

THE FUNDAMENTALS OF AUDITING STYLE

A lecture given on
1 December 1955

We have the main subject here in this basic auditor's course - this is not a basic auditing course; this is a basic auditor's course, coaching course - and we have here as our main subject (what do you know), auditing.

Now, that sounds a little bit strange but, actually, it's not strange, since there's a great deal to know about this subject of auditing, all of which is very fundamental and much of which is completely bypassed, overpassed, neglected and not connected with at all, by a great many auditors. And failing to hit these very fundamental bits and principles, the advance of Scientology thereby is enormously held back.

Now, you think that's a brutal statement, but we will just start from there. Lack of knowledge of certain of these basic principles are holding back Scientology. How? By creating failed cases and slow-moving cases.

Now, it is very often the case when an auditor has a slow-moving case that he looks for another process, and he shouldn't be looking for another process, because that's probably not why the case is moving slowly. The first thing that he should suspect is that there is something fundamental, extremely fundamental, which is awry in the handling of the case itself. Person to person, as a personality, as an individual, there is something awry. ARC has not been established.

The next thing that he should suspect - and he should suspect this until he is on very firm ground - is that he himself may have a fundamental or two that he himself has neglected to assimilate and use. There are fundamentals about auditing below the level of auditing which are more important than auditing. Even though these things are very simple, even though they are apparently something that just everybody knows, and so on, they are very, very often neglected and overlooked.

Now, I will give you a very, very sharp example of this. I happen to know a preclear who runs smoothly, easily, performs any and all command; given a proper process, will clean it up in a matter of a few minutes. This is one of these demon preclears - can run anything, does run anything; see, exteriorize and so forth.

Not long ago this preclear got into the hands of an auditor and got loused up. Now, how did this preclear - how could this preclear possibly be loused up? This preclear could run everything. Well, he couldn't run the misauditing that he was being given.

Well, was this misauditing really - really rough? I mean, was it really tough misauditing? Was it flagrant breaches of the Auditor's Code and all that sort of thing? Did these enter into it? No. There was something very, very fundamental missing in the auditor's education. He didn't know a certain aspect of existence which goes as follows: We have a scale. At the top of the scale there's Knowingness, just below this there is Not-knowingness, and just below that there is Understandingness.

Understanding means something exists to be understood. So something must already have been invented so that we could have something to understand. That's why understanding comes at that point on the scale. Know, Not-know, Understand and below that, on a dwindling spiral, ARC, until we get to the bottom of this, and we have Unconsciousness.

Now, that's all there is to that scale. There isn't any embroidery work, no Mechlin lace, no frills, nothing. If you just look at that scale right there, with just those things on it, you will see a scale in its purity which will mean a great deal and make a great deal plain right in auditing.

At the top we have Knowingness. Therefore, it tells us at once that the preclear who is cogniting, who has suddenly come into a new piece of knowingness about existence, is in pretty darn good state at that moment. Right? So therefore we could even change a process at that moment. But it has to be big. He has to be sure of it. It has to be Knowingness.

Now, if he merely understands his father and mother, where is he? "Oh, I - I suddenly understand my father and mother." That's not really a good cognition. It's an understanding cognition, it is a knowingness about something. And therefore we would think for a moment or two before we changed our process on "Oh, I see what Father was all about." You get the idea? We would think for a moment or two, because it goes Know, and then that little postulate Not-know, and then Understand. So it's a little bit lower.

And therefore you would handle this more gently. You'd maybe run it a little bit further, and it'll turn up into some knowingness. Some knowingness on the subject would have something to do with a far more general picture. A knowingness must apply more broadly to the dynamics than an understandingness. An understandingness generally applies to one part of one dynamic, and a knowingness generally applies to at least a few dynamics. All right.

Now, when we look this over, we see what we mean by a cognition. A cognition is something that is pretty darn sweeping. It is knowingness; it is not knowingness about something, which is understandingness. So we look at this understandingness, and we find out that changing a process at a moment of minor understandingness would be a risky thing to do, because it's below the level of a broad knowingness.

Now, you see these things, you work with them. It's something like how red is a red bicycle? You and I know that a red bicycle - a red bicycle that is very red is a really red bicycle, see? We know that. We can talk about it. We could measure it in angstrom units and go through a large chemical formulary and describe all of the colors of red and their reflective incidences and the ingredients which go into paint to make these colors red, and we could go through an enormous category, but it still wouldn't have gotten around this one fact: How red is a red bicycle? It's real red. Well, you and I understand that, but when we get it down to a system or put it down to MEST, we understand it less well.

Do you know that the chemist or the color expert who has finally figured out how red that red bicycle is, is probably unable to see. He's probably got glasses about that thick. All right.

So we understand what an understandingness is. See, that's easy to understand. We don't have to go any further on it. We do know what a knowingness is. This person has a certain knowingness on a certain level. We can understand what that is, and as such, in an auditing session we so adjudicate it.

Now, very often the auditor is making a slight error. He says this preclear got a cognition. All this preclear did was understand why Mama went into rages. Well, you could call it a cognition. You could play around with the idea of shifting the process or something at that point. With some two-way comm you probably could put it on the shelf, but it'd need a little assistance, you see?

And the preclear might be way up Tone Scale to understand something about Mama. Certainly the preclear has come up Tone Scale on the subject of Mama; certainly this has occurred. Very well. Very well.

We know the preclear is fairly high, but he isn't on a subject of knowingness. The actuality is that if he knew Mama, Mama would never again bother him. You got that? Just never again. There's - this kind of a gap could be envisioned between: It's quite one thing to be able to understand Mama and put up with her, and quite another thing to know the subject of Mamas, because you certainly never worry about them afterwards, you see? There's a difference between this understandingness and this knowingness.

Now, let's go down just below understandingness, and we find the component parts of understandingness. We find understandingness from there on down, till we get clear to stupidity. But it is better understood as it goes lower if broken down into its component parts: affinity, reality and communication.

It's pretty hard to measure understandingness after it drops a little bit above obvious understandingness, you see? It gets a little difficult to measure, so we want three more yardsticks, and those three are interdependent upon one another. Now, the reason we throw them in there is because they are yardsticks and also because by using them, we can promote understanding. We can actually bring it about.

So we have these three points, and we have this dwindling triangle, you might say, which goes down to practically nonexistent understandingness, which is stupidity. You could have stupidity about something, which would be above stupidity. But do you know there's a point below stupidity, and that point is unconsciousness. And we have embraced all gradients on the scale when we get to unconsciousness; we embraced all gradients.

Unconsciousness is a sort of waitingness. It is the last way to handle waitingness, for a thetan. He doesn't go any further south than unconsciousness. He doesn't have a death. That's as far south as you can get, then, would be a complete oblivion. But that complete oblivion is the unconsciousness which you see somebody enter into when he is unconscious.

Now, unconsciousness, oddly enough, has its own gradient scale. There is an unconsciousness by reason of anesthetics. And an individual, actually, under anesthesia knows pretty well what's going on. But there's an unconsciousness below that. There's an unconsciousness to a point where the individual does not know, as a thetan, what is going on. And that is about as close as you can come to an absolute, and that is the bottom of that scale.

So there is a bottom of the scale, and there is a top of the scale. Now, the funny part of it is, is the bottom of the scale is approached more or less on the basis of, as the bottom of the scale is approached, a dimming out of the intellect, the IQ, the good personality traits and so forth. And these dim out, and they get dimmer and dimmer and dimmer, and the final bottom of it is for the fellow to be unconscious. See that?

When he is unconscious, he has no agreement, therefore no reality. He has no communication, and in addition to that, he has no affinity. A fellow in a terrible rage might, to you, seem to be an individual without affinity. But believe me, an individual in a terrible rage has far more affinity present than an individual who is unconscious. Please see that, and you will see what is wrong with sodium pentothal and all these other brackets like hypnotism and so forth. Do you see that? They're downscale.

You take a subject who has been hypnotized or who has been given a great many drugs or something and you start bringing him upscale, and he goes into rage. Well, that's not the moment for you to smack him in the face and push him down again. The fellow is coming up through anger and rage and will go above those points because there are other way-stops.

But when we get to these other way-stops - when we get the original Tone Scale, when we get the various points on the subzero Tone Scale, we are getting far more specific than we actually need to be for elementary auditing knowledge, and we're actually getting more specific than an auditor should be in his basic understanding of this subject. He shouldn't introduce all of those interpoints until he understands the skeleton of that scale. Because the skeleton of that Tone Scale will tell him practically anything he wants to know at any given moment about the behavior of his preclear. And it will certainly tell him whether he's winning or losing.

This case was a pianola, we used to call them, and the auditor in question was utterly baffled in running the case and could not end sessions on this case. Get to the end of the session, couldn't end the session; case wouldn't let him end the session. Arguments, unsets

And do you know why those upsets came about? It's because the auditor, under very close questioning, did not have a good grip on the fact that Knowingness is at the top of the scale and Unconsciousness is at the bottom of the scale and had thought the preclear was more "restful" because he was less energetic and thought therefore that was the time to end the process.

This auditor had been auditing I don't know how many preclears without ever understanding that his mission and goal was to raise the ARC of the preclear. Lord knows how many preclears this auditor must have dumped into limbo. You know, they walked out of the session saying, "Where's the door?" He didn't understand that a preclear who is groggy is a preclear who is low on ARC.

And I went over it carefully, patiently - and for a guy that's commanded men awfully gently, hrumph - and I finally got it through his head that when the preclear started to get dopey on him and fog on him, that an auditing booboo must have occurred, or the preclear hit something that was too rough for him to handle for his state of case. One or the other has happened.

Either the preclear has pitched into it and it's too rough for him, therefore he starts toward unconsciousness - and they go fast, believe me; that is not a route in distance or time. And the other one is that the auditor had pulled some sort of an error, and the error was then followed by the anaten of the preclear. But the error was not the anaten and was not to be found in the anaten, and the anaten wasn't the error. The error had occurred before the unconsciousness (analytical attenuation - our coined word, anaten) occurred. The error occurred before the unconsciousness took place, and the unconsciousness was the last word of warning the preclear could give. He says, "It's all wrong."

And I said to the auditor, "Well then, how would you get somebody out of this?"

"Oh," he'd say, "you have to continue running the process. You've said that many times."

Bzzzzzh.

"You're going to run a process on an unconscious preclear?"

"Oh well, he wasn't very unconscious. He was just doped off."

"How is he going to register on this? Do you realize that he may have sunk below the point where you started the session?"

"Oh well, of course. They always do, don't they?"

Rrrrrr. He meant his always did. But it's not true. If a preclear cannot wind up a session more alert than he started the session, there was something wrong with the auditing. We just say, "alert." We're just talking about a better understandingness, a better ARC, a better consciousness.

Now, let's look at this thing called unconsciousness at the bottom of the scale and realize as we go upscale we must then being approach - approaching higher and higher consciousness, we mean he is more and more alert, that's all. We don't mean he is getting into the consciousness with a cosmic consciousness which is the square root of blah. We simply mean he's waking up. Did you ever see anybody wake up? Well, that's how a preclear gets conscious. You know, they wake up.

Preclear walks in at the beginning of the intensive, he's feeling for the door. He's feeling for the chair. You really don't find him feeling for the door or feeling for the chair unless you know how to look, and it's that he misgauges everything just slightly, you know? She puts her purse down and then moves it a couple of times to get it in the right place, you know? You get the incoherence. They're minor, but they're there to be observed.

And at the end of the intensive, a precision of motion, positiveness, placingness and so forth ought to be present. If you only knew this, you see, you would see at once that your preclear was bettered. He was more precise, he was more competent. And it will show up on the rather lengthy method of the intelligence test, it will show up on behavior tests, and it will show up in piloting airplanes and so forth.

But do you need these gross tests to discover whether or not you're assisting the preclear? You don't need these gross, huge systems to tell you whether or not you're benefiting the preclear, not for a moment. If you merely know that stupidity - one of the symptoms of stupidity is an unknownness of time and place, and is a definition of stupidity - stupidity could have several definitions, but the mechanical definition is an unknownness of time and place. And therefore competence would be a knownness of time and place, wouldn't it? That's what competence is.

What would you think of a bomber who pulled a stick of bombs an hour before he got on the target, but instead of pulling the stick and drop the bombs, which is what he intended to do, he let down his wheels? You'd say he wasn't very competent. Now, the bomber who pulls the stick of bombs at the moment he is on the target, and it is the bomb stick, he's competent.

Well, it's unfortunate that his competence would be dedicated and devoted to such an activity, but at the same time, he is doing a precision placement, isn't he?

Well, let's look much more thoroughly at that. What about Miss Malaprop, the lady who always says the exact wrong thing at the wrong time to the wrong people? You ever known such a person?

Female voice: Yes.

They just can't ever seem to say, "How are you, Mr. Smith?" you know. Nothing simple like that. It's always something else, and it is always a little bit offbeat. That is just the placement of the communication, isn't it? Time, place, person. The right communication in the right place to the right person would be competence in communication, wouldn't it?

Well, after this person has made enough communication boo-boos, they stop talking. You see, it goes downscale. It's not that they have learned better than to talk. They're just going downscale on communication, that's all.

And after a while, if you looked at them, they wouldn't be very conscious. You would come in the door, and you'd slam it and so forth, and rack around the house and so forth. And this person - you've been home an hour, you know, and this person looks at you and says, "Oh, are you home?" Get the idea? Well, that is where the awareness fits in.

Now, an auditor who sees his preclear all of a sudden go "Duuhh, hmm" he's dealing with something. It's time for him to get in there with some two-way comm. It isn't time for him to change the process. It's time for him to find out if there's any auditing to patch up. It's time for him to get in there with some two-way communication one way or the other. I don't care if he talks about fish and goats.

Every once in a while an auditor says to me, "This two-way comm is all right, but it's too complicated. I never can think of anything to say to the preclear."

I say, "Well, you just thought of a horrible thing to say to me, didn't you?"

He cognited. "Yes, I did, ha-ha!"

"All right. You can probably think of equally nasty things to say to a preclear."

Now, where you have communication, which is two-way communication, you're going to get a rise in tone. Where you have a slump on the part of the preclear into anaten, a relaxation of attention, his alertness is dropping, he is not being as sharp or as smart as he was before, there is probably something wrong.

Now, by the mechanics of auditing you can expect the attention to the environment to introvert when you are running a subjective process. Have you got that? You can expect, as you start to run a subjective process, that his attention for the environment will introvert. Now the question is, is it less alert?

See, from the environment to his subjective bank is not necessarily a drop of consciousness. But did he shift from the environment to his - see, he's examining whether or not his mother's universe and his universe are entangled or separated or what, see? And he's examining this, and his attention goes off the environment and goes onto the bank.

That will make him appear, from an outside viewpoint, to be less alert, as long as we say "less alert to the environment." You see, we have to classify it. He was not alert at all to his bank and his mother's universe. He was restraining this in some fashion, so he was not alert at all to that a moment before you started auditing him. And now right after you started auditing him, and addressed his mother's universe, we find him less alert to the environment and more alert to his mother's universe. You get where the shift of attention has gone?

Well, the question is not whether he's shifted his attention in to out, or out to in; that isn't the question. The question is whether or not there's less alertness to that attention. Is he less capable of exerting attention? That's the question you have to answer, so that the auditor has a very, very nice adjudicative principle.

He sits there and he watches the preclear, and as far as the preclear is concerned - remember, he's a thetan; he isn't a body. Now, is the thetan less or more alert? We get the answer to this in the thing called communication lag. As lags lengthen, the thetan is going downhill. Something for you to remember, see? He's going downhill.

Well, you can permit him to go downhill a little ways, if you know enough to bring him back uphill. But supposing we had a preclear, and it was rather late in the evening, and we ask him, "All right. Now, 'Are pumpkins red or green?'" Whatever our auditing question was, you know, "Are pumpkins red or green? Good. Fine."

You say, "Are pumpkins red or green?"

And he says, "That's right. They're red."

And you say, "Good. Are pumpkins red or green?"

And he'd say, "Well, pumpkins are red."

And you say, "Well, are pumpkins red or green?"

And he says ... (silence)

Now, we know that something is a little less alert here. Is it the bank or the preclear? Let's just take a look at this, see.

He finally says, "Oh, I don't know. I guess they're kind of pink."

You say, "Well, fine. Are pumpkins red or green?" And we get a little bit longer comm lag.

Now, it's just about time for you as an auditor to get very alert. It's late in the evening. It's approaching ten o'clock. You know, your preclear can go diving on down the Tone Scale on the

gayest little toboggan ride you ever saw in your life and wind up out. He's comm lagging on something. You've asked him the question the third time, and his comm lag was longer. And you ask him the fourth time, and his comm lag was longer. And you ask him the fifth time, and if his comm lag didn't shorten that time, you've got a problem on your hands, auditor, because that comm lag is not going to shorten.

The tiredness and the accumulated fatigues of the day, perhaps hunger, lack of food, all sorts of oddities may have entered into this session while it was in progress. And the worst thing you think you could do is not flatten the comm lag. Hm-hm, that isn't the worst thing you can do. The worst thing you can do is mess up a preclear.

If you were auditing the process only - not only in an extreme situation like this but in many other situations, you're going to make mistakes. And you're never auditing a process; you're auditing a preclear. And these days we interlard all processes with two-way communication. And when do we use it? That is the big mystery. We use it when the preclear starts downscale, and we bring him back upscale again with it.

We say, "Ah-ah-ah-ah-ah-ah-ah. You just come out of that little boil-off, and you sit up there, be a good little preclear, huh. We don't allow no skidding around here. We don't allow no anatening. What did I do wrong?" That's an awfully sort of a not-promotive-of-ARC question, but the very funny part of it is, if the preclear went anaten, it's an awfully good one to ask.

Not "What have I done wrong now," of course. But you can ask him, "What have I - what have we done here? What's wrong? Has anything gone wrong with the session?"

"No," he'll say - polite preclear. "No, no" - grog, grog. "No, nothing's gone wrong. Nothing."

He'll be really rather sure. "Just look it over for a moment there. Has anything really gone wrong there, or is everything all right with the session and..."

"Oh, there's nothing really wrong except, when you dropped your ashtray a couple of minutes ago, why, it had a funny feeling on me." Or "You've asked the last twenty questions without any kind of a break, and it just doesn't seem to me like you're very interested." Something's gone off.

Well, why bother to categorize how many things have gone off when all you have to do is ask the preclear? And that's a whole subject in itself. So we'll go back and take a look at this other - these other factors. And these factors start at the top with Knowingness, and they wind up at the bottom with Unconsciousness. Your preclear is a thetan. He is just so alert.

Now, there are some little oddities that come in this, and one of the oddities is this: A thetan is very close to being unconscious if he doesn't know he's a thetan. If he doesn't know he is a being separate from a body, I'd say he was practically snoring. See? He's really right there at a deep yawn, at least.

And one of the manifestations of his coming awake is quite curious. He starts to have nightmares. A thetan trying to have nightmares is something very remarkable to observe. The reason he has nightmares is not very disturbing. He starts to come awake himself while the body is asleep. He isn't differentiating between the body and himself. He has the body and himself still entangled, but to some slight degree he's got a differentiation going here. He's being audited, you see, and he's a little more aware of the fact that he is himself and the body is a body.

So he goes to sleep at night, and lo and behold, do we have a very relaxed thetan? No! What the hell is a thetan doing going to sleep at night? Just ask that question. That's a - dduuuhhh. To get rest? Huh! "Thetan needed rest." These are asininites, see? What's he doing going to sleep?

Well, he's doing - going to sleep is because his anchor point is the body, and the body keeps him located. And when the body goes to sleep, he's no longer located. And the reason he dreams and has nightmares is very cute. He's trying to put up enough mock-ups via his own machinery to get himself located again.

Believe me, honest, I tell you, this is the total significance of that circumstance. You'll have that circumstance reported to you over and over and over and over, so you might as well know the answer to it. It's one of these really - real fundamental things.

The thetan starts to wake up. He doesn't go to sleep anymore, of course. And so the body goes to sleep, and he starts waking up, and his answer is to have nightmares so that he can get enough mock-ups around so he can orient himself. Sure, these are horrible nightmares. Sure, these are awful. You ask him what his acceptance level is as a thetan. You just take the area of the body in which he's normally situated, and you give it havingness and find out the things it accepts, and you will be flabbergasted.

The idea of a piece of used sewer pipe would be as delicious as a lollipop to this thetan. See, his deterioration of havingness is quite marked, and we see this thing turn on. We see these various mechanisms occur as the preclear is being audited.

But the preclear is asleep if he's interiorized, more or less. He's depending on the wakefulness of the body and its alertness, and we start to wake him up by auditing. Then how are you going to tell at any given moment if he isn't just boiling off or if he isn't just waking up through a boil-off?.

Boy, I tell you, you could get awful philosophical about this. This is one of the most complicated questions that you ever heard of. This question is so complicated that Bergson would have gone mad trying to answer it. But fortunately, we're not this completely involved.

The preclear, as he sits down, is a unit. He is a unit beingness. And the sleepiness of the preclear or the anaten of the preclear is marked by such things as misplacements, inability to talk to you - the standard things you look for in a preclear, that you recognize.

You say, "What's your name?"

And he says, "I feel fine."

See, the wrong remark and the wrong answer, wrong time. And we then place our preclear rather accurately about where he sits. We know he's kind of out of communication, therefore, we know that he's not very capable of liking things. We know that he's practically spun in on two or three lines, therefore, he's probably not exteriorized.

We can add all these things up. And one of the finest things in the world to do is to gather experience on simplicities, not complexities. And if you gather experience on just these simplicities of how well is he communicating, you eventually get your preclears taped. You've got the preclear, then, standardized. You're looking at a standardized package; you're not looking at something else and then looking at some kind of a standard.

I'll give you an idea. I do quite a bit of photography one way or the other. If you want to learn a camera, you don't use several brands of film, because you'll be studying the film, not the camera, you see? You take - I don't care whether it's bad or good - you take one brand of film and shoot pictures with that one brand of film and get it developed and printed in one drugstore, one chemist, one laboratory.

Whether it's bad or good, we don't care - whether the finishing is. We'll learn to use the camera, because the other things are being held standard. Do you see that? We'll know, then, whether or not we're taking pictures or not taking pictures with a camera.

As soon as we start taking pictures with the film too - you see, we take eight brands of film. We're going to test all of these films and the cameras, only we're not going to pay any attention to the kind of film that we put in the camera, we're going to learn to use the camera by using them.

And then we have these things developed all over town in various laboratories that do various things and great differences and so forth. And we find out we don't know anything about the camera. Therefore, we kind of say to ourselves, "Well, I can't understand this camera."

Well, this is foolish, because you weren't studying the camera. You were studying films and laboratories at the same time. So the place to start in is on one of these simplicities, is how awake is the preclear?

And listen, he ought to be - this is one of these complicated things, see - he ought to be just a little more awake in any given instant of the session than he was in any past instant of the session. You knew how awake he was when he walked in and sat down. Therefore, you will know whether or not his communication, his affinity and reality, are better for progressing moments of the session.

If they are better - you see, you're looking at the preclear as a package. We're not going to separate him out now as a thetan. We're not going to pull him apart and say, "Well, this is behaving one way and the other behaving the other way." We know all these complicated factors exist. So we're just going to take this package that we call a preclear, and we're just going to look at him. And as we audit him, we're going to find out whether or not he appears to be more alert, as a thinking being than he was before. And if he is, we're winning. And if he isn't, we did something wrong or we used the wrong process on him.

Now, that is reduction to a simplicity, but it is as simple as that. It really is. Your preclear that sat there and went "nyar-vroomph" and at the end of twenty-five hours didn't think very much had happened was absolutely right. Something happened to his havingness. Something happened to his - more important - his attention. Something must have happened here to knock him down during this period.

Now, the good old days, when we were having people boil off like mad, I actually went and tested boil-off on pcs and got records on boil-off. And do you know that not one single preclear was ever found to benefit from any boil-off?. This is a complete misconception, that if we make them unconscious for a period of time - one was made unconscious, by the way, for 300 hours. He was run in boil-off of 300 hours from various periods (that was the accumulated amount of time), and he was no better at the end of this period than at the beginning. Has no therapeutic value.

Similarly, nothing else has any therapeutic value that does not immediately promote his consciousness. If we can't promote his consciousness, we're not promoting the preclear.

The goal of auditing is to raise the ARC of the preclear. Is this nebulous? No. Let's go back and look at this fundamental scale, this terribly fundamental scale. At the top there's Knowingness, below that there's Not-know, and below that there's Understand. Not-know is a postulate, so it's the ability to make postulates.

We're not interested, really, in the horribly complicated mechanics of any of that beyond this one fact: ARC are co-related, and ARC equal understanding. Understanding is the combination of ARC. Knowingness isn't the combination of ARC, you understand. Understandingness is the combination of ARC, because you understand something, you understand something. And when you just know, you know, that's all. Follow this?

So then understanding is compartmentable. And the compartmentable factor is the triangle, and that triangle is the ARC triangle. And if it's real big, if there's lots of affinity and lots of reality and lots of communication on the line, you say, "Mm-hm. In good shape."

Now, this is no time to go worrying about whether or not a compulsive outflow or something of the sort is present. Just don't worry about that. Communication is communication. Of course, it has its parts, but we understand communication. We know some guy who is rattling away at a mad rate and never gives us a chance to say a word in reply is not communicating; he's doing something else.

All right. ARC. And at the bottom of that scale is unconsciousness. And as we raise our pc up the scale toward knowingness, he is simply getting more conscious. And as we drop him down the scale, he's getting less conscious.

Funny part of it is, the more unconscious he gets, the more time enters into the situation, waitingness enters into the situation. The mechanism of unconsciousness is simply another way of waiting so you won't know about it. That's what unconsciousness is, "you won't know about it."

All right. Now, what are we stressing this simplicity for? Because I'm afraid it needs stressing here and there. It answers the most fantastic number of questions. It answers, for instance, this question that this auditor was up against: "How do I end a session?"

He'd say, "Well, I kind of get the process flat, but the preclear is still groggy."

We find the preclear was always groggy when a process was run on him. That's because there didn't seem to be any interest in whether or not the process did anything or not, you see? There was no two-way comm. The preclear could volunteer some information. It wouldn't be picked up. You were liable to get another remark on the part of the auditor.

The preclear - here was one boo-boo that I picked up that preceded the first anaten the preclear had had, and this boo-boo was just exactly this: It was a break on two-way communication, and a real simple break that you wouldn't think was a break at all.

The preclear said, in essence, "I think Mother didn't treat me too badly after all."

And the auditor said, "Well, we all come to realize things about Mother sooner or later."

Now, this doesn't sound like very much, does it? There was no acknowledgment. The auditor didn't say, "Good. Yes." He didn't receive the communication. He batted it back to the preclear, see? He made another comment. You got the idea, huh?

Preclear originated a communication, which was a bit of understandingness, and the auditor didn't say, "Well, fine," or anything like that - "Good." He didn't say, "I have received that." He gave a counter-communication. And we found out this auditor did that all the time. But that was why the preclear was anaten, not because the process was not working. The process wasn't making the preclear anaten, because the preclear couldn't say anything. A countercomment drove the preclear down. Get the idea?

Audience: Yes.

Now, this is very, very curious, then, that the first moment of analytical attenuation which was demonstrated by the preclear was preceded - and the auditor I was talking to about this and trying to explain it to him was very fighty with me right up to that point. He wasn't being brash; he was merely saying, "But I can't understand how you could possibly believe that I did anything wrong with the preclear. I obeyed the Auditor's Code. I ran exactly the right process," so on.

And we checked up to find exactly the moment when the preclear started to deteriorate, and we found out that it was a lack of an acknowledgment, see? It was just as fundamental as this: The communication line went out. And the auditor did not notice that the preclear had gone unconscious because of the auditing and had assumed that something horrible had reached up out of the depths and dregs of the case and had pulled the preclear down.

So we get to the next thing that the preclear decided. And the preclear decided this very, very glibly. Preclear decided that in view of the fact that the auditor always consulted him laboriously about the process to be run and always took the process that the preclear offered - and other conduct bore this out - that the auditor in this case expected the preclear to be responsible for his own case, and that the auditor was taking no responsibility for the case.

They never got a chance to run any process the auditor decided on.

The auditor didn't decide when to end sessions except by postulate.

"Well," he'd say, "I'm giving you warning" - I think that's a wonderful thing to use to a half-anaten preclear - "I'm giving you warning that I'm going to end the session shortly." You got any idea what the word warning kicks up in the bank? "And I give you fair warning if I..." you know, every fight up and down the line. "I'm warning you that I'm going to end this session."

Anyway, having done that, there wasn't any ending of the session. The preclear, you know, stayed groggy, and the comm lag stayed there, and the process wouldn't flatten, and the preclear stayed groggy and got more groggy.

And you just kept running the process and doing everything right, but you couldn't end the session.

Well, the auditor had an awful time with this because I kept saying, "All you do is throw in some two-way comm. You start discussing the situation."

And the auditor didn't get it that if you added some C onto this triangle, the preclear would come upscale, which would of course make him less groggy, and he would therefore be totally capable of being reasonable about ending the session. You get that?

But the auditor didn't follow that procedure. Having ground the process out to the last horrible click, but having made it obvious during the entire ending period of the session that it was an overt act on the part of the preclear because the auditor wanted to end the session. You get how this would be? The preclear, of course, just kept going downscale and getting more and more and more and more anaten.

Now, you'd think that somebody would look this over very carefully, but I found out, much to my surprise, that the auditor did not clearly know this basic fundamental: that Knowingness is at the top and Unconsciousness is at the bottom. And as the preclear approaches Unconsciousness, he's, of course, running out of affinity, reality (which is agreement) and communication.

Some communication which contained affinity and agreement would, of course, raise him up. So the preclear felt a little groggy toward the end of session. All the auditor had to do was talk with him about it, and he would have come right out of it.

Now, you get this fundamental - this fundamental scale. The preclear is operating on it. He is behaving according to it. He does not diverge from it. There aren't sudden wild variables that enter in. The preclear is either more alert at the end of two hours of your auditing than he was at the beginning just as you see him, you understand; no factors of extroversion-introversion or anything else connected with it. He's just more alert, just as a human being, than he was at the beginning of session or you didn't do him any good. Fantastic, but true.

Now, quite often a preclear is doing something fantastic, and we get a variation of his conduct in a session. We have a preclear who is sitting in front of us. And we start to audit the preclear, and the very instant that we start to audit the preclear, the preclear seems to absolutely collapse as far as we're concerned. We see this occasionally. What happens when we do that?

This is not a very hard thing to explain. The preclear is actually objecting to being audited, and the social machinery is agreeing. And once in a while we get this wild one, but it's about the only departure. Right there at the beginning of the session the preclear turns on a whole bunch of somatics and so forth.

What are you going to do about something like that? Is there any other reason behind this? Yes. Simply working with the agreement of the social machinery and not the agreement of the preclear won't do this in its entirety. This preclear had to be acutely ill and wasn't talking. There had to be something very fundamentally physically wrong with this preclear to get any behavior of this character. And anything that happens there from there on in terms of somatics with this peculiar preclear is upscale.

So you want to know how bad off this preclear was? This preclear was a social machine. You start to wake the preclear up (snap), and they turn on somatics, and they go on upscale. They will also occasionally get groggy and go through a period of grogginess and so forth.

But just because there is this case that is better off in agony than they were totally numb - this preclear, by the way, that turns on the somatics when you get them into session and so forth, usually was an anesthetic case, anesthesia, a numbness of a body or area. And you start to make it liver, and the somatic is liver than the area was.

If you want to check this over with the preclear, you've asked the preclear, "All right. Do your - body have any numb areas?"

And the preclear said, "Oh, well, nothing much. My left side, of course, is totally numb all the time."

Well, when that left side starts to turn on, you will get somatics, do you see, in the preclear - hm? So that you do have an appearance there of the preclear going downscale when they're going upscale.

Well, it doesn't matter if that little variation works. You still check your auditing. You still check as to whether or not we haven't busted this thing high, wide and handsome. And the preclear who is being audited by social agreement and not by their own agreement will thereby start out on the right foot. You'll get them to agree to be audited before you're through, and have a session running, and this situation will remedy itself, if you tried to find out.

They went anaten or they got somatics the second you started auditing them, then the best thing that you can do is to find out if there is anything wrong between auditor-preclear, session and the ARC which prevails on the subject of auditing. The second you try to check this up, you will immediately discover that there was something wrong.

Maybe one of the things that was wrong was simply that the preclear was acutely well - acutely paralyzed, you might say, from the knees down and didn't tell you. You're going to find out some more information right there. Your omission in that case was not knowing enough about your preclear.

Now, the other point - the other point is - oh, let me finish off this one point. Here is this scale. It goes Know, Not-know, Understand, and then down at the bottom is the harmonic on the Not-know, which is Unconsciousness. And that is all up and down the scale, marked with points and degrees of ARC. And that's one of these stable scales.

I found out originally that in research and investigation, whenever I diverged from the basic Axioms of Dianetics which were laid down - the dynamic principle is survive, the purpose of the mind is to pose and resolve problems, these various, very fundamental axioms - when I went astray from these various fundamental axioms, an interesting thing always occurred: I was wrong. I neglected some of these fundamentals, I was wrong. I kept these fundamentals in mind, I was right.

Well, this is one of these stable data of the auditor; this scale is a stable datum. And whatever else you know, if it violates this stable datum, it's wrong, not this scale. Get the idea? If the preclear apparently violates this stable datum, the preclear is wrong, stable datum isn't. You see that?

You can stake the case on that scale. You can say, "Well, it runs Know, Not-know, Understand, ARC, on down to total Unconsciousness and the degrees of it are so-and-so. And this preclear is behaving peculiarly and erratically and is changing valences, and that has nothing to do with this scale." Nah-ah-ah-ah. It has everything to do with that scale. And if you figure out the relation of the preclear's conduct to this stable datum, this scale, you'll all of a sudden understand the preclear yourself. All right.

The other thing is two-way communication. Somebody says, "Two-way communication is very difficult to use. It's very difficult to think of things to say to the preclear. It's very difficult to remember things to talk about," and so forth. One is having a social difficulty there, not an auditing difficulty. Please make the distinction. Because if you introduce other subjects than auditing the preclear and the preclear's life, very often, you're going to find out that you're off the entire subject of what the preclear is thinking about. You know? So it's not an appropriate communication. It hasn't any agreement with the circumstances and the time. You get your agreement factor by having your communication agree with what is going on.

And the preclear is too often hounded by the auditor - too often hounded - by this one thing: "How do you feel?" An auditor must realize this thing about havingness and not-havingness. A preclear's havingness can be cut to ribbons; and when it's cut to ribbons, his anaten increases. He gets more unconscious when he's losing havingness. If you're running processes on him which are making him lose havingness, he will become unconscious.

So run processes on your preclear which give him havingness if he tends to get a little blinky the moment that you ask him how he feels and how does it seem to him now, because these are as-ising processes. These are processes which rob him.

You say, "Well, that ordinary social convention of 'How do you feel?' you mean that upsets a preclear? Huh! Couldn't be." Oh, yes it does, because he looks himself over to some degree, and he as-ises some of him.

You can say, "How is it going?" You can say, "What are you doing?" You can say, "How are you doing it?" You can say almost anything you want to say except, "How does it seem to you now? How do you feel? How are you?"

He'll become very tired of that. You know why? Because it's as-ising what little havingness he has. And you make yourself a quarter of an inch of gain, and then you ask him, "How do you feel?" and you'll lose half an inch. See? You're not winning. Most preclears are a critical problem in havingness.

Now, what does this have to do with the scale? It just is that the preclear has a consideration that he has to have just so much to get along. There are some fellows that believe they have to have a million bucks before they can possibly eat their breakfast comfortably, and there are other chaps who have just a wonderful time of it if they've got a couple of bob in their pockets. And they think, "Boy, this is really fine," and they really enjoy their breakfast.

These are differences of considerations, aren't they? That's all they are. So one preclear believes he has to have eighty-five stone, and another preclear believes he has to have at least a couple of ounces of havingness in order to feel comfortable this morning.

But the funny part of it is, is once having made this consideration, they then obey it and respond to it, and they've lost the basic consideration. You can change it around, but they will now respond to it.

So you cut this fellow down below eighty-five stone, he's lost. He thinks he's lost a lot of havingness, and he'll start going anaten on you. And you cut down this other fellow's two ounces, and he'll start going anaten on you. You see this?

Male voice: Mm.

So when they start going anaten, one of the things that is happening is that they're losing some of their communication terminal - reality. Something is being lost there. Now, maybe they just lost an auditor because you made a boo-boo. But again, this is explanation of anaten by havingness.

When your preclear starts to finish up the session and he's groggy, you start talking with him. Preferably start talking with him about how he is doing things, what he conceives these things to mean, you know? That's real tricky. Throw some meaningfulness in there, get some more significance in there one way or the other.

"Well, what do you suppose that really amounts to, you know? What could that mean? What does that mean to you?" not "How does it seem to you?" Because you've got to make him go twist, twist, crick, crick, and he'll have a little more havingness. You get the idea?

And if worst came to worst and you'd run his havingness clean out through the bottom - as for lord's sakes I hope you never do - you still have some processes to fall back on.

He very often will fall out of the ability or not be able to do the thing of mocking up a mass and pulling it in on himself or pushing it in on himself. Very often he can't give himself havingness. You could run him too low or he could be too low so that he couldn't do this. But you can always ask him to remember something real. Not the full next-to-the-last list, just "Recall something real." And I've seen preclears do this in the worst shape you ever heard of, and it does remedy havingness in a moment of extremity.

Of course, it alter-ises a not-is, and that will create mass. They're not just pulling in old facsimiles, they're actually creating new mass. They have to alter-is (remember) the not-is of forget in order to get the isness of known, you see? And it actually does remedy havingness. You can keep it up for quite some time, and your preclear is not upset by it. Very often it will communicate.

Now, if you are running Separateness and your preclear starts to go anaten or suddenly starts to pull back or move in some peculiar fashion, you will conceive that he has lost some havingness. He pulled out of an engram. He didn't spot some separateness in it. He pushed some energy around and, by heat loss, lost some havingness. You better stand by to remedy havingness whenever you're running anything that might upset the preclear's havingness.

How do you run havingness? There are many ways to do it. The time to run havingness is when the preclear is still able to run it, not when you get him down to the extremity of remembering something real.

All right. Do you see that there is a basic fundamental by which to compare the results, by which to compare other data on a case, that you, trying to convince some auditor that he ought to become a better auditor, could show him rather easily and keep him from getting involved in

thousands of data? Just make sure he knows this one fundamental spectrum, you might say, of the preclear, and he will come out in the clear, and his auditing will better.

And it's up to us to make sure that everybody is auditing just about as well as anybody possibly could, because only in that way are we going to make forward progress. Okay?

Audience: Yeah.

Thank you.

Audience: Thank you.