

FUNDAMENTALS OF AUDITING

A lecture given on
11 January 1955

An auditor who doesn't know his fundamentals doesn't know his preclear because these fundamentals exactly and closely appertain to the preclear himself. They are a description of the basic agreements which this individual has made on the whole track in order to get himself in the shape he's in. And if we don't know these basic agreements then we're apt to go over along side someplace and go over the hills and far away and start hitting something that is terrifically ungermane to the situation.

Now, we could pile up a lot of things that we could call the fundamentals of auditing. The fundamentals of auditing would simply be those things which stressed and took apart the basic agreements on the track and rehabilitated the thetan's ability to make more agreements and make his own postulates stick again. That's what we would do in auditing, you see. We'd take apart the enforced, inhibited agreements, the ones he couldn't do anything about. We would take those apart enough so that we could get him into a situation where we could rehabilitate his ability to create and agree at will. In other words, we would take this obsessive or inhibitive line and put it into a knowingness category. And if we did that then we're auditing. If we don't know we're doing that we're not doing anything. You get what this is?

We've got to take him out of the unknown, unconscious, stimulus-response type of behavior and activity and put him over here to where he can cause this activity at will. And when we've done that we've really got a boy. All right.

What are these compulsive and inhibitive patterns? What are they? And they are contained in the Axioms of Dianetics and Scientology; the Axioms and definitions. If an auditor doesn't know what these are he might draw some of the most interesting conclusions regarding a preclear. Furthermore he will always have this feeling: "Maybe the HASI doesn't know what it's talking about. Maybe it does. I don't know."

He's definitely on an uncertainty. That's the least thing he's on. You can determine this immediately: Somebody is getting results with auditing, it's because he knows the fundamentals of this science. That is why he's getting results in auditing.

Now, let's make – let's make a good comparison of this. Let's take an engineer out here and he's building himself a bridge. And if this engineer knows the fundamentals of steel structure; if he knows something about grading, overburdening, positioning concrete in place; if he knows something about cantilevers, stresses, weights, overloads and factors; that bridge

will stay there. And if he is shorted on any one of these things I've mentioned then any goofball practical contractor – in our lines that would be “crystal ball reader,” you know, the engineer has this as his little cross to bear. He's always dealing with practical engineers who don't know anything about the fundamentals of engineering. And they come up to him and they start telling him what the stress analysis is and what it isn't and he doesn't know and he takes their word for it and that bridge goes crash down into the chasm.

Well, it works the same way with a case. The preclear is your practical engineer in this case and he's going to tell you what's wrong with him. And brother, if you do not know the fundamentals of existence itself, then you don't know what's wrong with the preclear and so he can tell you and so the case can go on forever. And that's about all there is to it.

There are just so many things that can get wrong with a man. The best categories of these are simply categorized this way: He gets out of a knowingness band into a compulsive or obsessive band. Instead of using postulates and handling things with postulates, he starts to use energy and handle everything with energy. This is what happens to your preclear. As soon as he starts to use energy and handle everything via-via-via, energy-energy-energy, he is then in a condition where any piece of energy that comes along directed at him can throw him.

If he is not using energy and if he can handle things by postulates, he is impervious to the stimulus-response patterns of energy itself.

So what gets wrong with him is he starts to handle things in terms of mechanics. He is being totally mechanical. He is starting to handle everything in terms of space. In the absence of space he doesn't find or feel that he can do anything. He has to have some energy in order to do something. You know the final result of that is the guy goes out here and he buys a bunch of fishing equipment and then he buys a reel, which is a very special reel, and then he buys a whole bunch of reels which dry line. And then he gets some boots and then he gets a fancy knife in order to clean fish. And then he buys himself a couple of outboard motors and then he buys himself a boat. And then he decides that in order to haul the boat around he's got to have a trailer. Well, in order to have a trailer he's got to have a special air-inflating pump in case the trailer tires ever went flat.

Has this boy ever done any fishing yet? No, he's getting further and further from doing fishing.

So he then decides that in order to really fish he better get himself this hunting lodge out alongside of this lake. And so he decides if he's got that he'd better stock it up for long stays, so he puts a lot of stuff in there. Then he decides that, actually, the crude plumbing that is out there isn't so good so he had better put in plumbing, a water pump, a well and a septic tank. He proceeds to do this.

Has he done any fishing yet? No, he sure hasn't. There's this little kid down here with a bent pin has gone out and emptied the lake by this time. He has to have in order to do and that is about the lowest of the brackets that man gets into. After a while he even inhibits this and he decides he can't have which tells him adequately that he can't do. But this is all getting over into compulsive and obsessive behavior. He has these things that tell him now whether or not he can do it. Does the motor run – does this outboard motor run? Well, that tells him whether or not he can go fishing. You got the idea, if the motor doesn't run, he can't go fishing. What's

the motor got to do with fish? Well, if his hobby is repairing and putting into action outboard motors he's all set. He – but let's not – let's not worry about that if our goal is to go fishing. All right.

Now let's take a look – let's take a look at an auditor and see the frame of mind that you actually could get into. You might think that you have to have all this tremendous number of possessions in order to audit, and that these possessions are so tremendous and they're so big and there are so many of them that you couldn't possibly grab hold of them. And so if this were the case then you wouldn't be able to get up to a point where you could audit, could you? You always have something more in order to audit.

Well, these things are ideas. They have nothing to do with mass. There are certain things you have to know. Do you know that you can be restimulated by a preclear if you yourself don't know the fundamentals of the whole track? And if you know them you can't be restimulated by a preclear because you will understand exactly what he's doing. It's only when you don't understand what this preclear is doing that you can become restimulated.

Now let's look at that as a slight bonus of knowing this science. These are ideas. These are the ideas, the agreements, the postulates and they have nothing to do with mass or energy. You are not in possession of a big lump of stuff when you know this. It's actually true that knowledge of the whole track and the common denominators upon it set a man free. Why? Because these things undo energy.

If you've run, even for a moment, a little spot out there saying, “Hello,” you saw energy start to disintegrate. You saw it start to come apart. You saw less masses just by reason of a little communication. Well, it took us a long time to win that particular datum but now that it's won it should demonstrate to you whether it was therapeutic or not. It certainly must have been educational if you look at it this way: A mass of energy came apart.

What is senior – the energy or the idea? The idea every time.

All right. Here is an organized chain of ideas which strings back over seventy-six trillion years. An organized string of ideas which actually do not amount to more – as far as the importance is concerned – than four or five dozen ideas. That's a fantastic thing, there's just this little bit of ideas. And those ideas strung back through time have created every form, object or activity on the whole track.

Now as a student of this subject you are being asked to put yourself into possession of these four or five dozen ideas. You don't have to have anything else but these things because once you've got these ideas, once you know that they are the ideas which are the common denominators in the track, then no preclear or textbook or anything else will be able to fool you or put you into a state of “I do not understand.”

That's the one state an auditor must never get into, “I don't understand,” because that is itself energy. It's incomprehensibility. The preclear can then sit there and be incomprehensible. Only when the preclear is being incomprehensible does the auditor get restimulated. If you were to understand everything this preclear is doing, then you therefore – you can predict this preclear. And what you can predict you don't worry about. You could predict that you would have to wait for eight million years for an answer and a comm lag that

you knew would be over in eight million years, would then not worry you, if you knew this – you follow me?

But if you thought that it might occur a year from now or ten years from now or fifty years from now or eight trillion years from now, you could then worry about it. You wouldn't have to – you wouldn't be able to predict where it is. If you can understand what is wrong with the preclear, you can predict what he is doing and predict what he's going to do. If you can do this then and there, you have placed yourself in a situation where you cannot be restimulated by anything. In other words you cannot be made into an unknown, unknowing effect.

And that is the first and foremost reason completely, regardless of results, why an auditor has to know his definitions and axioms. The first and foremost reason is for his own sake.

Do you feel comfortable with somebody fooling around with a .45 automatic that they know nothing about; putting bullets in it and taking them out of it and fooling around with its safeties and its hammer and not knowing where the safeties are and not knowing where the trigger is. Would you be comfortable? Could you sit there adequately calm in front of somebody doing this? You bet you couldn't. Well, by God, you are looking at a .45 when you are looking at a preclear that actually doesn't know where his safeties are, doesn't know where his – the loaders or ejectors or injectors or trigger or barrel or anything else is. This guy is this terrific mass of incomprehensibility. You know one of these days he's going to pull the wrong lever. Which way is he going to go? Well, he'll go in the direction to give you some trouble if you are living with him.

So let's apply this to the business of living. Still, if he pulled the wrong lever and you could predict that he was going to do so because you saw the motions which preceded pulling the wrong lever, you would at least know it was a wrong lever and you could be that comfortable about it, that you could predict his activity and behavior. Only those things which you do not understand can hurt you.

All right, let's go a little bit further in the making of an auditor. And he's facing this case, and he's running this case in an interestingly abstruse, obtuse sort of way. He is saying some process like, “Well, tell me about your troubles, and tell me some more about your troubles.” And he keeps this up and by golly you know the preclear gets better – some more troubles and some more troubles and some more troubles and you know the preclear is feeling – feeling right nice. I mean everything is going along very fine and some more troubles and all of a sudden the preclear starts to get upset and uncomfortable. If you do not know and if you cannot explain two-way communication in terms of living, that first thing alone could cause an eventual upset.

We just use one process and we get a good one-way flow started on it. And if we let that flow go long enough, certainly by just communication alone we're going to get a stuck flow, if we are going to do no more to this case than that. Right? You should be able to understand that.

All right, next thing, next thing; you are going to give him a scarcity of problems after a while because you are as-is-ing every damned problem this fella can think of. You haven't

asked him to invent any problems or remedy his havingness of it. You've just asked him time after time to tell you about some more of his problems, and the next thing you know there sits this poor devil who hasn't got any game left.

Well, for instance, the sore tooth that he's got, you know that once upon a time had tremendous workability and it might again. My, was his mother sympathetic. Tremendous workability, beautiful game. "I get a sore tooth, Mother runs herself ragged." Nice game. Might occur again. Might even work on the wife. And he starts telling you about this sore tooth and you as an auditor can make him tell you about this sore tooth in such a way as to as-is the entire computation. Now what do you think will happen to him after you've been up to this long enough? The first liability would be that he would get a stuck flow on just this type of auditing, you see. You're making him give you an answer, him give you an answer, him give you an answer, him give you an answer, him give you an answer. What are you doing with the communication formula, huh? Huh?

Male voice: Sticking it...

You sure are. You are sticking it and it will stick eventually. I don't – I'm not telling you now how to remedy it. I'm just telling you what can happen here. And if you don't know the real application of communication in everyday living, if you don't know that the two-way cycle of communication actually behaves as it behaves, then there's an awful lot of incomprehensible things can occur with this preclear which you then have to look far afield and find some very unsatisfactory answer for.

You did it; you were sitting right there. The first thing you did was stick him by auditing him for forty hours, or sixty hours or a hundred hours on how many problems he had and because it produced results at first, we thought that this was terrific. And the next way you stuck him was to take all of his games away from him without asking him to invent anything else to go in their place. So this wasn't good. That's bad auditing.

Well, you know the fundamentals. You see there's really no reason why I should have to teach you how to audit. If you were capable of applying the Axioms of Scientology immediately to the problem of another fellow human being, you theoretically could dream up enough processes to satisfy adequately every single condition which you would meet. But it has been found by experience that auditors do not do this. So we have codified processes.

And we have the codification of processes known as Two-way Communication, Elementary Straightwire, Opening Procedure 8-C, Opening Procedure by Duplication, Remedy of Havingness and Spotting Spots. All of these are very intimately seated in the Axioms. All of them have rationale back of them which stems immediately from the definitions and Axioms of Dianetics and Scientology. They were developed straight out of theory. And they are only there for one reason – Is it actually would be an imposition to ask every student of this subject to come along and suddenly start to extrapolate a hundred percent from these Axioms because he would not have any objective reality on it. Furthermore, the Axioms themselves are restimulative. They are restimulative. They cannot help but be restimulative. The fellow starts to resist them or fight them, the next thing you know he's got a counter-blast going against one of his basic agreements on the track and they fold fast.

You know, by the way, I don't worry these days, I don't even vaguely worry these days about somebody popping up somewhere grabbing a completely cockeyed brand of Dianetics and Scientology and putting out a lot of yap-yap to the public and patent medicine testimonials and so forth, and starting to go to town. I don't worry about this boy. You know why? He could have gotten away with it with early Dianetics. There wasn't enough – wasn't enough of these basic axioms on the track in early Dianetics. But he wouldn't get away with it now. He's fighting the stuff of which he is made. There could be no quicker way to kill a man. And so it occurs these people last about a year in a sane state. Now this is a horrible thing. We've got the most awful self-protective mechanism you ever walked into because they are stealing it or taking it aside – you see they could have it. There is no reason why they should steal it, but their make-up tells them they got to steal it. All right. They could have it. But they don't do that. They have a basic misunderstanding of its mission, its activity and its form. And having this basic misunderstanding of it, they then haven't got any better sense than to start to buck it in some fashion or to say, “Well, this and that of it is not true, and something or other is not true, and we all know this,” and so on; and then start to tell people how awful a real auditor is – you're in the area...

By the way, don't think these boys just yap at me. That's not true. They catch you in some area and they might tell you how bad I am, but they tell the next guy that comes in how bad you are. That's what that goes all about. It's just bad over there. And this individual starts saying how bad the real trained auditor is and they really don't have to do that and so on, and he starts fighting a buzz saw. And he might as well go out and find himself a nice, big sawmill and fight a buzz saw, because he – it'd actually be less painful. This is not a threat I'm giving you. I'm just saying this stuff is there to be understood and learned, and there isn't, unfortunately, is no short-stop. You don't stop early on this. There is no stopping early. You know that. That's why you've studied it for as long as you have.

You were studying it at the same time I was studying it. I was developing it along the line and I gave you everything that I discovered that had validity as it was discovered. This was good enough. This was good enough. But now there are damned few bugs extant in this stuff. Very, very few bugs. An alignment such as I gave you the last couple of days – we'll call exteriorization procedure – this is simply putting together a lot of stuff we already know and know well to produce more rapidly a certain result.

Well, let's not go astray in the believing that you know something if you can't define it. That is the sorriest trap that anybody ever led himself into. This is what's known as something like the recognition of words. You know about the recognition of words? People have a recognition value of words. It certainly doesn't make them literate. They know that word means something vaguely resembling what it means, but they themselves cannot use that word. Let's take a college student, somebody with a pauperized vocabulary, and turn him loose in Thomas Hardy – which is bad literature to begin with – and they start running across some of these words, and they give them recognition value. They think they know what it means. When they see the word, they have a vague idea of what it means. That's recognition value. It certainly isn't knowing the word. And they will wind up with the dimmest idea of what the author was talking about.

All right, let's get a little bit further. What is basically the vocabulary of people? It is terrible. I can really point you out an "It's bad over there." I was utterly flabbergasted the other day to write somebody a letter and have the entire letter misunderstood because the person did not know what the word expect means! You'd say this man was the champion moron of all time. Nn-nn, no he's not. He manages a business. "Oh," you say, "Recognition value or knowingness value of words couldn't possibly be so bad that there's somebody out here who doesn't know what expect means." Yes there are. There are lots of people around that don't know what a word like expect means.

I try to use, by and large, simple English. Very few of these definitions or Axioms in Scientology have complicated words in them. They either have a made-up word out of whole cloth; take some adjective and make a noun out of it, something, just a whole cloth, because there is no place, no hole – there's been a – there's a hole there in the language. There is no word that makes up this hole; a phenomenon nobody has observed before so we don't have a pat word for it.

But you don't find us using words like telekinesis, or telekinesis is the proper pronunciation of it. It's a gaudy word, isn't it; telekinesis. Well, if you were studying philosophy at Georgetown University in order to become a priest, you would not only know that word but you would know the four or five textbooks which go to explain what that word means. And that's what somebody would expect of you in one of our modern institutions, parenthesis, laughingly referred to as, unparenthesis, learning. It would be getting more symbols of the definitions of more symbols to pile on the top of more symbols. You'd get pretty giddy after a while.

I've never seen two priests that couldn't get into an argument over some such subjects as the one I've mentioned. They have observed certain phenomena and then they've given them words and the words have become more important than the phenomena. We all know this manifestation in healing, in psychology and so forth. We've seen it there. It's also in religion. A man who was really trained in the field of religion has simply been made a walking dictionary of symbols – not of understanding, just of symbols. You give him one word and he can come out with the other combination of words which explains that one word. See? Now you ask him to explain one of these other words that he used to explain it and he can come out with another regurgitation of words which explains this word. All words explained by all words. You get the idea? We got a word, so we explain it with these words and then we get one of these words and we can explain it over here with these words and then we got a bunch more words and the next thing you know we've got the symbol band beautifully hit.

Well, now listen – in Scientology we're not explaining words by words. We're explaining words by life behavior and we are unfortunately called upon to explain life behavior by words.

There is another point on our communication line. We have an actual comparison and that comparison is experience in existence.

Now an auditor, because he's working definitely straight up to and close to – very, very close to – the pattern of life which is the preclear; therefore, has this before him: He has

life. He doesn't have words. So he'd definitely have to have a comprehension of that life manifestation. And the most fantastic thing that has happened here in the last four years, that life in all these various complex manifestations has been described by words. Scientology and Dianetics are semantic triumphs completely aside from doing anything. You get the idea? We can give a simple word description of phenomena occurring in life.

You won't find very many long words in Dianetics and Scientology mostly because Western scientific thinking has gone over into the hands of the engineer. It no longer belongs in the field of philosophy. The engineer has captured all this ground. Today the psychiatrist and the psychologist is turning more and more toward some scientific explanation. He right now has turned rather interestingly to the electronic brain boys to find out what's happening – the electronic brain boys just as though – he's still on the idea that a human being is totally a machine with no other production in it, but a machine. It's a basic misconception of philosophy. But he's being forced over into the field of science.

It used to be enough for a doctor simply to be able to name the bones of the body and not be able to do anything else at all to be a physician. Now this is the most incredible thing you ever heard of. Every one of these bones had a tremendous number of names. This was way back on the track. But they had all these names. Somebody had named all these bones and this fella could name these bones and it took them hundreds and hundreds of years on the subject of bones to get up to a practical application of bones and healing. And the first practical application of it came in the – somewhere in the vicinity of about 1780, 1760. Somewhere in that band of time, somebody came up and said, 'A doctor should be able not only to name these bones but to identify them by touch while blindfolded.' Medicine had started to get real. And a good physician could do this. He could take all the assorted pile of bones; a skeleton completely knocked to pieces in its separate parts in a pile, and he could take each one of these things blindfolded and just by touch identify what that bone was. Now we've gotten over in toward reality.

But they still clung to the fact that the brain had an enormous number of names. You could ask today the psychiatrist what is a brain and it – in – the first thing that would click inside of his head would be an enormous number of names. That's his understanding of it – this great number of Latin names. That psychiatrist was made to sit in class day after day, week after week, month after month and memorize some of the most incredible and misleading Latin titles you ever saw. Latin. I wish I had a textbook here of all the parts of the brain. I myself, am just – I never look at it but what I say, "What a tremendously complex waste of effort. What a beautiful example of useless activity." Just casting up these names for the brain.

But these boys could not do anything for the brain. Now do you understand me? They have not to this date done anything for the brain, but they know an awful lot of names. So that you as an individual inheriting some of this tradition of – learn an awful lot of category, learn an awful lot of definitions and know nothing – you got that, learn a lot and know nothing – have some tendency in Dianetics and Scientology to discount the necessity of a precision grip. This has been done to you. It's been done to you in schools. You have had to learn, if you ever took basic psychology, you were asked to learn all sorts of parts. Completely useless, after

you learned all these parts, you couldn't make a man laugh or cry, but you knew all the parts. What good was that?

Scholastic training back down through the years has disabused us all of the idea of ever knowing anything about definition. And then we moved into the field of engineering. There have been engineers with us since long ago. They were building roads and bridges in Gaul that haven't gone to pieces yet. The engineer fought his knowledge out of the physical universe, and the physical universe is a very hard taskmaster. A man is right or he is right, he never gets a chance to be wrong.

And the engineer has come up paralleling these humanities with precision definition and formula. This is an entirely different philosophy. The philosophy is: State in the minimum number of words the exact behavior of this particular action. Where there's a bad engineer in practice, I will show you a person who as a student did not think it necessary to learn the elementary definitions of physics and chemistry. He didn't think it necessary. And the educational system in which that man was unfortunately forced to learn did not think it necessary to return him to the fundamentals. One of the most laughable experiences I've ever had in the field of education was trying to get across to an engineer who was working with me on a project in a big aviation company – I was called in on consultation very briefly, I have very, very little to do with this sort of thing – but I was called in on consultation in order to resolve a navigational problem, they had all of a sudden run into this and it was entirely far afield and they had to look around for somebody who was in Who's Who or some place on the subject, so I went in and I tried to talk to this individual about kinetics.

And the individual had been taught kinetics in a university which used advanced physics. And the boy had never had to study elementary physics. He only knew advanced physics. He knew none of the simple laws of motion, of inertia, interaction, acceleration. Newton's basic three laws were unknown to him. And I couldn't get across to this man anything about the problem because he kept talking about kinetics. He kept talking about the upper echelon formulas of kinetics.

This man was an absolute master of theory of equations, of differentials, not differential calculus, but that mathematics known as differentials, of topology, a German mathematics now about thirty years old. A master of these things. He could get more complex than any man I have ever heard of and yet he couldn't solve the basic laws of motion, and could not understand why the whirligig device, which was going to be the artificial horizon running on a little reaction motor, had to have as much mass to discharge in back of it, as it had. He just couldn't get it through his head.

Mass interaction – every action produces a opposite reaction. All right. Therefore, we just had to have so much fuel in the little whirligig that was going to drive an artificial horizon. He couldn't get it: Why we had to make any allowances whatsoever for fuel capacity in this device, and why the device itself was going to take down the actual functioning of the guided missile to such a degree. It was going to put on the guided missile immediately about 125 pounds of weight, in terms of its own fuel. And I kept telling him the fuel has to weigh 125 pounds. Why? Well, because there's 125 pounds of thrust going to be exerted – Well, something like you trying to explain to this kid that he should put on his shoes, because there are carpet tacks on the floor. And he says, “What do shoes got to do with it?”

And I got curious about this boy, and he was the head of the department that had this particular project in charge. And his complete stupid thick-headedness was the reason they had to send for a consultant. But was he stupid? No, he could put up the facade of being the most brilliant man you ever saw, and probably was a very, very brilliant man. But when he was educated, he took his elementary physics, his basic physics in high school, and he really didn't start to study engineering until he was in the university, and the university gave him a textbook on the subject of kinetics, which he later on dragged out while I was over at his house, and it didn't have anywhere in it Newton's three laws of motion.

We're going to write a textbook on kinetics without the basic three laws of motion. No we're not. Now, those three basic laws of motion are the most simply stated thing you ever heard of. They are most elementary thing; the inertia, acceleration, interaction, there's nothing to them. Any kid can understand them. And because they are so tremendously understandable, a person pursuing this course of study simply reads them, and he says, "Well, that's easy," and he goes onto the next page.

Let me tell you something, that next page doesn't have anything on it as important as Newton's three laws of motion. The origin of these three laws of motion was the surrender of the physical universe to the engineer. It was the white flag. It ran up a white flag at that moment in the face of man. This was enormously important. So what is important and what isn't important is the basic part of any educational system.

Now one time we were in the state in Dianetics that we didn't know whether it was more important that the preclear yawned – we thought the yawn might be a very, very important factor. We watched for yawns very carefully. All a yawn is is a change of his basal metabolism. It doesn't demonstrate anything better or worse. He might yawn, yawn, yawn and go into a boil-off. Boil-off is – we thought at one time was therapeutic, until we had somebody run... I got this as a – set this up as a project.

And I had auditors make preclears boil off until we had in one case three hundred hours of consecutive boil-off by a case, with no change of psychometry. No change on an E-Meter reading and no change of case or any rehabilitation of ability. Boil-off wasn't important, was it? It just wasn't even vaguely important. It's kind of found – we found out that the preclear didn't even get rested in the boil-off. It wasn't something that rested him. He woke up – if he went into the session tired he'd come out tired.

All right, so all I'm trying to show you is we had an enormous number of data, oh, just thousands of data, pieces of this puzzle which belonged somewhere, some of which were more important than another, but for God's sakes, which were the important pieces? Where did they belong? Which was the most important pieces?

And gradually as these years have gone on, we have built a puzzle within a puzzle within a puzzle within a puzzle. And the inside puzzle is the simple one. It's a very simple puzzle. Pieces one to fifty, fitted together, make a preclear.

But you can look at the outside puzzle that's around this puzzle and you can find out all kinds of interesting things. You can find out about his familial relationship, the relationship of his childhood, the fact that broken marriages very often result in juvenile

delinquents. We can discover all sorts of significant data which is of – still of interest to an auditor in the outer puzzle. But that's not a puzzle anymore because we worked that one first.

All right. Now we go around and we find outside of this puzzle we do get into a puzzle as far as life is concerned and that is; contains such things as the parts of the brain in Latin. And if I were today asking you to memorize the parts of the brain in Latin, I would be ashamed of myself. Because it wouldn't lead anyplace, wouldn't lead anywhere at all. It wouldn't make a single person better and it wouldn't increase your understanding of life one bit, except to this slight mechanism: If you give something a name it becomes more familiar, and becoming more familiar is better owned by you.

There's a process that goes that way, a very weak process, but it has some efficacy and it's simply this: Just start naming – giving things names in your environment. Now you look at that chair and that chair gives you its name, doesn't it? It says sort of “I am a chair.” You've been told often this is a chair, so this process goes in this direction: It simply says, “That is a yumgetit and that is a togwalla.” And a guy just goes on along this line, and he feels his vocabulary start to creak and come apart at the edges. It's not a very effective process, but it's a tremendously interesting process. It will certainly ruin a general semanticist. It'll ruin him. But it's an experimental process.

All right, the isolated data which were important as of 1951, end of; appear in Advanced Procedures and Axioms and the Handbook for Preclears as the Axioms of Dianetics, the Logics and Axioms of Dianetics.

Many of those still have validity. All of them have validity in this outside ring puzzle. But they – they all have some validity yet, but some of them are with us yet and they were the ones with the greatest validity. And so we look over all of these axioms, end of 1951 and we discover out of them enough impact to cause me last year, year before last now, to be welcomed with very widespread arms anywhere I went in Europe.

“This is the man,” not the fellow who invented Dianetics, but “This is the man who organized psychotherapy into usable axioms.” And whether they are the right axioms or the wrong ones had no bearing on it. Here was somebody who had at least organized psychotherapy into a usable series of rationales. And it became tremendously interesting from an intellectual standpoint, whether anybody understood them or not, because nobody had ever attempted this before. And so, these boys were not in argument with me on whether or not Dianetics was true or false or whether or not these were valid axioms or invalid axioms or whether they solved anything or not. They were with me all the way because I was the first guy that ever organized psychotherapy into a series of axioms, you see. That was quite enough for the European scholar. That was quite enough.

He had good differentiation there, he didn't think you had to do the whole job in one fell swoop. In America you're expected to have solved the whole thing, and written all the – and organized it and so forth, and then they'll let you live.

Now, here is a – here is an interesting viewpoint, there, those 1951 Axioms. If you were being required to memorize those 1951 Axioms and required to memorize and understand them, you wouldn't really be undergoing a big imposition because they still have tremendous validity. For instance, gradient scales, the basic – the background of data and how

we understand data, and so forth, are all in those, that data which hasn't been touched since. But as far as the therapy end of it is concerned, we have overridden it. The last couple of hundred axioms out of those nearly three hundred axioms have today been superseded by the fifty axioms which appear in *The Creation of Human Ability* and which you have a copy of.

The therapy axioms, the ones that immediately and intimately apply to therapy have to a marked degree been superseded. This doesn't make them any less valid. They are all valid observations, but they are axioms which belong to the outer puzzle. So we've at least condensed a couple of hundred of them into some fifty, which describes life.

Now an auditor plunging into a case without having this much understanding of existence is asking for several things. One of the things he's asking for is case failures. Another thing he's asking for is restimulation of himself. He's asking for that, he's asking for it very, very definitely. Another thing he's asking for is a puzzle on his own part as to just why Scientology works at all.

Now the basic thing most auditors try to change on preclears is the preclear's mind. We know this is the most basic therapy. They try to change him – change his mind by feeding him various ideas. Well, the single change that has happened here of recent months has been this: Has been the understanding that given the ability to change his mind, what he changes his mind to is of no importance.

The auditor a couple of years ago was trying to change a person's mind into a certain direction, you see. We're not trying to do that. All we're trying to do is get the individual to change his mind freely; put him in a situation where he can change his mind freely and then not give a damn what he changes his mind to. Because if he can change his mind he can change his goals. And if he can change his goals, he can survive. So we sort of leave that up to the fella.

Now that's a very much higher-toned view. But if you think that by running some concepts or rearranging a preclear's ideas you're going to get anyplace, you're mistaken. You will only get as far as you restore to him the ability to change his mind. If he can change his mind, he'll win. If he can't change his mind, he'll lose.

Now we get from there immediately into mechanics – changing the mind. If he can change his mind facilely, he'll be in good shape.

Now we get into mechanics and we find out that experience, education and other things may monitor the direction he will change his mind because he's applying it to a set pattern known as the physical universe. And we have moved over into this and we find out the first thing the physical universe demands of us is two poles. It demands two poles, at least; that we can – must be able to have force and strength to impose space on two electrodes – two positions, two locations.

You see, the base of the electric motor imposes the distance upon the two electrodes. And the floor of the building imposes that distance upon the base. And Earth imposes that – hold-apart on the floor of the building and the sun and the Earth are imposing this distance that light is going to travel, but something about this solar system and the galaxy imposed the distance of the sun and the Earth and somewhere, someplace – *reductio ad absurdum* – something is imposing distance between two particles. It just boils down to this: Something is

imposing distance on two particles. Remember, we're into the mechanical field of this because we're going to ask this individual to perform a mechanical trick, and the mechanical trick is simply be a distance from his body and reactive mind. He's already convinced of the distance, therefore within this framework of conviction we're going to impose a mechanical trick on him of ask him to be a distance from this body and mechanical mind and we're still going to ask him to control it while he's at that distance, which is cute.

And then we're going to put another trick to him, we're going to ask him to communicate with anything and everything there is in this universe. And if he communicates with everything and anything there is in this universe, as far as he's concerned there can or can't be, can be or doesn't have to be, a universe.

See, he could take the MEST universe or leave it alone.

Now, therefore, the first and foremost of these three things is something called change of mind. Now that's very silly that something which has nothing but the quality to – of mind change should have any difficulty in doing it. This is real wild, you see. I mean, this individual who can do nothing but mind – change his mind, he can certainly do this you see. He can make postulates or he can change those postulates or he can end those postulates. Well, if this is all this individual can do, then if you please, if you please, why do we have to work at it? Well, we actually don't have to work at it very hard, and it's certainly not something that we should stress considerably in processing. We should simply work in the direction of doing it.

Well, all right. Let's take these fifty axioms of which I spoke. These fifty axioms are a pretty good codification of existence, but remember each one of them was once part of an enormous sea of data, the sea of data of just two years ago; those axioms were afloat in there someplace. But that sea of data of two years ago – three hundred axioms – was – they were captured data, captured territory from an ocean of maybes. They were some captured certainties from an ocean of maybes.

And if an auditor is still afloat in that ocean of maybes, if he doesn't recognize that some of this territory has been captured, then he can be shipwrecked and drowned with great ease because he get – well, let's say he takes Opening Procedure of 8-C and he works it a certain distance and all of a sudden a great big mass of something moves in on the preclear from some quarter. And it might be a very painful mass, might do very bad things to him, and the auditor didn't know really that this could occur and didn't know why it occurred. Maybe he wouldn't know anything about this business about two terminals, there's got to be two terminals. He didn't recognize that every preclear is using his body as one terminal and an enormous amount of reactive energy or machinery for other terminals. And he goes over here and he touches – has the preclear touch the wall, and he touches the wall and he touches the wall and he touches the wall and he touches the wall and all of a sudden the preclear has terminal trouble. Why shouldn't he have terminal trouble, he's getting his attention fixed off of these terminals in the bank up to the fact that he actually has terminals in present time and doesn't need these damn terminals in the bank. So he starts letting go of them and actually they start flying around in all directions.

Is it serious? No, it certainly isn't. It merely shows you that 8-C is working. That's all it tells you. But if you didn't know this business about terminals, you could get awfully baffled. And you probably, if you didn't know that much, wouldn't know that I knew enough to tell you to go on and run 8-C, and that you would solve this particular juxtaposition of terminals. The individual has just started to abandon the terminal, he will abandon it all the way when he discovers that he can have another mass than some hidden mass, ball of engrams, in the bank.

See, he's counting on these engrams around in the bank. He's counting on masses. He's counting on old electronics. You wonder why these people bring in these electronics on themselves all the time. Well, you shouldn't be baffled about this particularly, they're just in search of a terminal and these terminals move in and they use them. And they generate electricity between the body and these terminals. And they're trying to set up automatic machinery.

Well, there's no reason why they should do this when they've got a terminal right there. There's a wall. And you get their attention on the fact that, look, they've always got terminals. Present time is just strewn with them. They're all over the place. There's other people, that's the most valuable terminal. These boys who go off and start finding terminals down in their bank someplace, and so forth, they've become unaware of other people. They don't think other bodies are standing around there to discharge against. Nobody to argue with, nobody to talk with, nobody to fight with. They must think this is the case or they wouldn't go using these isolated terminals.

All right. We find this individual starting to work here with the wall, touching the wall and letting go of the wall and approaching it and moving away from it. We could actually run 8-C, you know, all the way. We don't because the reason behind 8-C is simply get the guy under the auditor's orders so we know what he's doing and get him a little bit solved as far as this terminal problem is concerned. But we could make 8-C an end-all process and you as an auditor certainly ought to be able to make it an end-all process and do nothing but 8-C.

Somebody asked me yesterday would you touch the boss. We were running Reach and Withdraw with adult education. All right, would you go ahead and touch the boss? Yes! But you don't have to have the boss there. The simplest thing in the world would be for this individual to reach and withdraw, touch various parts of; and so forth, a human being.

Let me tell you how I worked a psychotic one time. I worked this psychotic for four auditing periods of twenty minutes each and she went out and got a job and we haven't heard of her since and she's a waitress in some place or another right now fairly nearby and having a happy time of it. This person didn't know her name when she came in. She gave four or five names doubtfully and then didn't know any of those. This is quite a – quite a interesting little case. Not an isolated case, not a selected case, one that walked in off the street and there were no available auditors so I audited her.

The oddity in this case was that nobody else was alive anywhere in the world. See, there was nobody alive. This person was walking around as the only one. But some dim circuit did walk her in the front door, so she couldn't have been too bad off, you see, I mean, she couldn't have been too serious of a case because some dim circuit did walk her into the

right place. And when they come to you as an auditor, you haven't got the worst psychotic you could get by a long ways.

All right. I had this girl touching the walls and I had her walking through space to discover if there was – anything was in it. She'd move her body through this space fearfully, feeling she would encounter something and reached the point indicated that she was to proceed toward with the greatest of relief I just had her walking back and forth in the room because I could make her do that at first. I couldn't make her touch anything. So I just had her walking back and forth through space finding out if there was anything in it. “Now, you walk over to that exact spot there and find out whether or not there's anything between you and it. Okay, now let's walk over there. That's right, that's right. Well, was there anything in it?”

“All right. Now, you see that corner of the rug over there. Now you just walk over there and see if there's anything between you and it.”

This psycho, of course, was less psycho every second of the auditing session, relief; relief; better off. Well, I finally got her up to a point where she'd touch the wall and let go of the wall and so on. I was still running A. I mean, I was directing her to the spots, picking them out, so forth. But I never came off A. I just ran A all the way.

And I said, “All right. Now, walk over here and touch my shoulder. That's a good girl. Now, you go over there. Now I'm going to walk over and touch your shoulder.” “Okay.” And I did.

And we did this for quite a little while, you know, several minutes, back and forth, many times. And now I said, “Breathe on my hand.” She did. So I said, “Now you come over here – you come over here and I'm going to breathe on your hand.” And I did.

She almost hit a terror charge. She recognized that I was alive – breath, very intimate thing to life. She recognized I was alive, got quite shocky, wanted to go hide herself; immediately, she wanted to hide under the desk or in the closet. She actually was trying to pull the closet open. Another time she tried to get under the bed just to get out of sight because there was something else alive there. She was convinced now there was something else alive in the world. That was a big uptake. Although she was afraid of it, she now knew there was something alive.

The next immediate gain was this: “Show me your hand. Thank you. Very good. Now, look at my hand. Okay. Now show me your other hand. Okay. Now you look at my other hand. All right.” Back and forth, back and forth.

“Show me your head. Show me the back of your head. Show me your foot. Show me your other foot.” Next thing you know, she definitely knew somebody was looking at her and she was no longer afraid. And she definitely knew she could look at somebody, and she was no longer afraid. And that was the end of the case. This is running 8-C all the way using a live terminal.

Now, I dare say it has considerable benefit in this direction but it has never been put out completely in this form. But why would I essay to do this? What would be the cue for this? Simply I knew the basic modus operandi of 8-C which happens to do with terminals. This is a process that has to do with terminals. First and foremost it overcomes the willingness

or unwillingness of the individual; the obsessive or unwilling following of orders. It overcomes that which of course reestablishes communication. But the next thing it does is overcome terminal trouble. And other people are alive in the world; there are other people around in the world. And sometimes a person doesn't know he doesn't know this, which is one of the more peculiar things.

So, there is a background to 8-C, you could give other backgrounds to 8-C. But it's a codified process. It's actually there codified for the excellent reason that it's pretty hard to get somebody at an HCA level of training to grab hold of the idea of terminals, electrical charges running between the other. Because he always tries to make it much more complicated than it is. This is a universe with the basic unit of two. This universe has two as its basic unit. And a thetan gets in here being one, and he's done. He has to be able to duplicate himself sooner or later.

Doesn't make a game. This universe will collapse on anybody, because he has to fight it. He starts fighting this universe instead of fighting another live thing. And the second he starts to resist this universe it caves in on him.

So there is the type of reasoning which an auditor should be able to accomplish through his knowledge of Axioms, through his knowledge of definitions.

If he knew these well, he could figure out, he could know, and he could predict any preclear he was called upon to process. And the only reason he doesn't is because he doesn't know this basic material. So, you're being asked to know this basic material.

It's all very well to say, "Well, it's not really practical." Well, I'll tell you what's impractical: is having to know eighty-five thousand processes. And I'll tell you what's practical: to be able to evolve any you need.

And if you know the definitions, you can evolve them. That's a lot to ask of anybody. But if he knows the definitions he will at least be able to understand what he is looking at. Because he'll gradually get a great certainty on the fact that these are the definitions that make up life.

Okay.

(End of lecture)