

## **AUDITING TECHNIQUES: SCALE OF PROCESSES**

A lecture given on 23 January 1957

[Start of Lecture]

Thank you.

Now, this is the 23rd of January 1957, and the fifteenth lecture of the 16th ACC unit. And this is a continuing lecture -- the third in the series of important processes and techniques. I'm still talking to you about techniques.

Probably many other things I could talk to you about at this stage of the game which you would find much more fascinating. But you're doing a dual job of learning right now. Your processes which you are running on one another and the processes which are very elementary are, nevertheless, bringing about changes and cognitions on your part, which forms, really, a considerable degree of learning all by itself. And then I am giving you data which is a more extensive look at processing at large.

Now, the whole subject of techniques is a subject which has been much more stressed than it should have been. Any technique is a method; any technique is a method. And there's only one thing wrong with a preclear, is method.

Technique is how little complicated you have to get to make him totally alive.

You're trying to find some level of reality on his part to which he can respond, and then your direction is simplicity, not complexity.

In auditing, you go from a simplicity to too much complexity, back to a simplicity. You got that cycle? You give him a signal which is a simplicity. And then, finally, you give him a hand signal that he has to mimic, which is... and he's supposed to do it, and he's just lost; he can't do that at all. That's too complex, so you drop back to a comparative simplicity he can do. In other words, you knock off these complexities until he can do these.

You have a level of reality for him, oddly enough, and you will discover this if you try to continue this with Hand Mimicry.

In other words, how do you find a man's level of reality? Well, you give him a simplicity that's too simple for him and a complexity that's too complex for him, and then you back off the complexity into one he just barely can do. That's real. That finds his interest level, and so forth.

But if he can't do it, it isn't very real to him; it's merely confusing.

You could define confusion on that basis. You could say confusion is that thought or motion which is beyond the preclear's ability to duplicate. That's about all there is to it. That is a confusion. Anything is a confusion, then, beyond that point.

If he can duplicate it, it's not a confusion. It may be a strain, but it's not a confusion. And if you have a preclear who is sitting right up on the edge of the seat, trying to exactly duplicate what you're doing, it's rather difficult because you keep insisting that the crossed fingers -- as you do this and that -- are very important, and he doesn't cross his fingers just right. Only you... Boy! With what intensity he will confront that one.

But you say, *„Just raise your hand,“* you know? Quite duplicative. See? And he's doing that in return -- just raising his hand. And he says to himself, *„You know, this is an awful bore. Anybody can do that.“*

The funny part of it is, he couldn't do that if he was observing that it was being done. You get this? See? It's out of his level of reality, really. If he was really observing that that much duplication was taking place, he would go stark staring goofy -- that was really taking place.

So, it isn't real to him, so he says he can do it and he does it. You got that?

Too much confusion or too much motion or too much complexity is not a duplicative -- within his duplicative range. So therefore, it tells him he's a failure because he is not duplicating it. But he is able to duplicate something almost that complicated. And then you move him from that something *„almost that complicated“* that he could do, which was quite real and quite interesting to him, and you back him right up into simplicities. And all of a sudden, he gets into that fantastic state of mind that raising the hand becomes duplicative and becomes real, and he can do it, and he is interested in it, and it is a function, and something is taking place, and present time is there, and there's no dodge to duck away from, and his awareness is up to it. Quite fascinating!

Now, in just those things I have been saying to you, and in just these Hand Mimicry and Body Mimicry Processes which you are being taught -- in just these alone -- is the entire scope of auditing, so far as technique is concerned.

A technique must follow in this same curve of too simple, too complex, doable, real -- as it does in Hand Mimicry -- no matter what the phraseology is, or anything of the sort. There is some level of complexity which is unreal to him, and [to] which he says, *„I can do it.“* You know? *„I can do it. Oh, that's easy. I can put up all the mock-ups you want.“* And some machine over in the corner puts up all the mock-ups you want, you know?

It's not real to him. Nothing is real. „*What wall? I'm walking through. I'm getting along all right. I can answer all the questions put to me if they're not quite the question which was put to me.*“ You know?

The preclear is then able to present a baffling picture to an auditor. He is a baffling subject then. „*Why, this fellow can do all these techniques!*“ you say.

Oh yes, he can do them all -- without interest, totally dead, completely on a machine, incapable of cognition and without any participation in the action at all. You have the definition of insanity going along with the whole thing: He's doing it with extreme irresponsibility. He's left the game.

Yeah, but you as the auditor -- you're talking to another auditor -- you say, „*I just don't know what the heck is cooking with this case! I keep running this, and he says he likes to run it and it's perfectly all right and it's very easy for him to run it. But nothing ever happens to the case, and he never gets any better, and I'm going nuts!*“

What are you looking at? You're looking at this... see? Didn't matter what technique you were running, you were looking at this... And the preclear was able to... See?

Of course, there's funny things will happen if you're a very close observer; if your obnoisance sensibilities are very high. You will notice something about it: That he's just a little bit out of time, that he is just a little bit out of coordination. And when you stop, he has three more. See? He's sloppy! See, sloppiness! It's not real. He's not doing it. There is no exact directive action. He isn't duplicating this motion; he's duplicating the first of these motions that you made. All the rest of them have merely been duplications of the first motion. All kinds of other oddities enter into this, but the main thing that enters into this is the preclear is not doing it. You see that?

So, we give him a process and say, „*Well, all right. Now, can you get an idea of putting up a mock-up of a ship in that corner and a mock-up of a horse in that corner, a mock-up of a soldier in that corner and a mock-up of a sailor in that corner and a chessboard out in front of you? Now, move the knight to king four while holding the rest of the mock-ups in place.*“

He says the ship collapses on the chessboard and the corners of the room go the other way, and it's all too confusing to him.

Well, fascinating, but you have got him interested. You told him for the first time -- you said it very technically (which you could express colloquially): „*Look, son. There is a point where your tone & no longer registers. There is something in the universe which you cannot do.*“

He looks at this. „*This is impossible! Here I am, the most brilliant, able, knowing best, goodest, handsomest gorilla alive. And to find something that I can't do is a great shock to me.*“

Now, that's what happens to one of these extreme cases. You'll find cases around: „*I don't need any processing. What do you mean do processes? They're perfectly easy. There's nothing to processing at all, you know? Nothing wrong with me! I mean, this hay fever -- my father had it. It's a physiological reaction, and so forth. There's nothing wrong about that! This consistent breaking of other people's legs and my own, of course, just has to do with the frailty of bones and the amount of strontium 90 which has entered into people's systems these days. It has nothing to do with me.*“

He's telling you irresponsibility, irresponsibility: „*It's all there. There's nothing to it. I mean, I can do it. It's nothing and you're nothing and I'm nothing and nothing exists,*“ and he goes on through life this way!

And you try to process this extreme case, and I'm afraid you're going to have to push him over into an impossible. See, you push him over into... He says, „*Hu-hu-hu-hu.*“ You say, „*Well, go ahead, follow it. You can do anything you know.*“ He's had it, see? He's had it at once!

And he says, „*You know,*“ he says, „*I have a cognition.*“ (This is his first cognition.) „*There's something in this universe I can't do.*“ Cognition number one. Vital in such a case.

Now, you take a person who has a fairly decent level of reality, and you give him a fairly complex signal: he watches it, he looks at it, he duplicates it, he is interested in it. You give him a fairly simple signal, and he does duplicate it, and he is interested in it. Get the idea? He takes part in the game; he has a feeling of responsibility for what's going on in the session.

You know? Well, what the hell are you processing him for? He's already practically Clear. You get the idea?

Actually, such a person can run Change-of-Mind Processes with the greatest of profit.

„*Get the idea you don't know a thing*“

He says, „*All right, I don't know a thing*“ He, at that moment, practically wouldn't, you see?

„*Now get an idea you know everything there is to know in the whole universe.*“ See?

„*Yeah, I could do that. You know, that's interesting. A fellow could, you know?*“ Cognition. See, just nothing to it!

But I tell you that it's very unprofitable processing Clears. See, it's very unprofitable -- because they can do everything. The funny part of it is, and the difference of test is, is they can go and duplicate the whole doggone thing all the way through, see? The whole works. Even the facial expressions. Fascinating. But they also don't have to at all. You got the idea?

But their responsibility is so great that they have a responsibility for existence which exceeds upsetting it. Boy, that's an awful different level of responsibility than „*I don't dare touch it.*“ And it's a lot different than „*I don't have anything to do with it, anyway.*“ See? Big differences involved here -- tremendous differences.

Basic differences are abilities. A fundamental in all this is duplication, which gives us the very great importance of a process known as Opening Procedure by Duplication - - very, very important process. Been years since you've been chewing on that one, but it's HCA training level -- a must, see?

Terrific process! Busted up a lot of cases in its day. Even cases with extreme unreality have had the most unreal horriblenesses happen to them: found walls in front of them

and found hands attached to their arms and -- bad things have occurred. But it's a process of duplication.

Now, the duplicative function of communication -- the duplicative function -- extends to this degree: Those things which one is unwilling to duplicate, or feels that he cannot duplicate in any way, are things which he cannot confront. So he has no space between them, and no space between himself and anything else, and he does an obsessive closure. And this we know as entrapment, and is the anatomy of traps.

A person says, *„I wouldn't ever trap anybody like that horrible, big greasy, horrible trap with all those filed teeth.“* Wahhh! Snap! *„What am I doing in the dark in here?“* he says. You get the idea? He says, *„I could not duplicate in any way, shape or form - - I'm unwilling to duplicate in any way, shape or form -- that particular trap or that particular motion.“* In other words, his attitude is, to say the least, very critical.

Now, because of earlier considerations -- underscore that please -- because of earlier considerations, all these things take place. This is just the way thetans play the game, that's all. But they play the game, not because thetans play the game that way, but because thetans have considerations and agreements which tell them they... They play the game that way because they made them. See? You got that?

We explore these considerations and we find if you were to take apart every single consideration a preclar had ever made on the whole track about anything, if you were to take apart in him every Axiom, if you were to take apart every consideration with regard to time, space, energy, masses, he'd go out the bottom.

But if he was to cognite on them (you see, when I said, *„If you took apart in him...“* see, *„he'd go out the bottom because he wouldn't have any game left“*) -- but if he was to cognite on them, and while maintaining his own level of game or a desirable level of game, understood them himself, he'd go out the top. Two different directions. All right.

So, that fellow is in a very good state of affairs who can handle duplication and who does understand duplication and who is able to duplicate and knows the mechanisms of duplication. Because these, then -- themselves, as mechanisms -- no longer deeply affect him, don't you see? So the mechanisms of traps don't necessarily happen.

But the poor guy who is all snowed under and buried deep in all this does get this other reaction. He sees this great big black trap, and it's got horrible teeth and they're very sharply filed, and he looks at it and he says, *„Boy, I don't want anything to do with that trap“* -- snap! See? Just the fact that he won't duplicate it says he can't confront it, says he can't be at any distance from it because he can't look at it, and space is the viewpoint of dimension. So if space is the viewpoint of dimension, there is no dimension if he can't look at it. You got this?

Now, just below looking at it is being in it, which mechanism we just showed you. You look at the trap: *„I don't want to be in the trap“* -- snap! One-two-three! No space between himself and the trap because space is the viewpoint of dimension. If a person won't look at something, there's no space between himself and it. I mean, it's that elementary and stupidly simple.

A preclar comments on this once upon a time, and he says, „*What? You mean, if I'm not willing to look at the wall, I'm in the wall? No wonder I have walls across my nose all the time. Wonder if that could explain how I never leave the house? I can't look at a house. But I must be able to look at a house because I am looking at a house. Or am I looking at a house?*“ Oh, what a rat race he's in. He's gone downhill from this very basic fundamental of his own consideration of „*When I look at a trap, I snap.*“ „*Can't be it, won't be it, won't duplicate it, won't have anything to do with it!*“

And you're into, then, the fundamental, characteristic reciprocity: overt act-motivator sequences, DEDEX, DED-DEDEX, and so forth. This is the underlying mechanism, you see? „*I see it. I won't be it. Where is it?*“ One-two-three.

The fellow says, „*Huhhh! That poor little boy. That poor little boy with a horrible earache.*“ „*Little boy, why don't you change your mind and get rid of the earache? Oh, you can't. Your ear still aches? Well, now mine aches.*“ You get the sequence there?

This was a very baffling sequence, by the way, to Freud -- terribly baffling. He never did grip this one. He had more fancy terms and less explanation for this than you could shake a stick at. And basically, it happened all the time. He had this phenomenon of „*transference.*“ If you tried to treat somebody, you got it. Well, actually, if you try to treat somebody so that you can face him, but you have to change him before you can face him, and then you don't change him -- then you don't face him, do you? Look at the trap: „*Oh, it's still a trap*“ -- snap! It's as simple a routine as that -- this business of getting the other fellow's somatics, inheriting his problems.

Now, basically, above that level a thetan has it all set up to happen this way. Don't ever forget that. This guy is sitting in the ditch, holding a shattered tibia tenderly. Fix him up, be decent, do all you can for him, and don't ever lose sight of the fact that he's a trap-snap case, because if you do, you can't audit him. He had it all set up to get himself a broken leg.

Somebody just tore out of here and went about twenty-five hundred miles, with my quasi-permission (no more than that), to keep somebody from frying. The guy is a friend of mine, so I said, „*All right, go ahead.*“ See? Successful mission -- the guy won't fry.

But why wasn't I fascinated? Why didn't I instantly quiver? Why wasn't I right up there worrying and chewing my fingernails off every night: „*This guy is going to fry; they're going to hang him by the neck till he's dead or put him in gas chambers or do whatever they're going to do to him.*“ Hm? Why didn't I worry about that?

Well, if you look over several incidents in sequence, you'll find out that he had it all set up to go to jail. And he was saved from going to jail before he finally did this other thing which sent him to jail. You got that?

He had a game going which said „*Jail doors will snap -- tonight.*“ And you said, „*No, you're off here and jail is there, and there's distance between you two.*“ He played „*trap-snap,*“ see, where he'd be back in jail. So it's a rather unprofitable proceeding, short of good auditing.

He had a game going which says „*I am going to jail now,*“ or „*Now, I am going to jail, I think.*“

If I hadn't had a few experiences myself of saving people and having them at once dive into the same tar pit ... First time this ever happened to me was a Chinese coolie, and it really upset me. Oh! Oh, I was upset!

I fished this poor blighter out of the drink on a dark night at no particular risk to myself And he climbed up on the jetty, and he turned around twice and went back into the river -- splash! And I say, „*What goes on here?*“

All right. I fished him out of the river again. This time I held him. I said that's a very bad thing, you know. My rickshaw boy grabbed ahold of him to give me a hand, because I was merely holding a man, and therefore the thing to do was to hold a man, so he held a man. The guy jabbered at me for a while, and I relaxed my grip on him a little bit. Back into the river he tried to go, and I stopped him. Then the police arrived and executed him the next morning at Execution Park with „*death by a thousand cuts.*“

That wasn't even a game sequence. He knew what he was doing! Unfortunately, no talkie Chinese. He probably could have explained this.

We have a mania for saving people. It's a national disgrace. It's something I had to unlearn. You think it's very funny that I'd know this, see, yet I go around saving people all the time. Must be something wrong with me. It's actually a national disgrace. I only save people with their permission. Do you understand that? I save people with their permission.

Anybody who brings a preclear in to me to be audited can take the preclear back out again. It's a very good thing for you to do, too.

People have a right to die. Don't think they haven't. People have a right to die. And yet, in this particular part of the world we don't even understand such a phenomenon as: Coolie gets tired of life, gives the gatekeeper a few coppers, walks halfway up Coal Hill, finds himself a little grave, sits down in front of the grave, sits there for three days willing himself to death, knocks off. Gatekeeper, in repayment for the few coppers, gives him a shove into the hole and covers it up. Routine action! There are always several such people around Coal Hill doing just that thing up near Peking in China. It's something which occurs. It's something which is routine.

They have a right to die. The arduous with which people keep other people alive is frightening -- frightening. What an obsession! You mean this thing which can do nothing whatever but survive must go to all this effort to make something survive? See? I mean, against his will, without his agreement? Drrrrrrr! You think you will? No. No, you won't. You'll break your heart as an auditor. You just didn't get it quite straight.

You went along and there was a hidden streak in you which was taught to you from your earliest infancy: that everything in your vicinity has a right only to live. And that's certainly an awful violation of self-determinism. The first thing you face in a preclear

is, of course, this game mechanism. He must have games. The first thing in importance, of course, is that there is a preclear there.

But after game mechanism there is this survive-succumb goal action. When I talk about goals, I am talking about the survive or succumb actions, and I don't care anything else about the situation at all. Whether he wants to grow pansies or paint directors' noses purple, it's all the same to me, and it would mean nothing to me in auditing.

You say, „*The fellow has no goals.*“ You mean he has no goals he will tell you about. That's the first symptom. „*No goals*“ is not something you remedy; it's something you find out about. Because if a person has no goals, he will not tell you. And this isn't one of those 100 percent, everything, „*all-jewelers-never-go- everywhere*“ facts, you know. It's just an indication -- just an indication. He has no goals, he's got a chute in mind. In spite of anything you can do, he is bound for the underworld, the nether regions. He's going to give Pluto a pat on the head as he goes by, see? He's going to go.

He wants to die, but he dare not. The punishment involved is too great, or this and that. He's being restrained from succumbing. Life to him is an inhibition in succumbing; his life has been saved too often, let us say. He has not been permitted to succumb. Succumb has become automatic, and therefore has become, eventually, his only game: „*How am I going to die?*“

Such a man drives down the road. He sees a little cross alongside the road that indicates that a motorist has been killed at that spot. This fellow who is on his way to death and succumb simply drives off the road in some uncomplicated fashion and kicks the bucket, see, whether he goes into a stone wall or another truck, or something of the sort.

The only thing we object to is his oversetting somebody else's self-determinism on how they kick the bucket -- see, running head-on into a car full of kids, or something like that -- we object to this! Haven't any slightest objection to a guy simply running into a wall and getting knocked off, see? He did it.

Now, the only time he ever upsets anybody is when it was somebody else's car, you see? He's upset somebody else's rights to some degree.

Now, a person does have certain responsibilities. Sometimes he gets into some condition which, by the peculiar structure of the arbitrariness of law, make it unwise to go on living. Now, this Chinese that I kept fishing out of the river when I was a kid and didn't know any better, might or might not have died by „*death by a thousand cuts,*“ but they didn't kill them easily in Execution Park.

Now, life does have certain things in store for certain people, they think. And unless he can upset his fate line through processing, why process him? That's how good you've got to be. You've got to actually upset his fate line, and you can do so. How? Go back to game condition; all you have to do is change the game condition. Now, there are several things here you can change.

First, you can change the considerations which led to a game condition. That's an interesting thing to do. (Impossibly attainable, by the way, at the level of most preclears. You get them up and they can do it.) So that's the first thing that theoretically would be addressed by a technique, would be to change this whole thing about game condition. Not something within your power to do easily at this time, at our present state of information. That'd be the first thing; that'd be a direct change of considerations regarding life -- awfully blunt.

Next thing you could do is to change his consideration concerning particular games. Now, don't you see, we've gone from a simplicity to a greater complexity? Well, this greater complexity works on any and all preclears I ever had anything to do with. It is a greater complexity. You're going to change his considerations, not regarding games (period), but regarding the particular games which he's playing. He's in terrible trouble. He is about to be left next Tuesday by his wife and the cook. He doesn't mind the wife, but it took him years to teach that cook. And he says, „*There's only one thing to do and that is to blow out my brains.*“ And there's only one thing for you to do in a case like that, is some version of a Problem of Comparable Magnitude. His attention is so thoroughly fixed upon the problem that this is the only game he can play.

He's going to succumb. Why is he going to succumb? Because he has no game that is in the direction of survive or otherwise. He's going to kick the bucket; that is part of this game. „*Problem of comparable magnitude. Another problem of comparable magnitude.*“ However you run it, whatever technique you use, you're undoing the considerations with regard to a particular game, and you change its vector from „*I'm going to lose*“ to „*I can win.*“ And then you take some other problem which is some other game, and you change its vector from succumb to survive. And you take another vector, and you change it from succumb to survive. Do you see this?

Now, you can be blunt, cruel and mean, as I'm afraid I sometimes am with preclears. They come in and they say, „*Oh, I want to get better, and I want to do so well,*“ and so forth. And you say, „*Well now, what day did you intend to park the mock-up in that chair and shove off?*“

„*Well, just as soon as you exteriorize me -- I didn't mean to say that.*“

You can read it all over them. Talk about handwriting on the wall. What about handwriting on the brow and front teeth of your preclear? I mean, it doesn't need to be handwritten; you don't even need an explanation of it. There it sits! The guy's going to kick the bucket! He's going to die! He's going to lose! He's playing it to quit!

And you, because you have been given the great tradition of „*I've got to win. I've got to win. It's a great deal of work. And we must all survive. We must all survive. And we must all survive..*“ That's on the third dynamic. On the first dynamic you say, „*I've got to succumb on a certain thing too.*“ But you just don't pay any attention to that; it's not popular; it's not the thing that's done. The way you play the game and wear the old school tie is say, „*We all got to survive. The fellow is sick, you got to make him well. The fellow..*“

I've seen them „*make people well*“ (quote, unquote) for over a year of agony, and then the guy died, see? Why did they keep him alive for a year at vast expense to his family

and agony to himself, and make it ten times as hard for him to shove off in a pleasant frame of mind at the end of that time?

I wouldn't say it's because doctors have to be paid. They're not underpaid, so that's not a good reason. But why? Why?

And when societies go real bad they go on the kick of „*Total survival. Must be. No right to quit anywhere.*“ See? When they get on that total kick, they're done. There is no more game for any individual in the society. This is a police state; this is a fascism; this is all of those things, see?

And when you see the medical profession going along with this, realize that they are being comparable to some of the lousier societies that have occurred on the track.

Gee, you were a general, and they broke you down to a spaceman third-class. And you were doomed to go back and forth between Arcturus and Barkturus. And it was a slow freighter, and the food was terrible, and you were never able after that to get off of that. And any time you even got a little bit ill so you wouldn't have to get out of your bunk, the ship's doctor put you on your feet again. That would be lovely, wouldn't it? There you are, from there on out.

See, what they're dramatizing is the first thing I was talking to you about. They're dramatizing „*there must be no unsnapped trap.*“ They're just dramatizing total trap. Trap goes on automatic, and they get on total trap. Don't you see?

So, anybody who is in a method of survival must survive from that point on at that level and in that level of survival! You get this? Well, that is about the most horrible thing that can happen to any person or any society or anyplace. You talk about over-setting power of choice!

The first place power of choice gets overset is when everybody understands that „*nobody should ever die.*“ It's a method of changing game. It actually is a method of expression of discontent with things as they are.

Children use this all the time as an expression of discontent with the way things are running in the family. And they say, „*Well, when I'm dead and gone, and they look down upon my pale white face there in that little coffin surrounded by roses, they'll be sorry! They'll know they did wrong.*“ There isn't a child alive that hasn't done something like this at one time or another, because it's in extremis of winning. You totally win by totally losing, you see? But you lose so thoroughly that they lose, too! It's just such a mechanism of total trap, don't you see? So „*total survival*“ is total trap -- by which I mean total survival in a given form, with a certain given level of actions, with an obsessed duplication of, with no further power of choice or anything -- that's „*total trap.*“

Laboring unions were formed originally because workmen had begun to believe that they had been pushed into a total trap, economically and so forth.

You notice that labor unions came about only after roving artisans got pretty well nailed down. A fellow could change his job, change his boss, go off someplace, see something else, take a look at it. He'd get dissatisfied; he had some power of choice left over it, and he still would keep on going, you see? But after a while, when they

pinned him down in one place and said he had to stay there, he eventually expressed his resentment with formation into unions, and fought for the ability to quit, see -- to strike; that's about all that amounts to.

Well, you can alter, then, this concept of traps. You can alter the considerations that lead into duplication. You can do duplication and alter his consideration about what he can confront, just by duplication alone.

Many ways you can do that. You can force it into being much faster than you should, with present techniques. You want to know how easy it is to exteriorize a man today? „Take ahold of your head.“ See? „Now, keep your head from going away.“ „All right, good, that's fine. Now, you see that desk? All right, take ahold of the desk. All right, now keep the desk from going away. Fine, good, good. That's right. Now, take ahold of your head. Keep your head from going away.“ He'd go out like a shot.

He starts to laugh like hell after about five minutes. I don't care how dead in his head he is, see? It becomes silly after a while. You just reverse that much of the trap mechanism. All a trap does to anyone is keep him from going away, you see? And you make him do it. You just flip it, just to that degree, and you get a result.

And don't be scared of this mechanism. You're a Scientologist. I'm afraid I've led you into the trap of having no unknown traps. All right.

Now, I'm giving you about where techniques lie; about the importance that they lie.

You could go into this thing of Problems of Comparable Magnitude and make him get more game. You could get him into some level of action which was quite real to him. You could use some technique that was quite real to him that he found interesting. He found he could do it, he did get cognitions, and he eventually could slack off to something more simple. What you're finding is his level of randomness, really. That's the way you discover it.

You go at it too simple, too complicated, and fall back between the two. I mean, it's the most elementary thing in the world. Minus randomness, plus randomness, optimum randomness. Run him on optimum randomness, and optimum randomness will then span out toward minus randomness and plus randomness, if you want it in very, very technical terms. That's what happens.

Straight Postulate Processing is usable, is workable, is quite successful on the most astonishingly downgrade cases, and you really do something about it. It's quite amazing where this sometimes works.

Something like old Rising Scale Processing. You take some guy who is totally dead in his head, and everything is all unreal, and you say, „All right. Now, we'll just work it too simple.“ And sometimes you get fooled; it wasn't too simple at all. You actually did make this person change his mind.

Now, because life will be uninteresting to him, he will change his mind back. But before he had a chance to look, you certainly did overwhelm a number of his difficulties. He won't like you for it, but you did do something to or for the case. Got that?

But, of course, you were playing this gag of insisting he survive. You were enforcing a simplicity upon him and he didn't like this. The technique was brighter than he was, is all that amounts to.

You can do Duplication straightaway, and just by the power of monotony itself (of duplication), make him snap into a realization that he can duplicate. It's so efficiently powerful that it practically pries most anybody out of his head or out of a situation. A very powerful process; it's a steamroller. You know, it isn't a kind thing. It just does what it does. That's what it does.

All right. Your next grade of technique, you might say, would be this Problems of Comparable Magnitude sort of thing -- improving the game: „*Invent a game.*“ „*Give me the consequences for playing a game.*“ Any variation of this, any variation at all.

But what you're doing is remedying quantity, and for the first time you hit quantity.

Now, Postulate Processing and Duplication are not at all dependent upon quantity. You do the trick in an hour with one case and eight hours with another case. The quantity doesn't mean anything.

But when you get into enough games and enough problems, you have now collided with quantity. And having collided with it, you're now beginning for the first time to be able to estimate the number of hours any given preclear would be in processing with that process. You got it? That'd be the first time you would have something, because we are now dealing with quantity. Enough games: The considerations of quantity are there, therefore these can be scaled against time. And for the first time, time means something on the case.

Your next level of process right down the line from there (next level of process, you might say) would be Tolerance Processes: What can he tolerate? And merging right in that on a gradient scale are the Havingness Processes. But these all are most safely grouped under the heading „*Tolerance Processes,*“ with Havingness and Havingness, Scale of, at the lower end.

Now, of course, we're in Havingness, and we are in quantity, so we have an exactly plotted process for the length of time it must be run, and the amount of gain on the preclear -- we've quantitated, you see? It's going to take so many hours to run this preclear. He's going to take at least ten hours of Havingness. You get the notion here?

Tolerances, of course, also include a whole group of processes.

And we move down the line again to [what] you might call, „*Educational Processes.*“ (This is not any carefully thought-out scale; it's just giving you some idea of about where these things lie.) Any one of those things is pretty good.

Now, there is one additional thing that can always be done, and that is environmental changes -- by which I don't mean processing the man; I mean putting him in another cell. You know, it makes him better. Change the trap. Move him around. Send him to another school. Send him away on a summer vacation. Give him a holiday in the mountains. This is about the spottiest sort of process that you could run on anybody,

but that's location -- locational. You're just trying to find a place minus the restimulators, and so forth.

Now, these lines of processes which I've just given you are all very effective. These processes are, themselves (in that band) the killers, you might say, of Scientology. They're killers, because no engram situation, something like that, is able to very forthrightly stand up against these things. They do produce a result. They do knock out aberration.

Now, when I use the word killers, I use it advisedly. I use it advisedly. They're overwhelming processes. A preclear, to stand up against these things, would have to know much more about Scientology than you do -- much more. And to stand up against them totally successfully, he'd probably have to know more about it than I do. I don't know very much about it. But he'd be so simple, he wouldn't need much processing. They're killers.

You have in your hands the ability to overset the power of choice of a preclear. See? Just wham!

All right. Now, let's look back at the band where we find most anybody could operate. While still possessing other processes and not admitting at all that we have covered all groups of processes -- not admitting this at all, but just laying out these classes -- let's look at the class where you have the happiest operational area. And that is this tolerance area.

And that starts with Waste and goes up through Substitute and Have. And I told you, Waste and Substitute get all flick-flack, so it doesn't matter which one you say first. It's probably Waste, Substitute, Waste, Substitute, Waste, Substitute, Waste, Substitute -- something on that order -- Have. And we go on upscale, and we get into Have, we get into Confront, then we get into Contribute to, and then we get upscale on these tolerances, to Create.

Now, it's only an individual's tolerances that inhibits his creations. The guy will just say he doesn't want to; if he creates, he'll upset the game.

This is so certain as a rationale that you can turn anybody's mock-ups on too brilliantly full, too violently -- you just turn them on! See, I mean -- vvvrrr!

How do you turn them on? Well, it's a very simple mechanism. All you do is say, „*All right. Now, you get an idea that you're going to make a mockup the size of the wall. You get that idea?*“ He says, „*That's right.*“ „*Now, you get the idea it's going to spoil the game and decide not to do it.*“ He does this happily, trustingly. And he does this several times. All of a sudden, he's got a solid, 3-D mock-up sitting up there on the wall. He doesn't like this! Why? He didn't consent to it coming on; he didn't do anything else. You just simply jumped on him with all four feet. You knew more about life than he did, and you turned on the mock-up. See, just like that -- bang! Upsetting, to say the least. It's a Creative Process. You can make him create things he'd never dream of.

But how is it that this fellow can be totally black, and then you, through a few simple commands, cause him to make this beautiful mock-up? And then he works at it and

he sweats at it for the next few days, and he gets drunk and has a fight with his wife and halfway fries his skull, and he manages to get it all black again. You know?

How did this happen? In other words, he did all the time have the ability to make the mock-up. It must be -- you could say on one hand -- he didn't want to. But that isn't embrasive as an explanation. You can say his tolerance of them was poor.

Therefore. tolerance apparently monitors ability. „*Willingness*“ would be another way to say the same thing. And we move out into the whole sphere of power of choice -- will, power of choice.

So that your exerted will without his will, gives you nothing as a final end result. So why do you work in the field of tolerance? Well, you work in it to return to him his tolerance of things, his willingness to change his mind, his willingness to see, to perceive, to have, to live, to play games, to do this, to do that. Fascinating, in the final analysis, because it comes down to willingness, not ability at all. You see? „*Increase human ability*“: it's a fib. See, you don't increase human ability. You increase a person's tolerance of ability.

There's many a fellow around who can't tolerate your ability, let me assure you. As a little kid, maybe you could skate on one skate better than anybody else. Somebody tripped you one day. They couldn't stand that. They just couldn't stand that, that's all. That was too much ability.

Children have a tendency to chop each other up until they find some kind of a tolerable norm amongst themselves. „*We're all wicked little bums. We can get along together. Good.*“ See? It's the way society seeks to adjust itself.

You've got this thing of tolerance. These two auditing commands are at once decided as to which is the best auditing command. You know? „*Look around and have something*“ That's a Havingness Process. Isn't it?

I'll tell you another process that almost knocks people's skulls off (and you can tell me right this moment why it does), is „*Look around.*“ That's all there is to the command: „*Look around.*“ „*Look around.*“

Now, you haven't, in that process, entered any tolerance. See? You haven't entered any consent, no will, no permission, no causation on the preclear's part -- whatever we want to call it, or however we want to categorize it. There are many ways to do so.

You say, „*Look around and find something you wouldn't mind looking at.*“ *That's a straight confronting process; perfectly all right.*”

But, of course, below that process is -- just below it -- is „*Look around and find something you wouldn't mind having*“ Or „... you could have,“ implying „... if you wanted to.“ Oh, you can do this. Do this like a shot. Go on, fine. It's okay.

Why is that okay and the other not okay? Well, you can always overset a preclear's ability, can't you? Apparently. Apparently. Always overset his ability by simply suppressing his willingness -- in view of the fact that the ability is demonstrably always there. It's a fabulous thing that a person has as much ability as he has always had, and

he will always have as much ability as he has. You can prove this to yourself someday. It's rather fantastic that it demonstrates when you handle this factor of tolerance.

He demonstrates -- which is quite different than has, you see -- he demonstrates as much ability as he thinks other people can tolerate, or that he himself can tolerate. See, he's willing to demonstrate, then, just so much ability, and he's willing to confront just so much ability. Got the idea? That's quite amazing.

So, you vary this willingness and you vary this tolerance, and you've done it. You of course, then, have been able to live up to „*change human ability*.“ It isn't true that you change human ability; you change willingness to express ability.

The fellow who was a great painter in 1400 is a great painter still, but his willingness to paint isn't there anymore. He says, „*Paint gives me hay fever*.“ This is about his reaction to painting.

Somebody wants him to go to an art museum. Not him! He won't go near the place. His willingness -- confrontingness. A person is willing to confront.

Now, the funny part of it is, that he's sufficiently complex that he doesn't know what he's willing to do and what he isn't willing to do, which makes him a real bundle of nerves. Fascinating condition of affairs that everybody is in: He doesn't know what he is unwilling to do. So we, of course, have a complete strata of processes which lie, at once and immediately, above all those I have mentioned, which, of course, are the Not-Know Processes.

You take over the mechanism of shutting off native knowingness -- take over the mechanism of shutting it off -- and you, of course, redetermined the ability to do it, providing the willingness and tolerance factor has not been violated in the processing. That is a master process! Below that level, you are fooling with mechanisms. And below that method, all is methodology. But it is only at that level that people will do anything. Their methodology is enough complexity. And you try to do it without any methodology, and you understand why Gautama Siddhartha was so gloriously misunderstood from time to time. He said, „*Well, tell you how to be Clear, boys*.“ He said, „*You just conceive mind essence. Now, can you do that?*“ A couple of guys in the crowd says „*Yes*.“ He says, „*Fine, you're buddhas*,“ and that was the end of that. Everybody else says, „*Gahh! What went on? Must be something very mystic*.“ Yeah, it was, for the time and the place -- very mystic.

In other words, the only people who became Buddha were those who could tolerate the simplicity of being Operating Thetan, who were Operating Thetans already, and they merely said they were Buddha, you see? Isn't that simple? Everybody else was mired down into a complexity which included a methodology. You had to give these people a methodology. If you didn't give these people a methodology, they were sunk.

The funny trick was, even though giving them a methodology is a falsity, you had to give them an exact, right methodology. That's where we come in. It's quite simple.

Now, there are your categories of processes. I'm sure there are numerous other processes. You say, „*Where does engram running lie?*“ Well, engram running, today, lies just

exactly and very squarely in the teeth of the Havingness Scale. Tolerance. You make the guy go through it enough times, and he can tolerate it.

Now, the Havingness Scale includes in it all upper scales to some slight degree. Each one of these scales includes in it all upper scales to some slight degree. So you then have a progressive level of complexities, which at last go into the horrible complexity of „*He's nuts, he can stay nuts, and that's it.*”

Thank you.

[End of Lecture]