

## **CONTROL**

A lecture given on 14 January 1957

[Start of Lecture]

Thank you.

What's the date?

Audience voices: The 15<sup>th</sup>. January 15<sup>th</sup>. Fourteenth of January.

Fourteen January 1957. And this is the ninth ACC lecture.

Now, look-a-here. Auditing procedure would be perfect, if you were perfectly alive.

Let me say that again: Auditing procedure would be perfect, if you were perfectly alive.

But, of course, if you were perfectly alive you'd be an OT. You got that?

Learning auditing procedure in the direction of a perfection actually moves you in the direction of OT.

It's a hard move, see, in that it's tough on you. It's a bit tough on you -- I recognize this -- because you think there are a lot of complications that have to be gone through before you do this and that. You think there are a lot of sole considerations here which are terribly important, and that you have to get those too. And you've got complications added to complications.

Perfect auditing procedure is a terrible simplicity, actually a brainracking, body-wrenching simplicity. It's something that isn't attained at once.

Now, you have been taught procedures which made auditing possible in spite of case state. Got it? Let's just be factual, shall we? We have HCA level; we have book-auditor level. And if you've noticed, the books on the subject are more complicated than the HCA. Got that? Huh? You see, they'd have to be.

All right. And the HCA level, you have to be taught certain things that are just so and so and so -- you get the idea? -- that permit you to cope with an auditing session.

Now you're in an ACC. And there's hardly anybody here who isn't able, at this state of the game, to confront this situation. There aren't any complicated vias in auditing procedure. It is pure communication. It's pure control. It's just head-on. You got that? It's just a head-on collision with it. When you talk to somebody, there is no method by which you talk to somebody. See, there isn't any method by which you talk to somebody.

But you, being alive and existing in this universe, do follow a procedure in talking to somebody -- if you're in excellent condition. If you're in perfect condition, you'll follow a perfect procedure.

What is that perfect procedure? Well, we happen to know what it is.

It's just the communication formula. You say something, the other fellow acknowledges; he says something, you acknowledge. Got the idea? That's the communication formula.

But you have to say something. Not words. Not a voice intonation, the way an actor who is being taught thinks he has to learn. You really do say something. Whether it's „*Do fishes swim?*“ or whether it's „*Go over and touch the wall,*“ you actually do say something. You don't verbalize something, you say it.

Now, you can separate out, if you want, intention and command. You can separate these things out. You can separate it out with ARC and other things, and we're getting a lot of pieces scattered around out here, aren't we? See, we take out of this command „*Go touch the wall*“ or the question „*Do fishes swim?*“ -- let's just start taking parts out of it. We're actually taking parts out of it. Do you know we're actually creating a new thing? We're creating a new thing called „*intention.*“

Look, if you communicate to somebody that you want him to go over and touch the wall, you sure as the devil have an intention that he goes over and touches the wall, don't you? It isn't a separate part from the communication.

Now, you can discuss it because we've taken it all apart. I mean, the parts are lying all over the floor, as far as that's concerned. Sometimes an auditor gets into the happy state of a little kid who has just taken a hammer to an alarm clock: he sees the parts all over the floor but he doesn't quite know what to do with them.

Now, the funny part of it is, there is not much difference -- now, please get this -- there's not much difference between you telling somebody to go over and touch the wall, and you having somebody go over and touch the wall. See?

Let's look at this real close. There's not much difference, you see, between you saying, „*All right, Joe. Go over and touch the wall,*“ see, and you having Joe go over and touch the wall.

We're talking about something that's almost impossible to talk about. See?

Now, what does this „*go over and touch the wall*“ entail? It entails, while he's handling a body, that a body -- a body -- walk over and touch the wall.

Now, I knocked your spots off the other day when I said to you the intention „*intend to touch the wall*,“ „*intend to turn the car*,“ (remember?) aren't separable, necessarily. A fellow doesn't think, „*Now I am going to have my body turn the car*,“ see? He doesn't think that. He goes whoomp. And that includes the action of turning a car and the command of turning the car and the intention of turning the car, and he does these things all at once. And they aren't a lot of separate things that are done all at once.

We've come along and we've said, „*Look at all the separate things that can be said to be in this action 'turn the car.'* See, look at all the separate things that we can account for as part of that action. Aren't we clever?“ Well, yes, we're very clever, except for this one point: Turning a car is simply an action of turning a car. You got it? You know, zoomp! You're going to turn the car that way, and you turn the car that way, and that's all.

You don't say, „*Now, let me see. The additive factors of the curb, the mooring-board problem of the two other approaching vehicles, the speedometer reading the torque, the acceleration, the gear, the amount of skid I will have to enter into before she really starts to skid, in order to make her skid and broadside into that position, if I'm being fancy -- all of these things equate in this following fashion, and we put it on an ENIAC and it UNIVACs.*“

But all the time we're figuring this thing out, we have gone by the point to turn, and we're disentangling metal from some brick wall someplace. Get the idea?

The engineer is off on a fantastic kick. He thinks he is synthesizing the action of the human brain, the human mind -- he calls it the brain -- he thinks he's synthesizing this when he puts it up on a bunch of ruddy rods and thingamabobs that pushbutton some information banks into a correlation and feed an answer. He's got problems and solutions mixed up with actions. And when you go at it that way, it is so complicated you would never be able to take it apart.

If you tried to add in the number of factors which could be added in to turning a car, you would probably wind up with ten or fifteen thousand factors, each one of which would have to be adjudicated, each one of which had some bearing on the situation.

If we get to reductio ad absurdum in the whole thing, the spin of the Earth actually has an influence upon turning a car. Cars turn differently in the Northern Hemisphere than in the Southern Hemisphere. How do you like that?

Now, you say, „*Well, by experience I know how these cars turn and I know about where..*“ Oh, we've got another false factor here: experience. Why do you have to learn how to drive a car so as to turn it at the right time? Why do you have to learn to do this? Well, because you believe that experience is necessary for you to perform the action, and that is the only reason why you count on experience.

The whole basis is you want a car from here, over to here. Obviously there's an „*over here*“ for the car to be. And if you're hot, there's no equating in it at all. I doubt that the steering radius of the car has anything to do with it. The turning radius of it would have very little to do with it. If you were red hot, you would simply have the car ap-

pear on the new course. How would you do that? You would just „*Car. Car there*.“ Got the idea? It'd merely be position situation of the car plotted against time.

But if you're real good, the time you plot it against is tremendous and there's lots of it. It's by the half kilometer, see? Time. You just got lots of time. You're only traveling at 105 miles an hour; turn the right-angle curve, see? It's lots of time. Loaf! Time going through to admire the scenery and make a couple entries in your logbook. See? Lots of time.

The fellow who's complicated doesn't make enough time to turn the corner. So he turns the corner with no time at fifteen miles an hour.

You ever drive behind some old lady who slows down on the road about a half a block before a Y turn? -- not a right angle, but a Y turn? Hm? This is very fabulous. I mean, they slow down. Some old guy, he's usually got a nice car, they slow down half a block, and they feel -- you can just get them feeling for that corner, see? They feel for it and they feel for it and they feel for it. And you're sitting back there and you want to go, see, and here's an obstacle in your road. And you wait for the obstacle to get out of your road, being mannerly. All right.

He finally makes it, you know, and he manages. Well, now he turns the wheel this far to see how far the car turned. Then he turns the wheel that far to see how far the car turned. In other words, he does it and proves it and does it and proves it and does it and proves it and does it and proves it, and then he's out on the new straightaway. You got it?

Do you know that he only had a millisecond in which to do all that? The man is running at some fantastic high rate of speed, according to him, see? There's no time. He hasn't got any time to turn that corner. Here he is, traveling at this breathtaking speed of fifteen miles an hour, so he has to slow down way in advance so he'll have enough time.

Well, what's entered in here? He's gotten complicated about the whole thing. He's gotten very complicated. He can't take care of a number of factors involved in it; he isn't putting any time in the corner. Got the idea? He's putting no time in the corner; he's putting no energy in the corner. He is trying to do a substitution. His effort all the way along is to substitute something for the actual positioning.

All it is, is just a running-fire series of positions. That's all. You might say it's a concatenation of positions, and that's all you're doing. You want the car to go here and here and here and here and here, and then turn the corner and go there and there and there. Got the idea? Positions. You're just putting the car in the next position and the next position and the next position. All right, a good driver simply puts his car in each one of these consecutive positions, and he has lots of time, and he's relaxed, and so on.

Now, a person who has gotten very complicated does something very interesting: he substitutes something for the positioning. And we get a rather new definition of logic. Logic consists of a gradient scale of substitutes. Logic is a gradient scale of substitutes.

Substitutes placed on a gradient scale, with not too great a dissimilarity, becomes logic. But every bit of logic is a substitute.

People are always logical about something. Let me call that to your attention. If they are logical about something, then the logic itself must be a substitute for the thing.

The more logical a person gets, really, the less he has of it.

Now, let's be a little bit more definitive here; let's be a little bit more definitive. We see a wall, and if we can't have the wall, we get logical about it. You got that? If we can't have the wall, we get logical about it. We get (quote) „*reasonable*“ (unquote). In other words, we substitute a lot of figure figure for the thing, and that is what we call figure-figure: It's a substitution of a bunch of things for the thing, you see? And that is figure-figure. All figure-figure is, is substitute, substitute, substitute, substitute.

Somebody goes down here, it's a nice day, he wants to have a picnic. There's no place to have a picnic. Why? The mound he sees is the Civil War mound of the Battle of Manassas. That's interesting, isn't it? I mean, there's an historical mound there and it's not a piece of ground on which you can spread a picnic cloth. You got it? It's an historical area which was used in the Battle of Manassas. You got it?

Now, this gets absolutely ridiculous; this can get to a fantastic degree. He won't go down to that area until he reads the total history of the Battle of Manassas. Got the idea? See, we're just drifting off that much further now. And we get this one: „*you have to know before you go*,“ which is followed by never going. „*You have to know before you go*“: that is really the death knell of all adventure.

The Royal Auto Club is one of the finest auto clubs in the world. My hat is off to them in all directions. Some of the people to whom they cater, however, have pressed them into one of the most interesting actions you ever cared to go over. If you are going to take a trip in darkest Africa, the auto road which you're going to follow is laid out for you by the RAC stone by stone, creek by creek, tree by tree. And it is all written down; it's one of the most fantastic documents you ever saw.

Now, that's to say nothing of a touring document that has to do with France. But a touring document having to do with France -- which is simply an express highway in all directions, with no brakes on any other car but yours, with all roads completely jammed with pedestrians and carts (the French know what roads are for: they're to walk on) -- you couldn't need anything less than a complicated chart of France. This would be a useless item, completely useless.

People have been going over these roads for a long time. The roads are very well defined. You look there and you see a road and it is a road. And they're scarce enough that they don't turn off. In other words, they go from place to place. As far as that's concerned, they got road signs all over the place, too, and they have gendarmes, and they have all kinds of things. I mean, the one thing you couldn't do in France would be get lost.

The RAC puts out a series of maps on France which are very interesting. But they have little cards. We issue them here in America also, but we don't issue them like the

RAC card. Honest to Pete, there is every single rivulet, every rut in the road marked consecutively from one point to another, and you just turn that card over and you've got it -- landmark by landmark, rock by rock. Why look at the scenery? You've got the whole thing? You never have the surprise of turning a corner and going over the top of a hill and seeing a valley; you know all about it! It's been described to you completely. Furthermore, the historical significance of each and every landmark is given to you on that chart. Fabulous.

Well now, you think that's bad enough for France. The RAC figures somebody has gone foreign, at least to have jumped the Channel. How about England? Ten times as good. Boy, that's really shined up. Now we really do have -- we really do have -- the population of each hamlet. We have practically the number of buttons on the mayor's coat. We are not now told every rock, we are told the history of every rock! Quite amazing.

Here is a completeness which demonstrates that they have done a very fine job, and it does tell you that their clientele must be very demanding. But it tells you more than that: it tells you the clientele doesn't do much looking at the scenery.

And sure enough, we find that is the case. We find a tourist going through a series of monuments -- Stonehenge -- and the fellow is walking through Stonehenge with a book in his hands! And the guide says, „*These are...*“ and „*This is...*“, and he looks in his book? He reads all about it. The guide has just told him, so he looks in his book and he says, „*You know, that is true*.“ And just as the party moves off, he glances over his shoulder and notices that the thing was there. Why didn't he stay home?

In other words, he doesn't have any Stonehenge. You got it? Not only does he think about it (substitutes), he thinks about it in terms of symbols (substitutes for substitutes). And now he thinks about it much worse than that; he thinks about it in terms of history, which is a substitute for a substitute for a substitute.

Now, if you think you need experience to turn a car around the corner, you must have a series of substitutions going. That's a horrible thing to throw at anybody.

And yet it is proven by this: You can take somebody out, show him a vehicle, he comprehends at once what its use is, he promptly boards it, mounts it, starts it, rides it.

You take somebody and you show him a tractor. In particular, Caterpillar tractors -- they're rather hard to run. One tread runs one way and the other tread runs the other way. And sometimes if you get the levers reversed, they just go round and round and round.

All right, you go out on a farm; they've just had a new Cat delivered. Fine, somebody's going to show this farmhand how to run this Cat. Well, they've got several farmhands. And there'll be one of those farmhands that will simply get up on the Cat, and with a little bit of instructions of starting and stopping and changing its oil, and so forth, and the understanding that he must keep the treads balanced, will move the Cat off.

And there's one of them that after a few days of hard study on the situation is able to move the Cat. And there may be one of them who, after he has read four or five books on Cats, they've been explained to him completely, he has been trained in tandem seats to drive Cats, still has a little trouble with it. Funny things happen to the Cat: It doesn't start when he comes out and gets in it, you know? Starts for everybody else but doesn't start for him. He does everything that you have to do to start a Cat, and it doesn't start. After he has driven it for an hour or so, all the other drivers know it. They all know it. There's something wrong with the Cat now.

Which one of these people will destroy that Cat? It's the last one. Oh, but this wild, reckless young fellow that goes hot rodding all over the countryside, and he's on the job, but you know, never in at night, and so on -- has every girl far and wide convinced that she's about to be wed -- this fellow, he's gotten on the Cat, and he's torn up and down with the Cat, and he does work with the Cat, and the Cat works all right, and everything's fine, see? Nothing wrong with this, see? Does he wreck this Cat? Nah, the Cat runs for him.

In other words, the fellow who does it easily is high in awareness, and the fellow who does it with difficulty is low in awareness. And the fellow who is low in awareness will, of course, wind it up in the nearest ditch. Because the lowest awareness has the least time. There's a direct coordination between awareness and time.

The fellow with the lowest awareness has the least time. And you wonder why some person, oddly enough, never seems to get anything done. Well, you're not actually viewing the world from his viewpoint. He doesn't have any time at all. Honest to Pete, an hour hand of a clock just goes shwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwww-pop! That's that. That's the end of that hour, see? A minute is hardly a segment anymore; hardly a segment of time. Minutes just go pshew! pshew! pshew! Oh, faster than that. They go p-s-h-e-e-e-w! That's minutes.

And this person has more complexities and reasons why and substitutes and parts of and compartments of than you could easily count. And he never gets anything done.

You come along and you ask this person to do something. Well, he „*has to have before he can do.*“ That's one of his mottoes. „*There isn't enough time*“ is another motto, and „*he didn't notice it*“ is another motto, and „*I forgot*“ is another one. And „*let's all have an accident*“ is another one.

In other words, this thing goes from a high awareness. And high awareness includes with it high communication, which includes with it high control. And it goes from that level down to less awareness, less communication, less control. And it goes down below that to, finally, almost no awareness, controlled by everything else, no time at all.

It's sort of a molecular idea. If there were molecules, and if one were in that wall, really... You look at that wall, it's pretty solid. You'd be surprised, but there are people around who'll tell you it's as full of holes as a Swiss cheese. And a little flake, molecule or bit of that wall thinks an eternity goes by -- wshewww! See, that's eternity.

You want to watch these people who don't have any time. It is possible to have too much to do only if too many people desire that you be in certain positions at certain given instants. That way you could have too much to do.

If it was demanded that you be in certain positions at certain moments, you see, there could be too many positions to match the moments, and then there would be too much to do. See, this is a possibility. But it would depend upon the demand of others. Working yourself, you probably could fulfill the whole thing rather easily. Got that?

So you get a third-dynamic dragdown on this in doingness.

High-level comm, high-level control, high-level awareness: they all go together.

We actually have had to take these things apart and the take- apart is much simpler than what man conceived these things to consist of before. You see, he thought there was a rather foggy Lord-knows-what-was-it, anything-could-have-been-attached-to-it, on such a thing as control.

„*What is control?*“ you ask somebody.

„*That's bad,*“ he says.

„*No,*“ you know, you say, „*What is control?*“

„*Control? That's dominating things!*“

And you say, „*Well, all right, that's dominating things. Why? To do what?*“

„*No, no! Not to do anything to dominate things! That's control.*“

In other words, we didn't have any kind of a mechanical breakdown of this thing; we had to look at it a little better. And we have. And we find out that control consists of start, change and stop. In order to control things, you have to start, change and stop them.

The odd part of it is, purpose has something to do with it only when you enter the field of reason.

Let's get back to what we were talking about. You say to this person, „*Joe, I want you to walk over to the wall over there.*“

This is actually a communication to Joe, who is then expected to exert some effort of one kind or another and take himself from where he is to a position adjacent to that wall. Isn't that right? So your statement -- your statement „*Joe, walk over to the wall*“ -- your statement is a substitute for walking over to the wall. Now, if you cannot do the action, your substitute is an unknowing substitute. In other words, the communication is then an unknowing substitute for the control, the action. Got it?

Now, you're at your hottest and best -- but this is not good for Joe... You see a body standing there and you don't say a thing to it. You see, it is walked over to the wall. You're over here in one corner of the room, and you make the body go dah-tha-a-tha-bang, over to the wall. That's a communication, isn't it? And you're in one position,

it's in another position, so you communicated a control. Only, the control was an action; it did act; it was an action. In other words, you didn't say anything.

Now, this is where we get into telepathy. I think „*Body, I would like you to walk over to the wall.*“ „*Body, please concentrate.*“ This is a substitute for actually doing it! Yes, you can sit up in one corner of the room and walk a body across the room. Yes, you can sit in one position and have a thought occur in another position. Whether it's to anybody else or not is beside the point; you could make the thought occur somewhere else.

As a matter of fact, a lot of people have trouble with this. We run Placing a Thought: „*You think a thought in that chair,*“ „*You think a thought in that window,*“ you know? It almost kills them sometimes, in running this old process. What are they doing? They're thinking a thought exterior to themselves.

Well, thinking a control exterior to yourself is worse than thinking a thought exterior to yourself. You got it? Hm? Why? Because you're thinking a thought of action and motion, only you are simply thinking action and motion, and so action and motion occurs. And, in such a way, you actually could be in one part of a room and have action and motion occur in another part of the room. That's pretty hot.

You think action and motion occurs best right where you are. Yes, it does in the state you're in, right here and now. Action and motion best occurs where you are. But the funny part of it is, that when you have action and motion occur where you are, you have action and motion occur where you are. And that's all there is to it.

I'll give you an idea: Lift your hand.

Well, that's action and motion occurring where you are. It was suggested by me, I didn't do it. Got that? That's just action and motion occurring where you are.

Try it again. You'll understand this a little better. Lift your hand.

Mm-hm. Who did it?

Audience voices: I did.

„*I did.*“ In other words, the action and motion did occur where you are. Is that right?

Well, how about the fellow walking across the room with your action and motion? You're six feet away from him, only the action and motion now is not occurring where you are. You are experiencing it, and it is occurring several feet from where you are.

When a preclear walks over to the wall, if you were in total, top, OT state... I want you to lift your hand again. Lift your hand. That's what'd happen. You got it?

Now, that would be a total control. He wouldn't have a prayer if he wanted to walk some other way. You were a „*strong personality,*“ had a great deal of personal magnetism... I don't know what this „*personal magnetism*“ is. We've tried to measure the flux and field around people, and we find out that the crazier they are the more flux and field they have, so...

Nevertheless, this fellow would think, „*I think I will walk through the door.*“ And you have action and motion occur which walks him over to the wall. He says, „*Muscles, go toward the door.*“ In other words, he doesn't say this, he starts to move the muscles toward the door, but you are a tougher beast than he is, and he walks over to the wall. Got the idea? It'd be a strain on him; it would discourage him. He would begin to believe that he could not control his body. Right?

We're doing something else in auditing. We do it best if we knowingly can exert a total control. See, we actually do it best. We knowingly can. We're not obsessively and unknowingly exerting a control on him; this'll louse us up before we get through.

Did you ever try to feed a baby breakfast cereal, and you spoon the breakfast cereal up to the baby and the baby won't open its mouth, so you do? Did you ever see anybody doing that? A spoonful of cereal at the baby and then they go... Something is real funny; something real funny going on there. I was in a Howard Johnson restaurant one time -- touring through town -- and a mother was trying to feed her little boy in a highchair, and she was pushing the cereal at the little boy and opening her own mouth, and I glanced around, and any customer within sight was opening his. They were all trying to get that little boy to open his mouth. Funniest sight I've seen in years.

Now, they didn't know they were doing it. This is a goofy state for a person to be in; they had no awareness of doing it at all. But they were so incapable of placing a motion there, that when they tried to place a motion there, it occurred here. Got the idea? When they tried to place the emotion somewhere else, it occurred where they are. That is contagion of aberration.

You mean somebody ill, and you try to put the emotion „*Die, you dog*“ the action of dying, where he is, and a couple of days later you say, „*I'm dead. I wonder how I feel so bad. I can't understand this.*“ All you did was fall short in a communicational-type control. You didn't drop dead where he was, you dropped dead where you are. You got it? Except you didn't drop dead, because you know you're alive. So you got two conflicting ideas or considerations or actions. And these two conflicting actions are sitting side by side. So is every engram, so is every aberration or a ridge, one of these composites. It's what you intended while you intended that other thing, and so on. You've actually got a couple of actions or a couple of motions.

Well, you would have nothing but engrams from beginning to end if all things hung fire. But of course, only those motions by which you meant to stop something hang fire. Only those incidents wherein you meant to cut down time, cut down time. Only those incidents where you meant to curtail awareness, curtail awareness. Do you understand me?

In other words, we curtailed awareness at a distance, we have cut down time at a distance, we've done a stop at a distance; and in those considerations, we achieved no motion across space but achieved it where we were instead. Got it? Hm? That is all there is to the top-crust echelon of over-tact-motivator sequences, the mechanics of action, of motion, being part of the dynamics and then wishing yourself out. That's the higher crust. It's an inability to communicate a control. Got that?

After a while, a person gets lazy and he communicates thoughts instead of controls. It's a lazy thing to do. It's just too much mock-up to place the car around that curve bodily. He lets the motor and the tires and the arms do it. Got the idea? He's moved out of the game to that degree. He's off the sixth dynamic to the degree that he will always permit a motor to drive.

If he was in good shape, sometimes he would, and sometimes he wouldn't. But he always permits a motor to drive. He's totally dependent upon the motor to furnish the motive power for the car. He's totally dependent on the wheels to keep turning. He's totally dependent on the steering wheel to give it direction. He's totally dependent on the arms. And all he does is put into action a concatenation of effort which begins with „*Now-I-think- I-will-turn.*“ And that is supposed to go through a lot of machinery, and this machinery finally winds up with the fait accompli of a car having turned the corner. See that? In other words, it's physical machinery, mental machinery; it's sixth- and seventh-dynamic machinery totally.

Remember, you have sixth-dynamic machinery in the form of car motors and other things. You have seventh-dynamic machinery in terms of automaticities, and so on. It's just machinery. There's machinery on every dynamic, by the way.

When civilizations get very highly developed they have a brain that functions someplace that they call God. It figures out everything for them. They actually do have towers and things like that where they have some kind of a UNIVAC that does all the figure-figure; that's their eighth dynamic.

Now, as long as you're going to fall short in relaying a command across space, you're not going to get full compliance on the part of your preclear. You have to, then, be willing to be a preclear as well as to be an auditor. That's about the first thing that you have to say about somebody.

A lot of fellows around that are very hot psychiatrists, I can assure you, are not willing to be any of their patients. Bzzzzzt! Scalpel, sutures, snipstheir idea of mental... Electric shock and brain surgery. They're not willing to be their patients. And they stand there trying to control somebody physically by a whole bunch of vias, which of course never arrive anyplace. They're counting on a lot of complexities to occur and finally result in some kind of an answer, as far as the fellow is concerned.

The first thing that's wrong is, of course, they're not willing to be in the position of the person that they are doing this to. How could they possibly, then, control that person? They are not willing to be that person, so therefore, they're not willing to occasion the action in the position of that person which walks that person to the wall. See that? See, they're not willing to be lying there on the electric-shock table -- dzzzzzt! -- a hundred and ten volts raw juice by logarithmic curves. And they're crazy?

Not one of these fellows, by the way, could pass his own sanity criteria. Not any of them that I know can pass their own tests. They're very careful not to take them most of the time. But when you see any kind of a test series on this, of psychiatrists and things like that, you've got difficulty.

You say, „*Oh, I'd hate to be in the position of that person over there. Look at how horrible he is. He has leprosy of the left toenail and has woman trouble, and he has this and he has that and he has something or other. What a horrible position to be in, and so forth. And I will change his beingness now so he won't be in that position either.*“ Oh, no, no, no, no, no.

You'll get into obsessive control of self after a while. You'll get in a case of dramatized sanity. That's one of the wildest things you ever saw. Have you ever known anybody that totally dramatized sanity? He can never let his hair down, he can never have a good time, he can never do anything, because he has to be sane all the time.

One of the things that goes along with this is he can't tolerate motion in his vicinity at all -- total intolerance of motion. You go like this... at him and he'd just go bluuuhh! Dramatized sanity. You go like this..., and he turns into solid obsidian. Well now, he's tried to make other people sane where they are, only he couldn't make it where they are, and it was just a matter of the kid wouldn't open his mouth to eat the cereal. Got the idea?

Now, you as an auditor, willing to control something at a distance to an extremity, are merely expressing your willingness to be it. That's the only thing you're expressing. You don't have to worry about being it or not being it; that's just a side worry. But when you totally control something, you are actually expressing a willingness to be it.

If you totally control something that you're not willing to be -- whew! One of the first things that happens is you never control it. Simple, isn't it? So if you succeed in controlling somebody, it must follow that you were willing to be the person. And it goes around the other way: If you do succeed in controlling somebody, you have then succeeded in being willing to be the person. Follow that?

So, you have to be alive, don't you? That's all it boils down to.

Must be that you shouldn't be mindful of the application of effort; you shouldn't have to cringe or wince simply because somebody exerts a little bit of teeth gritting. The idea of applying effort where you are or at a distance is sometimes overwhelming. The truth of the matter is, you get out of that rather rapidly -- to the degree that you get out of sitting back and being detached from, and never being part of, the session. You follow that?

You enter the eight dynamics, you enter agreement all along these lines, and then you count yourself out. You got that? You enter an auditing session and you say, „*Well, I'm just the auditor.*“ No, sir. No, you don't. You entered something, didn't you? And then you checked yourself out and you disenfranchised yourself to some degree, didn't you?

You said, „*Well, I'm part of all this,*“ and then you said, „*Well, I'm only this part of it.*“ Dit-duh, second-postulate situation. Your being an auditor then becomes a lie. You were willing to be everything around there, and then the next thing you know, you were only willing to be the auditor. That you will control the preclear jumps you over that, and there is no more mechanical secret involved in it than just that.

I'm trying to talk complexities off of you, not into you? See this? Just by your action of start, change and stop of the preclear, on a total basis, you are expressing the willingness to be a preclear. And if you find it absolutely impossible at first to run start, change and stop on a preclear, which is a total- control basis, then you are actually expressing an unwillingness to be a preclear. But your control of him is, in itself, very therapeutic for you as an auditor. It increases your ability to be, all over the place. Next thing you know, you find out you can be a lot more things. You can be other things.

But if you're diffident and you say, „*Well, that's his universe, and it's all private, and hands off now. Well, he says he's going to knock off of this process, so I guess... well, power of choice... After all, we can't upset his power of choice all the time. We'll change the process.*“ You can't upset his power of choice.

Look, there's a big difference between bringing a person to exercise power of choice, and quite another thing -- quite another thing -- that you „*cannot do anything else.*“ If you cannot do anything else but let somebody exercise his power of choice, do you know that only his bank exercises a power of choice in that session? He never does.

The best thing he can duplicate is you. And if you give that body good control, he can duplicate you as part of the communication. The next thing you know, he can control the body. So good control on the part of the auditor is part and parcel to a recovery on the part of the pc. And when good control on the part of the auditor is missing, then there is nothing for the pc to duplicate in terms of running and handling his body, and so he gets no place.

If control will lead into beingness (which it does), then his road to beingness is an increasing ability to control a body. If you operate with good control, you are not crushing his self- determinism! Almost any preclear you get hold of is so doggone lost he hasn't ever heard of any for the last eight billion years. „*Self-determinism? What's that?*“ Bank determinism!

Determinism to him is the total composite of all the bad habits, good habits, social responses, punishments, teachings that he has... And this composite, in its reaction on a machine basis, is his self-determinism. And it's no good; it isn't worth having around. You might as well wheel it off to the junk heap, because it'll only bust down when you need it.

Now, you've got something else -- you've got something else here that's much more valuable. You have a person, a being, a thetan. And you start controlling that body, wham! wham! wham! wham! he says, „*What do you know!*“

Now, if you controlled him to a point where, and in a manner which, he was then powerless to control himself; if he was given the feeling that he himself was being overwhelmed and that your target was the overwhelming of him, you would only have hypnotism.

But if he understands rather clearly that your exercising of his body is an invitation for him to exert a power of choice and to handle it as well, he climbs upstairs by your ability to control himself. And if that block is missing in the communication ladder,

then he hasn't any stairs to climb. And you wonder why the technique doesn't work. Well, the technique can't work.

You can mold him in another image. You know enough about the mind to take it like putty and push it in to a new shape. You can do that; you can run an engram and key another one in. In other words, he's sitting in engram A, you can run engram A out and shove him into engram B and let him follow its stimulus-response for a while. Get the idea? I mean, you can do this.

You can be terribly selective. I can take a preclear and kick him back down the track into space opera, make him fight it, resist it and tell me how bad it all was, pat him on the head and have him joining the police force in a couple of days, just so he can wear one of those blue uniforms again. Have you got the idea?

Well, this isn't inviting anybody's determinism on anything; it's simply handling a piece of MEST! And all they've done on the track from beginning to end is handle people as though they were MEST, and it's about time it stopped!

Well, how do you stop it? You do good control, which is knowing starting, changing and stopping of the preclear -- and that's good control! And you put that in there as a step. Then he can duplicate that step, and the next thing you know -- first using your control pattern -- he then finds out that he can control it himself; then he doesn't need your control pattern. But if he hasn't got an example of good, solid control, then he has nothing and he has received nothing from the auditor.

As I said, I'm leveling with you. This is an ACC. We can tell you all sorts of interesting ways to produce a tremendous number of effects. I could give you some formulas that would be so complex on the subject of control and how it controlled and to what you appealed and which you did when and where, that you would feel vastly edified. And you would wonder why in the name of common sense your preclears didn't respond really well: Their habit patterns changed, and you got a little shift on their APAs. Their IQ had a tendency to shift a little bit. But actually, for some reason or other...

We could set ourselves up as a black-cowled priesthood. The only reason we would do that is because we were fresh out of total game; we were in a position where we hated everybody, cared nothing for anything, totally out of communication in all directions. Yes, we could set up as a black-cowled priesthood with a tremendous number of mysteries, and boy, could we deal off the bottom of the mental deck!

We can brainwash a man in twenty seconds. What more do you want? That's enough technique to conquer the world.

I point out to you, the entire Arab world was enslaved by a man whose name, mispronounced, still exists in our language. We call people who kill people „*assassins*.“ And Hashshashin, the Old Man of the Mountain, back there in the thirteenth century, operated a part of Mohammedanism which controlled within an eyelash, by terror, by fear -- a very bad example of control (you get the idea); preventive action -- India, Asia Minor and most of the Mediterranean Basin.

The group that did that controlled that great part of the civilized world for about three hundred years. And all they knew how to do was to tell somebody he was in paradise, and convince him that in order to come back he had to go out and kill somebody.

They'd get a young man, give him hashish, bring him in to a garden -- beautiful black-eyed houris and rivers of milk and honey -- and had him all fixed up. And they'd say, „*Now, here you are. You're in paradise, and we've brought you to paradise. In order to get back here you'll have to get yourself killed, because we're kicking you out now.*“ Well, they dragged him in anaten, see? They knock him out again, shove him out into the world, and he reappears, and he knows he's got to get himself killed in a particular fashion. He's got to get himself killed by being the assassin of some notable.

The Old Man of the Mountain, meanwhile, has just written notable relatives a letter and said, „*In the next reign we want several more camel-loads of gold per month than we've been getting. Because at such and such a date, why, the Sultan is going to kick the bucket, folks.*“

Well, it's impossible. They'd surround him with guards in all directions. This young man, wanting to be killed so he could go back to paradise, would walk through the guards and kill the Sultan dead! And of course, they'd chop him to bits and he would go off to some between-lives area. That was beside the point. The Old Man of the Mountain, the Assassins of the Middle East, did control the civilized world.

It doesn't take very much to control somebody, then, does it? I mean, if this kind of a sorry idea, and this stupidity, and this littleness of knowledge was adequate to control that much of the world, then control itself must be rather easy to engage upon.

Control by fear is only a Tone Scale manifestation, and it's to make people afraid so they won't do something. It's control by restrained action. You got the idea? It's a species of stop only.

So I ask you this question: Were the Assassins ever really controlling anybody? They had change and start to fool with yet, didn't they? And they didn't start and change much of anything. The world might as well have been ruled by some North American Indian for all the difference it made in the shades of history. They did nothing. A very ignoble effort. And yet they did know something about the mind. See, they did know this one thing: That the mind could be prevented from acting by being made afraid of being killed. They became a priesthood.

We know so much more than that, from beginning to end, that there's just no chalking it up and there's no comparison between what we're doing and what they were doing. But it shows you which directions controls can go. If we know this much more than that, then we know enough not to do it. Do you see that?

Therefore, an auditor auditing a preclear, who knows fully the totality of control and can exert it, then never stops with some sort of a subterfuge; some substitute action which is way downscale, which is only in the direction of a partial patch-up, or something of the sort. He carries on through, and he'll do the whole job. But an auditor who's unwilling to control, stops somewhere on the time track like the Assassins. See,

they just knew a little bit about control, they didn't do it well, and they could just kill people, and shove them around therefore.

An auditor, therefore, who is not willing to exert a total control, who doesn't know how to exert a total control of a preclear, does not actually make them well. You want to know why some auditors make preclears well and some auditors don't. Well, it's all wrapped up in the field of control. It's all wrapped up in the field of control.

You have to be willing to make a motion over there; you have to be willing to be the thing which you are ordering about. And it's just start, change and stop. It's murderous. It's murderous because the bank is liable to cave in on you, entering upon this simplicity.

Be alive, really communicate, really control. It's very simple. All you have to do is do it.

Thank you.

[End of Lecture]