lateness of the hour, that the pc keeps going downhill faster than you can keep him pushed uphill. And don't be amazed to find yourself still there at 3:30 in the morning trying to flatten something – which, if it had been run at 2 o'clock or 3 o'clock in the afternoon, would have flattened easily. After 10 P.M. they don't flatten so well. And if a pc gets into something that is very difficult, it's very arduous, aha, he'll go right on down the chute in it after 10 P.M. Might not have even fazed him at 6 o'clock in the evening, but at 10:30, 11:00, 12:00 – ah, ah, ah, ah, ah. He just catches it!

That's because mostly, most humans think of night as being a thing of which they are the effect. And they are more readily an effect at night. They have been – they've lost bodies at night, they have been eaten. But it goes clear on back to the little old monocell floating on the bosom of the ocean that scientist to think think we all came from, which we didn't.

But on some planets, we've occasionally been luckiess enough to be lying as a monocell on the bosom of the ocean. That little monocell drifting along there was totally dependent on sunlight for its food and body structure and so forth – in the absence of sunlight believes it's going to starve to death. It gets very anxious.

The reason most people – the bulk of deaths from natural causes certainly – ah, well, I don't know what an unnatural cause is – occur between 2:00 and 4:00 – is that this is about the time a little monocell just gives up, that's all. Because the monocell lives on photons, that's its food. And bodies are built out of these things, so they say.

All right. That doesn't mean that you can't get away with it, but it certainly means that some day when you do it, you're going to regret it.

You'll process some preclear at 11 o'clock and then you'll look for a place to stop. And it's 11:15 and you're trying to find a flat spot, anything to stop. And it's 11:30 and you're still trying to find a flat spot, only it's worse now. And it's 11:45 and you're trying to find this flat spot, and the pc just seems to get groggier and groggier and dopier and dopier, going down further and further. And it gets to be midnight and you're trying to find this flat spot. And you say, "Hhhh! Why didn't I stop at 10:30? That wouldn't have been so bad, but if I'd even stopped at 11:30, I wouldn't have killed him. But here he is practically in death throes. And I'm really getting into a hot one, and why didn't I get him into this in the daytime?" It wouldn't have acted that way in the daytime, is the secret. One-thirty, you're liable to still be sitting

there running a writhing pc. Ten o'clock tomorrow morning after he's had some sleep, something like that, why, you see him again and you'll find out the session didn't do him any good. Interesting, but true. There's a mechanical fact – 10 P.M.

Six: Do not process a preclear who is improperly fed or who has not received enough rest.

This is a wonderful way to ruin your own results. There's a method of testing the basal metabolism of a person with an E-Meter. And you can take a person who has not had breakfast, and he will read one way on an E-Meter after he's taken a deep breath, and if he has had breakfast, he'll read in quite another way. Quite amazing.

People are accustomed to eating breakfast, people who aren't accustomed to eating breakfast – if they don't eat breakfast, they process badly. One of the reasons why is they chew up the energy in the bank. They breakfast off their engrams. Keep pulling things in on them. Sort of like food.

A person who hasn't received enough rest is so susceptible to being an effect, that any time you throw something into restimulation, it kicks his teeth in. See? So you're just – you're just running a pc who isn't rested – terrific effect, terrific effect, terrific effect, terrific effect, no matter what you do it's terrific effect. And he doesn't seem to be able to get over the hump at all. He's just getting awfully cuffed around by the processes. You're not doing him a tremendous amount of good, either.

If a person goes without sleep – and you cannot make an HPA or an HCA without adding this – if a person goes without sleep for about 3 nights because of worry, upset and so forth, man, don't process him! Hit him in the head with a baseball bat, throw an ether mask on their face, sit on their chest and stuff them full of sleeping pills. Anything you can do to get them to rest, but don't process them! You see that? It's fatal! It's utterly fatal!

This is what happens to people in institutions, you know. They get so they don't sleep, and then they get less and less rest, and they get less and less rest, and then they're more and more agitated, and they'll become more and more an effect and they cannot rest, they can't stay still and so forth. And then somebody comes along and tries to give them psychotherapy. Oh, yeah? Nuh-uh.

A PC who is very tired should not be processed. A pc who is totally exhausted should be left alone until he has rested. This is primarily the reason why pcs who are physically ill respond less easily to processing. You have to run lighter and lighter processes on pcs when they are more and more ill or tired.

Pc might have been soaring up there around Tone 4 the last time you audited him – he hasn't slept since. You get ahold of him, he audits like somebody at about 0.5. Everything you say to him, he cries. Everything he runs, he cries some more, so forth. You say, "What's happened here?" Well, what's happened here is you disobeyed the Auditor's Code. You processed a preclear who did not have sufficient rest. Okay.

Seven: Do not permit a frequent change of auditors.

Very often you can't prevent a person from having two, three auditors. But this has been one of the common denominators of people who have had a rough time in processing and have been unstabilized during an intensive. They have had changes of auditors.

They get all set and oriented with the known quantity of an auditor, they know what to expect from him – all of a sudden somebody changes auditors on them. They have a new quantity that they have to get used to, somebody changes auditors on them, a new quantity they have to get used to, somebody changes auditors on them. They spin in. You understand that? Frequent change of auditors is a very, very, very, very poor practice.

Sometimes it has to be done. Sometimes you actually do have to have changes of auditors even during an intensive – sometimes. But it's very poor practice. And a frequent change of auditors can practically spin somebody in.

And here's an old, old, old one [8.]: Do not sympathize with the pc.

Could be said there are several things that you could do for a pc. What you want to do is something effective. All right, if you can't do anything effective, what can you do? You can make him comfortable. All right. If you can't make him comfortable, what can you do? You can sympathize with him. Well, we're not down that low.

The basic reason for this is that it responds very badly on the pc. It makes too much identification between the auditor and the pc. And he starts flipping valences more easily and so forth – a lot of weird things happen. This isn't a terribly serious one, but it's just something that you don't have to do because you can be effective.

Nine: Never permit the preclear to end the session on his own independent decision.

I have known Instructors, hearing of this having happened, who themselves almost ended session. Practically hang themselves on this one. This is about the most dreadful thing – this, this is about the most dreadful thing you can permit to happen.

All of a sudden the pc gets up and says, "Well, that's all. I've had enough. Goodbye, now."

And the auditor that still sits there and let's him go – no friend of ours!

You say, "Well, that's just fine. Now, will you sit down in that chair. Yes, thank you. Thank you. Now we're going to run this process a little while longer."

"Bla-bla-bla-bla-bla." ARC break ARC break, ARC break.

"Well, that's all right, we're still going to run the process a little while longer."

And then you find out you win because you're running good 8-C. But pcs who terminate the session on their own decision and disappear hence, are simply blowing, no matter how cheerful they look! And an auditor that will let a pc blow is hardly worthy of the name.

"Well, I feel great, now," this pc will say, "I just feel great, I just feel dandy. Yeah, just end the session right here. Well, goodbye now." That's just a blow. He knows he'd better not take one, two steps further.

Now, of course, there is the condition of being inexpertly audited past the point of session end – like the cyclic aspect in ARC Straightwire – and the auditor getting into difficulty

and can't end the session. That's a technical problem of the auditor's, however. The pc can protest because there is no code by which a pc runs. But nevertheless, it's a technical problem on the part of the auditor. He can't find a flat spot to end the session on. We just discussed it a moment ago – auditing too late at night.

Similarly [10]: Never walk off from a preclear during a session.

Now, I've seen auditors go five and six feet away from a pc, eight or nine feet away, still in the line of sight, and get away with it. But I've seen an auditor step out a door, just out of line of sight and the pc blow the top of his skull off practically, or just fall to pieces as a case – just go to pieces.

And yet it seemed to be perfectly all right. The pc said it was all right, the auditor thought it was all right, and it was during a session. If you want to walk away from a pc, you end that session, and when you come back to the pc, you start a new session!

Eleven: Always reduce every communication lag encountered by continued use of the same question or process.

Ah, very, very vital. "That which turned it on," we always say, "will turn it off". The pc is being audited on Third Rail – ruins him, screams. Nah, don't leave the process!

We had an example of that. Fifth London ACC, a girl was run on Third Rail. Auditor decided that that was what was wrong with the pc – been run on Third Rail – Third Rail had never been flat. And they went back to their home several thousand miles from here. When they got back home, so forth, started running her on the engram which was stirred up and – started running her on the engram that was stirred up, and they ran and they ran and they ran and they ran and they ran and they spent about 350 hours trying to flatten this engram that came up while running Third Rail. And he got on the transatlantic telephone to me and he said, "What do I do, what do I do, what do I do, what do I do?" over a very bad connection.

And I said, "What turned it on?"

"Oh," he said, "it was that terrible process that they were running in the 5th London ACC. It was that Third Rail. It was terrible, it turned the engram on. We haven't been able to..."

I said, "Flatten Third Rail!"

"What?"

"Flatten Third Rail! In English, flatten Third Rail. Flatten that process! Flatten it! Do you hear me? Flatten it!"

"Oh, flatten Third Rail."

"That's right! You got it! Ha-ha-ha. You got it! Ha-ha!"

And he did and I got a cable, and I've had a couple of cables since of what wonderful progress the preclear is making. Well, of course the pc would make progress. Third Rail gets progress, but the auditor didn't flatten Third Rail.

You could, by the way, go back and find the first process anybody was ever processed on that was left unflat, and flatten that. And the next process he was never flattened on, and

carry him right on up to PT, flattening all processes that were left unflat on the case and produce a tremendous gain. That's what's known as parasitic auditing, using the other fellow's starts.

Number Thirteen: Always continue a process as long as it produces change and no longer. That's it.

Fourteen: Be willing to grant beingness to the preclear.

Fifteen: Never mix the processes of Scientology with those of various other practices. These are self-explanatory, certainly.

Sixteen: Maintain two-way communication with the pc.

And we must say that muzzled auditing violates the Auditor's Code. But muzzled auditing doesn't take into account that we have an auditor yet. This is how we audit without an auditor – muzzled auditing. When an auditor is an auditor, he runs by this Code. Until he knows this Code and runs by it, he's not an auditor.

Maintain two-way communication with the pc, it says. And that sure means it. Pc wants to say something, let him talk. If he talks too long, shut him up.

Seventeen: Never use Scientology to obtain personal or unusual favors or unusual compliance from the preclear for the auditor's own personal profit. Very explanatory.

Eighteen: Estimate the correct case of your preclear with reality and do not process another imagined one.

That's just – points your attention to this thing called observing the obvious – obnosis.

And Nineteen: Do not explain, justify or make excuses for any auditor mistake, whether real or imagined.

Don't explain your mistakes; handle it with an ARC break process; 'What have I done wrong?' 'What have you done wrong?' But don't explain it.

You were called away to the phone. You left the pc. It made an Auditor Code break. Comes back, pc says, "What's the matter, what'd you do, why'd you leave me?"

You say, "I was called away to the phone," you're guilty of another Code break!

You say, "What did I do?"

He says, "You walked away."

"What did you do?"

"I felt bad about it."

"Well, how do you feel now?"

"Well, I feel all right."

"Okay, let's carry on."

Okay? You understand this Code a little better?

Audience: Yes.

All right. So be it. Thank you.

Thank you.