AUDITOR'S CODE

A lecture given on
27 February 1962

Thank you.

Once upon a time there were three bears. No, that's this time of evening.

All right. Second lecture. February 27, AD 12. Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

Now, the—I want to talk to you about the basic activities of an auditor and call your attention to the standard procedures which have been invariable over a long period of time. And the first of those is the Auditor's Code. That is an invariable and it is a tool of the auditor. And it's had two or three additions to it over a period of many, many years; and you already know the additions. You think of them as the Auditor's Code, but I'm just saying it came out in its basic form, and it's been with us more or less ever since with just these few additions.

Now, why did the Auditor's Code come out? Why? It was to make auditing possible. If the Auditor's Code is violated, auditing becomes impossible. So it is a practical tool, and all of Scientology is built on practicalities. It has its own branch of theoretical gee-whizzes of "What do you know . . ." "What do you think might. . ." "Well, perhaps," and "Gee-whiz, if. . ." "Wouldn't it be very interesting . . ." etc. See? It has its own branch of speculation—any zone of knowledge has. But it has a very, very heavy zone of practicality. And its foundations are the foundations of practicality, not the foundations of theory.

The Auditor's Code was compiled in Wichita, Kansas, in 1951 after a survey of pcs who had gone wrong in being audited in the Central Organization in Wichita. And I traced back each of these cases and found the elements which had caused a difficulty in auditing the case.

And I think it's the first twelve items, in the same numerical order as they exist today, were the results of that rather arduous survey. And those things are quite factual.

They come in little groups. The two shuns. And I found out that invalidation and evaluation, wow, wow! Oh, man. you run either one of those in on the pc, or the pc runs either one of those into a session—as you're learning in 3D Criss Cross you have to keep them cleaned up—the net result was no auditing gain. Actually, not as mild as no auditing gain, but actually a slump. The case was worse off. Got that? That was a slump.

Now, the matter of eating breakfast sounds like a funny thing to have in an Auditor's Code but let me tell you something about that. Every case that has ever spun in under auditing— (quote) (unquote) "auditing"—in addition to other things has had as a constant nothing to eat and no sleep. Those two are also present whatever else happened. And that's every case that ever spun.

And you get somebody there who just staggered out of an institution someplace and sat down. They were going to make progress all the way along the line and then all of a sudden you'll find that they are spinning You trace back and find immediately preceding this that they stopped sleeping and stopped eating

Now, all of these things, all of these factors of the Code—I'm not trying to cover them one by one—are empirical. That is to say they are the benefit of observation and the coordination of data, and they are there simply because they are practical.

The first theoretical code had greater appeal, and it was something on the order of when knighthood was in flower. Had greater appeal but it was not the practical code. But I still sort of favor that earlier code. I think that that's got some good beef to it. Every once in a while I

feel like shoving that at somebody because one of its primary points was the auditor should be courageous. And you just never let an auditor chicken out. Never. But anyway, these are just the practical aspects of things.

Now, we go into such a thing as the Axioms. They are very, very carefully examined over a long period of time. And the first Dianetic Axioms were written during the year 1951, and you will find that they're quite practical as auditing axioms. Not enough attention is given to those first Dianetic Axioms—those and the Prelogics. The Logics are very interesting as a synthesis of all education. The basic common denominators of all education can be found in the Logics.

But there you're on theoretical material. In the Axioms of Scientology, you have a condensation and a recapitulation of all of those early Axioms and Logics boiled down to a more practical, more fundamental, more forthright list. In other words, those fifty-five original Axioms and so forth of Scientology are more or less observed. They're pretty well observed. They are observed from the more theoretical Dianetic Axioms.

Now, as far as the mind itself and its constituency as covered in Book One, do you know there is hardly a thing you're doing right this minute that isn't somehow touched on or handled or mentioned in Book One—which is very fantastic, see? That's written the first part of 1950. That's very interesting

And you have some data which was in The Original Thesis, 1947—more practically brought up to date. That thing was brought up to date as of 1950—49, which is the present version. There's some data in there which is very, very applicable to auditing and has become very strong and more recently has not been mentioned. But I've mentioned it on this course several times but I'll give you a little synthesis of this.

The auditor as a thetan plus the pc as a thetan is greater than the pc's reactive mind. The pc as a thetan is less than the pc's reactive mind. The auditor plus the reactive mind is certainly greater than the pc as a thetan. Do you see how the equation works out? In other words, the auditor has got to work with the pc in order to overcome the pc's reactive mind. And the auditor cannot condemn the pc and expect to have the pc handle his reactive mind. See, if the auditor takes the pc out of the running as a thetan and as a being, you see—he invalidates his beingness, you might say—you get no conquering of any reactive mind. you just get an overwhelmed pc.

Now, that set of formulas out of The Original Thesis, is what the Auditor's Code is set up to effect. You have the Auditor's Code, you see, because of these other formulas—these little basic formulas. Auditor plus pc, as thetans, greater than pc's reactive mind, see? Auditor plus reactive mind, greater than pc as a thetan, see? In other words, the auditor's validating the pc's reactive mind, you see, and invalidating the pc in some fashion, why, you get all sorts of interesting combinations on how these factors could go out.

Now, if the auditor is a reactive mind, you get all sorts of interesting things. And partially as a sort of a little moral code of auditing, it's a moraltechnical code, you avoid all this trouble if you follow the Auditor's Code very thoroughly. But you're entitled to know what you're avoiding You're avoiding the auditor invalidating the pc as a thetan and beefing up the pc's reactive mind and getting the pc overwhelmed by his own reactive mind. That's all you're—all you're doing And those rules are laid down as a result of it.

Now, the formation of the reactive mind into circuits or valences—they were considered separate once. There are circuits, machinery and valences. Well, machinery—I could tell you very factually—is I don't know what happened to machinery. I don't know where machinery fits in all this, to tell you the truth, because I've audited pcs that have suddenly looked up and found some of the nicest, brightest, shiniest pieces of mental machinery you ever heard of. They go, "Watch!" you know. They have—sometimes have flywheels, and they have goojagodgets that chump-a-chump, you know, and so on.

And I don't know where machinery fits in unless it's a valence of a machine. In other words, the beingness of a machine. The identity of a machine. The individual has been an engineer for so long that he's the engine, and this leaves a machine called an engine which is a valence. It could be that way, but I haven't inspected this any further.

But a circuit, as far as we're concerned, is a Specialized function of a valence. A valence is an identity, but when this identity balls up and acts on its own initiative, it is a totally separate functional identity. And when this— when this valence—well, valence—John Jones, see? John Jones operating without benefit of thetan equals circuit. See, when John Jones is an automatic identity, he's all balled up and functioning, and this is very strange because— Lewis Carroll sort of an approach—" 'e 'adn't any thetan for a number of years," see? "And this is very strange because he hadn't any feet."

Anyway, you've got this kind of a thing. He's been dead now for eightthousand-jillion years so that the planet on which the body is—not only is the graveyard gone, you see, but the planet in which the graveyard stood is gone. And yet we have this John Jones—no thetan, see—but this identity, John Jones, totally functional, still giving the pc orders as to what to do. I think it's quite remarkable. Of course, the pc gave John Jones orders over such a long period of time that you get a reverse flow of John Jones, as a circuit, now giving the pc orders.

Well, it's the stuck flow. you throw baseballs at a wall long enough, and by George, you'll get the idea that the wall is throwing baseballs at you. It's inevitable. Just one way, you see? One way, one way, one way. You'll get a backlog there. Well, the pc at the time he inhabited the character known as John Jones gave nothing but orders to John Jones. Of course, John Jones was not capable of anything else but receiving orders because he was just a meat body or something like that with a thetan resident in it. And as—the pc as the thetan was saying "Do this," and not articulating it, but you know, sort of "Pick up the fork with the right hand. cut off a bit of the shredded wheat biscuit. Tilt the spoon," you see? "Hold the spoon level. Be careful not to spill the milk. Turn the wrist. Open the jaw muscles. Close the elbow. Close the mouth—not too far—withdraw the spoon. Don't drivel. Unjoint the elbow. Lower the hand. Tilt the spoon"—and this would be taking one mouthful, you see?

And that happens every morning for a long time, you see, in all of its dubious complexities. And don't think it is peculiar if the fellow gets the idea after a while that John Jones ought to feed him, a thetan. See? He's been giving all the orders that fed John Jones. So he sits there as a thetan— naturally, the valence becomes a circuit which gives him orders about eating Do you see how the mechanism is? It's a stuck-flow mechanism.

Having proceeded only from the North Pole to the South Pole for seventy years, it is now peculiar if the South Pole doesn't proceed to the North Pole for a while. And that's a circuit.

All right. You're dealing with that with 3D Criss Cross. You're dealing with these things very directly. And everything that makes this life miserable made the life of John Jones miserable, too, probably. See?

You know, you have withholds, and you get in trouble with buying stocks and bonds, and you don't sell them right at the right time, and you should be buying a present for your wife and you're whistling at a blonde, you know? Or you should be thinking about your husband's dinner, and instead of that, why, there's a terrific urge to pick up the phone and call Bill, you see?

And there's as many complexities and withholds and upsets and economics and duresses and familial stand-on-the-heads and antisocialities and games of cops and robbers and so forth, going on, you see, in the lifetime of John Jones, as there has been in this lifetime, see? It was all at earnest, too. It was all at—in fact—perhaps because it's earlier on the track even more

earnest, even more sincerely arduous, even more dedicated, even more this than the present lifetime, see?

Well, all of that, you see, has been lived, and there it is packaged as the accumulated engrams, facsimiles and ridges of John Jones, all neatly packaged and no longer parked on the time track, no longer parked but definitely mixed up in present time. It sort of floated free. There was nothing locating any time there anymore, is there? So it can very easily bunch up and float free. Well, just as this lifetime can get into a grouper—which is your black case; the no facsimile case is simply somebody whose lifetime, this present lifetime, has gone into a grouper—so you have a valence going into a grouper and becoming a round black-ball circuit which gives orders and does various things.

The thinkingness of John Jones is restimulated every time a little bing of energy hits this black ball, see? And we've got that mechanism covered in Book One. And inside this thing we're going to find, as it pulls apart, all of the pictures and all of the picture phenomena that you find in engrams, secondaries and locks and their chains. All of that phenomena is present in that circuit.

Now, that circuit belongs somewhere on a time track in relationship to other circuits, but if it's part of the Goals Problem Mass, it has totally floated free from its position on the time track and every moment of its time is now time; it's instant time. Hence, your instant read on the E-Meter.

In other words, this stuff is not timed anymore. It is "Now-now." You ask, "Did you blow up a planet?" and you'll get instantaneous crash on the E-Meter, you see? Well, how come he gets an instantaneous crash? He blew a planet up a billion years ago and if you were to ask him to travel to the point where he blew up the planet and back again, it would take several lightyears. So therefore, your E-Meter read would be a several light-year lag. It would be latent by several light-years. You see that clearly, don't you?

But it isn't. You say, "Do you—did you blow up that planet?" and you get an instant read. Well, that doesn't mean that he's on the planet. That means that the pictures that represent this explosion of the planet and so on are here and now and all time is now time. So of course, you get instant reads on the meter.

Now, that data, plus all the phenomena of matter, energy, space and time, and the association of incidents and the confusions, and one of the earliest axioms there were, which appeared in the book, "Excalibur", about identities and similarities—life is composed of differences, similarities and identities.

In other words, you identify two things or two things are similar, or they are different. And all things become identity and then collapse on this same scale to becoming different when they are just alike, and go on an inversion, and you get the disassociation of the psychotic, and so forth. All that data is, of course, pertinent to everything we're doing right now. We get all time identified with this time and then we get all these identities giving the pc all these orders and dictating all these reflexes and so forth. And by George, you know, just the last few minutes here, I've stated everything you're handling, see? There isn't anything else you're handling

I had a young fellow one time—I sometimes meet disreputable people who—I have been known to associate with disreputable people and so forth. I've heard afterwards they were disreputable. They never—people never seem very disreputable to me. They always seem like people. And it's always a great shock to me to having spent the afternoon talking with somebody that I am afterwards informed is a wanted murderer. This is supposed to make some difference or another. But it never seems to make much difference to me.

And in talking with disreputable people I have sometimes been given to believe that certain actions were bad. I've been given to believe that certain actions were bad and certain actions

were good. I have. They actually believe this. Certain actions are bad; certain actions are good.

But having talked to an awful lot of disreputable people in an awful lot of strange and different areas, I find there's some conflict in their statements. This is often puzzling to me. So that—well, you go to Australia, for instance, and you talk to some of the people in Australia about law and order—and they give you some very different ideas. And you examine the law codes of Australia and they find out—if you examine them very closely— you'll find out that they are calculated to prevent the law from ever reaching anybody, which I think is very laudable. They mostly concern themselves— I'm not joking now, you'll find all strung through their laws very odd laws which prevent law from ever being applied. And the laws which they pass are to prevent law from being applied, which I consider quite interesting; not necessarily good or bad, but interesting, see?

And you get that law code, and if you took their law codes and asked them to be passed by as close a cousin as the British Parliament, I think there'd be quite a bit of discussion. I think there'd be questions in the House about some of these laws.

Well, there's little things like you've got to post the whole amount of a suit that you're suing somebody for before you can sue him for it, or something like this. I think that's fascinating, you know? And after you've sued somebody and waited for two years, you could lose the suit and forfeit all of your cash, and so forth. It sounds just about the way guys that were edgy about the law and had had enough of it would act.

And there's very curious things. But as far as their morality is concerned, it's comparable morality unless you get back into the bush, and you start talking to some of the aborigines. And I don't think they'd see eye to eye with the white man's law.

I've had discussion with Blackfeet Indians, for instance, on the subject of law. And I was perfectly open-minded about the subject. You're always— you always are open-minded about things that you couldn't care less about, see. And I found out that the Blackfoot Indian has certain fundamentals on the subject of law that we would not completely agree with. We wouldn't agree that these were the best possible laws, and so on. But they always looked very sensible to me.

If you murder a man, you have to support his wife and family from there on out. That's the penalty for murder. Gives you to think, doesn't it, huh?

Now, all these conflicts of morality, all of these various counterpoints of morality, of what's good and what's bad and what isn't good and what isn't bad and all the shades of gray in between, give us so many confusions and conflicts of rightness of conduct that we can then get people seeking right conduct until they go nuts.

Well, now, how do they do that? Well, you're an Egyptian one lifetime and then you're a Persian and then you're a Greek and then you become a Roman and then you become an Egyptian. And these civilizations are wildly and flagrantly different one to the next, but each one has its standards of rightness of conduct.

So if your rightness of conduct in Egypt is inexorably followed, you would be all right unless that got set up as a now-I'm-supposed-to circuit. Rightness of conduct? We always do the right thing automatically. See, training—social training, see? So that in Egypt, never had to think, you know. Just do the right thing, right then. Spontaneous. Bang! That is the thing to do. you all got it, see.

And then we become Persian with an Egyptian circuit. Decision of what to do in any given situation in Persia might be quite different, might be quite different than in Egypt. But we— our rightness of conduct gives us the automatic, now-I'm-supposed-to answer. But in Egypt,

that has to be cancelled out first as the first impulse of what we're supposed to do so we can do the second impulse, see?

Well, that's all right, but we get to going in Persia just fine, and the warrior paints his face, and so forth. And you talk about makeup, I think that's where makeup came from: the Persian knight, the Persian warrior, and so forth. He's real pretty, you know? And—he looked like a Greek prostitute. And they—so we just get along fine there in Persia, see, and we get along dandy and then kick the bucket, and now we've got an Egyptian circuit and a Persian circuit. And we pick up a body in Greece. So now rightness of conduct consists of stopping the Egyptian impulse, stopping the Persian impulse, in order to do the Greek impulse. That's very interesting, isn't it? And then we kick the bucket in Greece and get another body in Egypt.

Now we've got, first, an Egyptian conduct line that is now a century out of date. It's the moral codes of Rameses II or something, see. And then we've got a Persian one and then we've got a Greek one and now we've got a new Egyptian one. Well, that new Egyptian one, that's real easy, isn't it, because we're in the most restimulative country, except we're very old-fashioned in our courtesy at first.

Ah, but wait a minute. While we were being a Persian, while we were being a Greek, we stopped all the early Egyptian impulses, so rightness of conduct is stopping an Egyptian impulse. So rightness of conduct in Egypt now is being antisocial. Isn't it?

Now we're antisocial, you see, and the way to act properly like an Egyptian is to stop an Egyptian impulse. And about this time we sit down and wonder why we don't feel free. And why we feel a little bit confused by our environments. And why we don't think instantly. And why our power of decision seems to be a little bit slow. And why we comm lag before we speak and other such mechanisms.

Well, now all this would be all right if rightness of conduct were given very light weight. See, if we had very little weight attached to rightness of conduct, you know? I mean, if we had individuality and some people acted one way and some people acted the other way, and there was nobody putting any pressure on it.

So having worn out numerous bodies in this Mediterranean circuit, we arrive in England in Puritan times, during the time, well, let's make it worse—the Roundheads—the time of the Roundheads, you see, where an insistence on rightness of conduct is the exclamation point of the day. Now we get some real good ones laid in. The penalty for unrighteous conduct is so fantastically huge that we go in danger of our lives daily. And we're coping at the same time with all these other circuits that tell us what rightness of conduct is. And some of those just as forceful, practically, as the Puritan one.

So we think, "Well, you know, I think the best idea—I tell you, Bill—I think there's a solution to all this. Let's just forget the whole damn thing. Let's just bury all these things and let's not pay any attention to them and let's get them safely out of sight and tucked under the chair and totally notised. And we'll say we only live once. And that will solve the whole thing"— except, of course, nightmares and the impulse of rightness of conduct in Egypt and all these other rightnesses of conduct coming up automatically as a dictation. Because now they're from a hidden source, we don't know the source from which these orders are coming, we can no longer stop them because we don't know from which they emanate and we go around with ideas racking around in our heads. And we feel peculiar, to say the least.

Now, if it was just rightness of conduct that we were worried about, that would have been all right. But rightness of conduct is usually enforced by somatics. And the somatic is most intimately connected in mental phenomena with rightness and wrongness of conduct—punishment.

If we drive a car correctly, we seldom get somatics. And if we drive it incorrectly, we are liable to get somatics, as one of our students can represent. That's just a matter of rightness of conduct, isn't it? It all goes under the heading of measurement and estimation of force, doesn't it? And correctness of action and all of these other things go along with it.

And if we don't do these things, we get the idea of punishment, from— and punishment from just the punishment of the physical universe for incorrectly estimating direction and effort. And it's no wonder that children spank their parents when they get into their teens, for having been spanked all during their childhood. We get a reactivity going here of magnitude. Punishment. Punishment. Make them guilty for punishing, and just punishing. And punishing to be punishing and punishment just to make people guilty so that they will have right conduct and the right conduct becomes punishing. So rightness of conduct becomes sadism and masochism. Rightness of conduct becomes, inevitably, an enforced conduct. We enforce rightness of conduct with pain and deprivation and that sort of thing It becomes a considerable discipline.

So these various valences and circuits, because they are founded on rightness of conduct, enforce rightness of conduct on the pc. Because, of course, they are formed by pain and collision, they, of course, enforce with pain and collision. So every time we collide with one of these things, we get a somatic. That's all there is, basically, to the somatic phenomena.

And we try to run them out and we get somatics. And the somatics appear to be so formidable before we actually contact them—they appear to be so formidable—that we'd better not approach the valence or touch it or interfere with it. And of course, if we mustn't touch it or interfere with it while carrying it all the time, it just gives us—the total order flow comes straight from it. you would be surprised at the command value of valence.

If you want to witness this sometimes, get the list that you're making up in 3D Criss Cross, just note carefully what the pc is doing, saying and what the pc is thinking in the few minutes just before you nail the item. At that time you will have it in its highest level of restimulation. Its command value will be extreme at those few minutes. And then, of course, when it's found and identified, its command value drops off. But if it's also a very unsafe thing that had tremendous withholds in its own lifetime and tends to keep dropping out of the pc's sight so he keeps asking you, "What—what was that one I just gave you? What was that item we checked out yesterday? Oh, yes, buzzbomb. Yeah. Thank you. Um—what was it again? Oh, thank you." In other words, it's unsafe to reveal, and it keeps bobbing out of sight and into sight and out of sight. The pc will dramatize that one occasionally or feel he is.

Now, just that it's been put into view desensitizes it so he really can't capably dramatize it now. He doesn't ever do a good job of dramatizing one that's been brought to view, but he can still feel the impulses and feel upset about having the impulses. And that makes him feel very odd.

He actually isn't in any danger of suddenly going and blowing up the . . . One of our dear students here—it very much looked like one of our classmates went around here for some time with the horrible thought in mind all the time, of how lovely it would be to blow up the East Grinstead bell tower. It was just to the shape and size that it just invited being blown up. And she'd regard that with some appetite every day, but know that she weren't really supposed to do it. Very appetizing. And that was on a terminal that was bobbing in and out and was being run at the particular time. And of course, it would come into heavy dramatization.

If you actually operate with a 3D Criss Cross terminal and you push this 3D Criss Cross terminal a bit under auditing and get it into a higher degree of restim and it's a long, strong one, the pc will go around all the time questioning the rightness of his conduct, wondering whether or not it isn't the conduct of this terminal. And he will do the peculiar thing of equating all of his most normal activities into the terminal, see?

It doesn't matter what the terminal is. He'll equate, "Well, that is the way, that is the way a vicious thief would eat. That's for sure." He suddenly catches himself eating, you know. "Nobody noticed. Close one."

He feels himself on the borderline of being found out in any given moment of the day or night. It's very funny, but it's sometimes, over a period of three or four days—when one of these things is being audited particularly, and continuously agitated and so on—how the pc passes through the strata of being it and then not being it and then deciding at length that he doesn't have to be it or obey it. These are all quite interesting as phenomena.

Of course, these are—3D Criss Cross items are the items, the identities and the beingnesses which the person has actually been. Don't call them so much a beingness as an identity. And they are a package of conduct. They are a package of training patterns, and so forth, which are residual from that particular life. And oddly enough, every facsimile that they gathered in that life is still in that bundle. And you start taking that bundle apart, it looks like a stage magician producing cards from behind his back, you know. Here's a pack, you see, and here's a pack. And here's another pack. And then he reaches over into the girl's bodice and brings out another pack, you know? And here are these pictures, pictures, pictures, incidents, and so forth; that sort of thing coming up. And at first the rather disgusting thing is you really like to see the pictures, but they are a kind of a smudgy piece of charcoal with a white fringe all representing nothing really very tangible.

And when you try to audit them, why, they go in and out, and they don't go—they're not in focus, and they're all improper, and if you really could see them, it would be so much better. And then you find out that they're laid in with terrific cold. There's enormous cold. A bad time to run 3D is during a wintertime. That's a poor time to run 3D because one has a lot of chills that come off of this thing.

And it's very funny, sometimes you'll be running 3D, a pc who has been cold all his or her life has never realized they've been cold all his or her life until the cold wave suddenly departs. And they feel much changed now, and they're not quite sure what's changed. Actually, they were right resident in the middle of the iceberg, you see, because these black masses are drained of their heat energy factors. They don't have too much heat left in them although waves of heat and fever still come out of them. They're dominantly cold, occasionally warm, occasionally even hot, occasionally even fevered, but those are just residuals. They're like burned cinders.

"I burn my candle at both ends. Some say it isn't nice, but, oh, my foes, and oh, my friends, it makes a lovely light," or something like that, whatever the poem was. Because they sure burned that life up. And that's the way the thing kind of sticks on the time track, you know? Charred. And when you get into it it's real cold.

Did you ever realize that the last time you died you probably didn't stay on Earth. You probably went out into the ionosphere and did one of these transorbital migrations that they're doing lately from the left to the right. Very often pcs yo-yo—I mean people yo-yo out into the outer dark. And it's cold out there. And they very often will go out there and get their whole track collapsed. And then they say they've been brainwashed or something of the sort. There's a lot of phenomena connected with this.

But all I'm stressing at the present moment is these are simply the items and the phenomena with which we are operating.

Now, every one of these bundles, a lifetime or a whole cycle, is composed of pictures in greater or lesser state of decay. And here are all these pictures and when you take one of these things apart, you start running into pictures. But because the pictures are already burned out and deteriorated to a marked degree, they sometimes don't show up as good pictures at all. And a pc is very, very disappointed sometimes. He runs into his life as the custodian of the bathing beauties or something like that and he thinks he's got a nice picture file in there, and

he keeps digging for this picture file. Well, hell, he wore it out years ago, you know? In fact, he wore it out in that lifetime.

And he gets into a condition of where the item itself was scarce so he made a picture of it. And then, of course, because he didn't have the item but he did have the picture, the picture itself became scarce and therefore became very valuable and can become so scarce and so valuable that he can't have it at all. And that is the condition in which most of these circuits and valences are.

So these pictures show up. At the same time the pc wants them and has to have them, the pc won't have anything to do with them and can't have them. So you have a no-havingness of the pictures and views. So he uses the picture, he's dependent on the picture to orient himself and tell you what he is doing and he can't get the picture clearly to tell you what he is doing and so orient himself and tell you what he is doing, so he remains in a state of God-'elp-us.

Now, as you remedy his havingness and bring these things back and prepcheck it out of existence and get the withholds off of it, and get his overts off basically because a person's— a person's havingness deteriorates to the degree that he commits overts. This is the other part of the puzzle, is the overt-motivator sequence. And the overt-motivator sequence consists of when the individual has done something to something, he can then receive a similar action from the thing he has done it to. It's as elementary as that.

You cannot be run over by an automobile till you've run over somebody with an automobile. I mean, it's as positive as that. you cannot be hooked by a wild boar until you've gone around hooking some wild boars, see. A girl can't mess you up until you have messed up a girl. This is something that a lot of fellows overlook.

Now, if it went quantitatively one for one, like the law of Hammurabi, God-'elp-us all because I was counting up the number of lifetimes I would have to live just to counterbalance the overts of World War II, see? I was counting them up, so on. Well, it seemed like an awful lot of nonsense about the thing one way or the other.

So it actually isn't a one for one quantity proposition. It's the sensibility of having done something Because when you've done something to something, you have cut your havingness down. And the elementary sense of all O/W is just based on that.

You get individuated to the point where "It's their havingness and my havingness. And therefore, I can protect my havingness by destroying their havingness." And we totally overlook the fact that it's all your havingness.

Well, we've got—a little boy has four lead soldiers, and you have four lead soldiers. So in order to protect your lead soldiers, you teach him not to destroy your lead soldiers by destroying one of his lead soldiers. You now have seven lead soldiers. See? So then, because you've destroyed one of his lead soldiers, he's going to destroy one of your lead soldiers. You now have six lead soldiers. So to discourage any further incursions of him upon your lead soldiers, you destroy another one of his lead soldiers. You now have five lead soldiers. But because you have done this, he gets even with you by destroying one of your lead soldiers. You now have four lead soldiers. Two are yours and two are his.

Now, because you've both become that upset with each other you have a hell of a fight and break up the remaining lead soldiers. You now have no lead soldiers. See, the misnomer of havingness is personal ownership.

I have been up above a lot of real estate that has been owned by a lot of people. But while I've been up above this real estate looking at this real estate, let me assure you it belonged to nobody but me. I think you'll find that's the case in all cases: that you own that which you can perceive as far as havingness is concerned. And this is degraded down to the idea that you can only own that which you personally can fully use. Of course, if you just walked on

some of this real estate you're looking at, they'd set the dogs on you. You're not supposed to use that item.

So freedom of use is the final idea of havingness to an awful lot of people whereby it isn't really the idea of havingness at all.

See what that is? If somebody debars you the use of something, and you say you don't have that thing. You can look at it, but you mustn't touch it. you mustn't use it. you mustn't do this. A lot of nonsense is entered in onto like this. That's why the communists, the socialists, and so forth, can make such large windrows on society, because he's talking on a mockery harmonic of what is basically true, is nobody owns nothing. See?

All ideas of ownership are postulated ownerships. They're not actual ownerships except those things which one owns by the right of having created them. And, therefore, some people fall back on creativeness as the only way of life because it's the only possible method of declared ownership. Do you see that?

"That's mine, I made it," which is unanswerable. But what they neglect to point out is what the other fellow made is theirs too.

Now, the commie gets down into the point of, "Everything you made is mine." It belongs to—then they don't even own it. It finally belongs to the state. Everything belongs to the state and there is no thetan called the state so they got it taped. Anyway, that's a lower mockery, community property is a lower mockery of what is actually a fact.

Now, I don't even know that you own everything you create, see? You can continue responsibility for the things you create actually, without owning them, strangely enough.

Now, here's your problem in a nutshell in processing a pc, is to understand what fundamentals are important and what are not fundamentals— what things are not fundamentals.

Don't make the mistake of considering all data equally important. It is not. Sketchily it is true, but I have nevertheless touched on, in just the last hour, every important item that you are handling in Prepchecking and 3D Criss Cross and the mind.

I have mentioned these things and actually their behavior and their role and relationship in modern processing. And these are the important items there are. They're all developed items. You handle just those items.

Now, if we say that it's equally important across the boards, from one end of the scale to the other end of the scale, that the pc must not smoke cigarettes during the session and the auditor must use the Auditor's Code, we have approached most philosophic idiocies.

And you'll find out people will come along, and they will tell you, "But these truths of Scientology that you say, they have appeared in other philosophies." That's true, too. That's absolutely true. They have occasionally appeared in other philosophies. By the way, the enormous majority of them have not. But some of them have, see?

And you sa—if you wanted to be very cruel and shatter this person in their tracks, just say, "Well, show me the book." And they will show you the book, and they will look it up and they will find the line and they show you this very proudly. This book usually is about a foot and a half thick, you see, and so on. And you say, "All right. Now where's that line?"

And they say, "Well, look here. 'Man is basically a soul, and all of his beingness is contained in his soul.'"

See, they show you a piece of philosophy like that. you say—they say, "Well, there's a thetan."

You say, "Now read the next line."

And they read the next line, and they say, "And every man should be good to his mother."

You say, "Go ahead and read the next line."

"For the finest role of the being is making a family of which he can be proud."

And you say, "Where's the notation by the author that only that top paragraph has value?"

This slaughters them. They finally get it through their heads that, yeah, there's a piece of philosophy there, but it just happened that nobody had marked out whether it was important or unimportant.

And the importance of a datum in relationship to other data is the sole criteria of the value of the datum. You can utter truths and idiocies consecutively for hours, and some will look upon you as wise, but others would say you're only pretty confused.

Now, there's this story about fifty-five thousand monkeys or something like that could write for fifty thousand years on fifty thousand typewriters—I don't know. Some typewriter company must have put this out—and they'd write all the books ever written. Well, I think that's very interesting. It's very interesting.

But I know one book they wouldn't write. And that'd be Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health. They couldn't write that without finding out what they were doing.

Anyway, it's the importance of the datum. And one of the things you must learn in all of your activities on study and so forth is the relative importance of what you are learning How is this important to a session? How is this important to a pc? How is this related to the final goal of getting something done?

You could just memorize all of these things as just strings of words. And that's a valuable action, too. you would be considered learned if you did that. Yes, you could become very learned and still be as dumb as an ox.

If you never related any of your learning to any activity or evaluated any of the things you had learned, where would you be? You would merely become learned. And it is not enough to be learned. There have been lots of learned men. I have seen them neglected and thrown overboard and dropped in rivers along with unlearned men. In fact, sometimes a little quicker.

But to he wise, to actually be wise, you have to be able to relate data to activities and actions and evaluate them for their own sake and their relative importance to other data.

You can't go through a training manual and read the number of pints of water carried on a route march as being relatively important with the fact that you should always salute subalterns. These data are not of comparable importance. And yet you will find that most people tend to make data of a monotone value. Well, beware of data of a monotone value.

If you think of the hundreds of thousands of facts that have been developed in Dianetics and Scientology—the hundreds of thousands of them, because they actually exist and much of that data, almost all of it, is brand-new in the field of the mind—if you think of that vast body of data and then think that I was able to sit here in the course of an hour and give you a summation of the data that you're handling in processing, then it must be true that some of this data has greater importance than other of this data. And that's a basic role in study: To

find out what you're studying and how it relates to what you're doing or intend to do. And you have to make that bridge, too.

Because in auditing you haven't time to think of a hundred thousand data. But if you know very well the basic and fundamental data that you are addressing, the basic and fundamental things which you are handling in the auditing session, you don't become confused at all. you can make very, very wise and smart decisions with regard to the pc. you know exactly what you're doing with regard to the pc. you can wade right into this one left and right. Why? Because you're handling only the important data. You're not handling the valueless and the unimportant and the merely interesting data. You're handling what has to be handled.

So it's not enough to know data. you must know the data's use and where it belongs and how it fits together and how it aligns with what you're doing and what you intend to do.

And I'd advise you when you're studying to try to align what you are studying with whether or not—with how it applies to a pc that you will be auditing, and how relatively important it is to pay attention to it in the pc. And if you ask the question of any data—of any datum as to whether or not it would expedite an auditing session, then you will quickly and rapidly align what you should be handling in an auditing session. And you suddenly will realize what you should be handling in an auditing session and you will cease to make any mistakes with regard to it. And you'll cease to be adrift with regard to pcs. Okay?

Thank you.