

AUDITING TECHNIQUES: ALTERING CASES

A lecture given on 24 January 1957

[Start of Lecture]

Thank you.

All right, we're going to talk today about some more techniques. This is, I think, about the fourth in that series of technique lectures, isn't it? And it is January the 24th, 1957, and this is the sixteenth ACC lecture of the 16th ACC. Duplication going on here.

I'm going to talk to you about techniques, some more about techniques. And I've already talked to you a great deal about techniques and I think that's very fine for you to sit there and listen. I'm going to tell you confidentially that this short series of lectures I'm giving you here, just sliced up on this subject of techniques, is something you better listen to after this course is over. I'm going to give them to you now, but I want you to listen to them all over again. Got the idea? Right down about the end of the course. Hm? Just these four hours. And I think that they'll probably fall together better. You need it now, you know, but you're going to have to have it then. See?

Techniques. The whole subject of techniques, as I told you yesterday, breaks down into a gradient scale, the reality of which is most apparent for a Homo sap at the Havingness Scale level, the tolerance type of technique: to increase his willingness, to increase his willingness to be, do, have, confront, create -- his willingness to. There is no doubt about his ability to; his ability is always there.

If you're going to „*increase somebody's ability*,“ give up. It's a lie. It's a lie that you're going to increase anybody's ability.

You increase, instead, their ability to demonstrate their ability. The ability is always there, but something happens to the ability to demonstrate it. See? That's a little bit slippery, but it's for sure the route.

Now, you have to know that or you will go on trying to increase somebody's ability directly. And you'll think then if he practices long enough at balancing a handball on the end of his nose, he will be able to balance a handball on the end of his nose. And there are more sports coaches throughout the world who believe this implicitly, who continue to have stinking teams! „*If he just bats the ball long enough, he will eventually bat the ball.*“

I call to your attention that Babe Ruth had more or less the same number of home runs at the end of his career as at the beginning. Quantity of home runs had nothing much to do with his ability. Well, what was this all about?

Every other teammate he ever had was as able to bat home runs as Babe Ruth -- but not as willing to demonstrate it. That's about the whole score.

And when you understand that it is the willingness to execute the ability which is at fault, and not the ability, you will stop pulling the same kind of a boo-boo that is pulled by all of these coaches.

All right, let us take a singing teacher. Singing teacher says, „*If I just make this student say 'Dah-dah-dah-dah-dah-dah-dah-dah' enough times, they will eventually be able to do 'Dah-dah-dah-dah-dah-dah-dah-dah.'*„ See? But they don't. Somebody comes along and sings and it's Caruso, and somebody comes along and sings and it's Galli-Curci, and somebody comes along and sings and it's Betty Hutton -- you know, boom! Still as loud, but not quite as toneful.

What's this all about?

Well, you have differences of vocal chords, and it all lies in the field of physiology. We all know that. Everybody knows that. But I imagine if you dissected their vocal chords, you would find that there was nondetectable difference. Then what is it that makes Caruso, Caruso; Hutton, Hutton; and a deaf mute, a deaf mute? What is it? What is it factually?

It is the willingness to demonstrate the ability.

All right, we take some young actor... Some of you'll do this sometime or another. Don't think I'm drawing a long bow. You'll take some young actress, she's on her route, she's on her way. But she's been on her way for an awfully long time, and it begins to look more like a plateau. A rather low plateau, one micromillimeter higher than all the other little starlets. Why? And what? What's wrong with her? Why is she just leveling off at that level of ability?

Her willingness to proceed is at fault. She isn't willing to be a great actress.

Now, what about a great actress... ? Vivian Leigh -- good example -- had a great deal of ability when she first appeared in the streets of London very early in her career with Charles Laughton. A lot of snap and vivacity, and so forth, and didn't do too badly -- a lot of expressiveness.

She went along more or less at this level. She played, I think, Scarlet O'Hara. Played a lot of other roles that rather endeared her to the public somewhat. Married a fellow by the name of Lawrence Olivier who is pretty darned good.

I saw her just before she cracked up. I was on the lot as a guest of the director Kazan in *Streetcar Named Desire* when they were directing that thing. When I talked to her it was quite obvious... It was quite obviously why Kazan had had me come up „*to see how he was getting along with his new picture.*“

Vivian Leigh was running through one take, and that wouldn't be so good, so they would try to run her through the same take about three more times so that they could get a sequence that they could cut the ends off of and fit into the film. See? She would go through one take and she would be almost all right. And the next three times through, each one would be worse and worse and worse and worse.

And the next time we hear about her, she's in an institution in Great Britain. Well, she was even out of communication at that time, so I wasn't even able to talk to her. I couldn't put any time in on putting her into session, and so forth. But it was almost an impossibility -- all of a sudden confronted with a big job!

Because what? What had happened? Had her lungs suddenly gone bad? Had her tiredness suddenly kicked in? Or had she suddenly got an engram in restimulation? Remember, if I said „*all abilities continue,*“ then the ability to select and pull in, and the ability to select and throw away, an engram would also be part of one's general ability. Therefore, there must be an unwillingness to handle engrams with this wild abandon.

Well, next time that I heard about her at any great extent, she was in very bad condition in England. Somehow or other she's fished out.

But what happened? What happened? She became unwilling to be a good actress. Now, what this tied in with would be up to an auditor to find out. Maybe it was marrying such a superlatively good actor. Maybe she no longer shined. You know? Maybe the polish, the glitter or something; maybe an „*only one*“ complex or some other such thing was kicked out. But the fact of the matter is, the ability to be a great actress was present, and her illness -- which was physical illness and exhaustion, by the way. She didn't go mad; she just became so tired and so sick that she just couldn't move around. All right. That kicked in. But she must have kicked it in -- to cut down her ability as an actress. She's unwilling to be an actress.

All right, now you find it rather difficult to understand how Vivian Leigh -- who, even in that state, with her own dressing rooms, and at least a squad of maids and everybody bowing down in all directions, and her art and ability appreciated on every hand, and when she appeared on the boulevard everybody going „*Oh*“ and „*Ah*“ -- how this would be an undesirable sort of thing. Success had been attained.

How about a schoolboy? How about the schoolboy who has been going along all right and one morning he says, „*I am sick, Mama. I cannot go to school.*“ What happened? He's unwilling to be a schoolboy. See, he's unwilling to. Then how about his ability to learn arithmetic? Well, his ability to learn arithmetic has met up with an unwillingness to learn arithmetic. See? That is very, very much to the point.

Now, what deteriorates in the individual? It is something so easily monitored by an auditor that it'll rather frighten him one day or another to find out that he can turn up and turn down, without the power of choice of the preclear, so many abilities on the preclear that the preclear himself is terrified. You can do this. You can turn on a person's ability to create a three-dimensional, solid mental image picture, and you can do this in about fifteen minutes. And the preclear will actually have an awful hard time getting his own willingness to do such a thing straightened out. May take him two or three days before he gets this off thoroughly -- gets this turned down to a point where he won't be doing it. Yet you'd think it'd be rather desirable for somebody who is rather fond of going to motion pictures, of seeing color movies and stage plays, music and things like that, to turn on something three-dimensional, solid, brilliant color, full perception, sonic, visio, and everything else. What's he want to turn it down for?

Well, to some slight degree, that's up to him. Why? Obviously it is a dangerous thing to be able. Obviously, that's the only way you ever get into trouble: You do a job well and people will keep you on it. All sorts of odd things occur in this direction, see?

A person is taught gradually not to be superlative. What is this technique that turns up that? It's a very simple technique: „*Get the idea of making a picture the size of that wall. Now get the idea that would spoil the game and don't do it.*“ That's all you do. See, that runs over and over and over. And you just give him those commands in sequence.

Now, you'll find a few cases who are rather badly inverted. They don't get into session and they do not, when you ask them to, decide to put a picture on the wall and decide it'll spoil the game and decide not to do it. They don't do these three decisions in order. We don't know what they do. They're so far out of session they do not follow these auditing commands, and it will not occur.

But on anybody that will follow them even vaguely, this phenomena of brilliance and perception and so on, in the creation of pictures, I assure you, will occur. Pretty long bow for me to be throwing in your direction. Of course, you're immediately monitoring postulates; you're making him make up his mind. Bang! See? Very direct. You're making him make up his mind. And he'll do it with that result.

What's he want them off for? What's he want them off for? Why are they off? He's unwilling that they be on.

There's no trick in turning on somebody's perceptions today. That technique I just gave you does it.

You can run such a command as this on somebody. These are overpowering commands, by the way. I mean, they're not good auditing techniques, they are simply overpowering commands. If people do them, they get an inevitable and immediate result that he cannot control. And this quite upsets him.

You can have somebody do something such as... Well, you know he's got birth or something keyed in. You locate it on an electropsychometer. You look at him; you know he's got birth keyed in. And you say, „*Now, get the idea you're going to throw away your birth engram. Now, decide that will spoil the game and don't do it.*“ That'll work too, see?

Birth engram will go phewww! finally. He'll have it right back in, hugged to his chest by midnight, but you can separate him from it. That's your power as an auditor.

In other words, there are ways that you can persuade somebody to do things he ordinarily cannot do.

Old witch doctors... I don't know what they used to call them; I think it was „*psychiatrists*“ -- some such word. It was a misleader. They were sued in 1960 by some organization -- I think it was the HASI -- for the use of the word psychiatry, in view of the fact they did not treat the psyche or soul. And they were sued in the Supreme Court as a misleading title, and they lost. And they also lost on calling their organization the American Psychiatric Association. Clear back in 1960, none of you would remember that. But it wiped them out pretty much.

Anyway, the whole substance of their yakity-yak is „*He could've done it if he wanted to.*“ See? They keep saying this all the time; they say this. But this is a racial engram, not a psychiatric practice. Mothers do this, fathers do this, bosses do that. „*If you just wanted to do a good job, you could do it.*“ See? They've got this on the brain. This one has been going on for generations and generations. It's not a discovery. It is one of those little facts out of all of the other facts that you isolate from all of these other „*everybody knows,*“ and all the other things they say. And that one happens to be important, because that one's true. That is true: He could do it if he wanted to.

Now, a psychiatrist tells you that people aren't really insane, because insane people could snap out of it if they wanted to, and this, therefore, is their reason for punishing people who are insane. See, their logic just goes haywire halfway through. They almost have an answer and then they miss it. Almost touch it; miss it. Once in a blue moon some psychotic will -- well, this is not even a technique -- but some psychotic will suddenly get sane on this statement made to him: „*You don't have to be insane, you know.*“ You know, he all of a sudden gets sane. It's quite amusing.

Much more often, psychotics turn sane on this one: „*Come up to present time, please.*“ They do and they say, „*Hello!*“ They're not insane anymore; just pull them out of an engram.

But the willingness to be sane is lacking in a psychotic. The willingness to be a worker is lacking in the person who (quote) „*cannot work*“ (unquote). Willingness to be always accompanies the ability.

Therefore, you find somebody able to pick up a half a dozen grand pianos and run up and down flights of stairs in moments of great emergencies. See? I mean, they do these terrific feats of strength; they don't quite know what they are.

Now and then a thetan surprises himself half out of his own wits by failing to monitor his own ability. He does something fantastic, like picks an automobile up and turns it around, or does something, you know? Just boom! you know? He'll say, „*What did I do that for?*“ He's always able to do this, but he's not willing to.

Well, „*it'd spoil the game*“ is the motto of unwillingness; „*it'd spoil the game*“ Therefore, there must be some series of decisions in a preclear concerning the liabilities and con-

sequences of the demonstration of ability which mount up to an unwillingness to demonstrate it along certain lines. And there's another consideration that *„it must appear difficult to others if one accomplishes something since it is never appreciated unless it is difficult.“*

The strong man in the circus must always grunt and groan while throwing a thousand-pound barbell up over his head. He always grunts and groans, even though it's made out of tin and sawdust, you know? He'll grunt and groan and struggle, and so on. And this is what a thetan is engaged in. *„It's hard to do all this. It's hard to learn this. It's really something that should be appreciated. If I accomplish this it'll really be something“* you know?

He puts up his own barriers for himself to jump across. Obviously, there aren't enough of them in life.

But you are seeking change, and a technique then must seek change in the preclear. If a technique will not accomplish change in a preclear, it isn't anything that you should have anything to do with.

Now, I can tell you techniques that just run for hours; that make people feel fine all day; that keep them from going completely by the boards. Tell you techniques, as I just have been, that overwhelm the ability of the preclear to resist. He doesn't resist the technique; he doesn't think you can do anything that powerful. And you say, *„Magic presto-chango. The magic charm is - - boom!“* *„Eeeek!“* See, the reaction to any magical trick is about the same reaction you get when you use one of these man-killers or thetan-killers that overwhelms all of his stops.

Now, you always hope that you can do this to some preclear to demonstrate to him you really can do something to him. Boy, is he respectful afterwards, though, when you've done something like this to him. So these are not bad things to do to a preclear, but they aren't things which make him any different in the long run.

Why do people remain the same? You would have to know that to know what technique to run on a preclear to produce a change. Why do people remain the same?

Well, what they have is real. Whatever they have, that which they have is real. I don't care if the only thing they've got is one little, tiny shred of a lock left. They're apparently, to you, sitting in a body, and they've got a house and they've got a name and they've got all these things, and so on. This person has a little bit of a shred of a mental image picture that is all worn out and wadded up, and so on, but that is real. That is real and he can have that, so he's stuck in it. It is real to him.

In other words, a person always has that which is real to him and generally doesn't have anything else. And he has been so often robbed of the things he has, and time itself seems to connive with everything and everyone else to rob him of each passing moment of havingness, that he after a while becomes rather leery of having any more than he can have safely. He can safely have something. If he can safely have it, he's got it.

But what is a secure havingness? A job? Don't make me laugh. Where's the job you held in your last life? Don't tell me that was very secure. It wasn't! You don't even know what it was; you probably couldn't perform it today. Something happened here.

So, reality monitors havingness. It is the thetan which is the survival type in this universe. This universe is not a survival type.

You look around you and you see all these walls and bricks and buildings and worlds and space and so forth, and you say, „*Ah! Obviously what is surviving here is this universe.*“ Nah, it's transient -- transient in extremis; you're not.

I showed you one time -- I showed you the motion of an ashtray here. Is that motion still going on up here on the desk? Hm? It isn't. It's going on in your heads. Who's the survival type then? This ashtray, or you?

You can make things survive, the physical universe can't. You make things survive.

Well, the preclear is liable to be making everything survive, including his own unwillingness. Or he's trying to kill off everything including his own willingness. He gets someplace on the cycle of action of anxiety: „*What is the reality of the havingness which I can have? I can have a thought: I'm a goop. See, I can have this thought. Nobody'll ever take that away from me, you see. That's... Who'd want that?*“

You sometimes find somebody marrying somebody, and you come along and look at this somebody and you say, „*For heaven's sakes, why did that bright young man marry that girl?*“ or „*Why did that beautiful girl marry that horrible-looking creature?*“ Well, they can have them.

Well, „*have them*“ also takes into consideration „*not having one.*“ It's the easiest thing in the world to not have a very good-looking husband or a very good-looking wife, see? Oh, that's easy to not have -- uhhh! Now you got it, and then it's gone. See?

As a matter of fact, almost any time in the history of the world since man has been here, it was the surest route to an adventurous life to marry a beautiful woman. That was a very adventurous thing to do! You certainly wanted randomness if you did. And a person comes off of that and eventually says, „*Well, about the only thing I could have.* . .“

You find somebody marrying a total unproductive invalid, see? Total invalid. What did they do that for? Well, nobody is going to take them off their hands; they've got something which survives, which persists. It's a havingness which will continue.

Only when a person is almost totally gone, in terms of utter unwillingness to demonstrate an ability, does he get to the point where „*He'll show them; he won't have anything!*“ And he starts making nothing out of everything he comes in contact with.

But still, you as an auditor are dependent on the last speck of havingness that he does have -- see, whatever that is. It may only be the postulate „*I've got to knife everything*“ See? He can have that. Nobody would have that; you get arrested for it. And he monitors desirability in terms of possession: What can he possess?

And amongst the things he can possess is a tough case. Amongst the things he can possess is an unchangeability. Amongst the things he can possess is a „*no effect on me.*“ Amongst the things he can possess is a game that nobody else wants to play. Funny kind of a game, isn't it? But yet it's at least got the name „*game*“ with him.

Techniques have to break through this cordon, then, of total persistence of that thing which is real to the preclear -- if that which is real to the preclear is a terrible case; if that which is real to the preclear is a broken-up skull; if that which is real to the pre-clear is a moldy old lock tucked away in one corner of his thetan machinery, you see? That's his total havingness.

Now, you are apt to dramatize a little bit as an auditor and play a game too, which is demonstrated best in running „*can't have*.“ „*Tell me something your body can't have*.“ „*Tell me something your mother can't have*.“ You always run the other person, the opponent or the other thing, on a „*can't have*.“ „*Look around the room and tell me something your body can't have*.“ „*Look around the room and tell me something your broken leg can't have*.“ „*Look around the room and tell me something your mother can't have*.“ You see? Can't have, can't have, can't have.

All right. That runs out an obsession with a game, and the game consists of taking it all away from the other fellow. See? And that's just the obsessiveness of that game. Let him win a few of these games and „*can't have*“ works. It's „*can't havingness*.“ You follow me?

In other words, there is a game of taking it away from the other fellow; and that's about the „*mostest*“ common denominator there is about games. The game is about something, and the goal of the game is to take it away from something or somebody.

Now, games which make the other person accept something are rather high-toned, analytical games.

Even war is apt to be more high-toned than civil life sometimes in the business world. „*We've got to take money away from people and give them nothing in return*“ -- something on that order. Don't do anything for them, please.

So, what is this? What is this? Well, you get on a game condition with a preclear and all you do with the preclear is try to take things away from him. See? We're going to take an aberration away from him; we're going to take an engram away from him; we're going to take a case away from him; we're going to take it away from him. You got the idea?

Half the time you don't even charge the preclear because you don't feel it's a good game to take money away from him. See, you're just going to take his case away from him. See? You get on this bent whether you realize it or not. Sometimes about the middle of a session, you know, you'll be all grogged up and so forth, and you say, „*You know, the guy's got a funny idea about women. I'll just take it away from him*.“ Something you can catch yourself doing sometimes.

And if you're living and alive here on Earth, your preclear is liable to do something that annoys you, and your next action is to take something away from him. Quite cute. No matter how you rationalize it, you sometimes do this. So just be out here and look at yourself, you know, sometimes when you're doing this.

The preclear is annoying as the devil. I mean, he's a sort of a preclear that anybody should have strangled; they should have strangled him in his crib years ago, you

know? He does something, he roughs us up one way or the other, and an instinctive reaction very often from that point on is to just take that engram away, take this away, take that away, take it away! take it away! Get- rid-of-it! And we tell him, „*Get rid of it, get rid of it, get ri--!*“

Now, many an auditor gets restimulated only on a havingness basis. The preclear has such beautiful engrams and the auditor doesn't have anywhere near enough. The auditor runs them out of the preclear and gets them himself Darnedest thing you ever saw in your life. The auditor's havingness reality is an engram. He himself can have an engram and he'll take them away from preclears, and then the auditor gets restimulated. Now, that's quite silly, but it happens; you'll see this happen. Basic mechanism of restimulation.

So techniques which take things away from the preclear don't work. Got that? They don't change the preclear any.

Now, you can sneak up on him on a reality level. What is his reality? Well, whatever his reality is, why, you can do something about it. By doing what?

Altering his ability to have, which of course in turn alters his ability to confront, which in turn alters his ability to contribute to and create. But what does it alter? It actually doesn't alter the basic havingness of the individual at all. He's sitting there and he's looking around and he's saying he could and could not have this thing, but his willingness to have them is what you're monitoring; you're monitoring nothing else. His willingness to let Mother have or not have is what you are monitoring when you're running „*can't have*“ on another terminal. His willingness to confront or not confront is in question, but his ability to confront it is, of course, beyond question.

Some thetan [who] tells you that he cannot confront a buzz saw running full blast is telling you an outright lie; he's telling you a lie. Any thetan could confront any buzz saw no matter how close he was to it or in it. Feels kind of funny to sit on the tread of a tire on a speeding car going over gravel, but it's certainly not very upsetting. See, a thetan can confront anything; nothing can happen to him. Basically true -- it's no effect on self.

He has to do things to himself and change his mind in certain ways so that an effect can be had on him, so he gets down out of a total ability and does get into communication and does have a game.

Now, his considerations of what condition he has to be in to have a game are sometimes the most disgraceful things you ever heard of, and they're monitored by the kind of game that he can have. And he'll cut his willingness on abilities to match the kind of game he can have. So there's an open chink, there is a hole, there is a pathway through in changing cases right there in havingness. And, of course, below havingness there's wastingness and substitutingness.

Now, you change these willingnesses, you will change the individual's abilities. You've got to change his willingness. Willingness to what? To have or not have as the case may be. Once you've got that changed, you've got it made.

Well, how are you going to persuade him to do this? Well, in the first place, you have to convince him you're a good fellow -- communication; in the second place, you have to convince him you can control him utterly, right down to the last joint, which is good control. It's the first control he's seen for a long time. Your most savage control would be a higher scale of control than he has been able to view for years. That's more and better control than he has seen for a long time, and he's better for it. He's not worse for it; he's better for it.

And you have to change his willingness to have, which changes his willingness to confront.

Now, the trouble with most people is there really isn't enough to confront. It's not that they are upset about confronting things. Their willingness to confront things is what is in question, of course, but they are unwilling to confront nothing to confront. That's an involved statement but it is an exact statement of the state of case of your preclear.

Preclear is saying, „*Oh, I don't know. I just couldn't confront this... Couldn't possibly confront this, that and the other thing. It scares me. It does this and that.*“ Oh, yeah? It simply means he hasn't enough to confront, that's all.

Now, why does some rich person who is totally cared for, groomed, secured, sometimes have a bad time in life? Well, let me point out something to you: It is never the busy rich person. See? That's funny, see? It's not the one who is busy, it's the one who isn't doing anything. And that person, usually, is seven times removed from anybody having anything to do with life and its activity. You get it? But the person is totally cared for and totally safeguarded. They're having a hard time? Well, there's just nothing to confront, that's all. Got the idea?

What's their idea, after a while, of what is enough to confront? Oh, I don't know, ten thousand troops cut to pieces out here with machine-gun bullets, or 180 thousand wolves, all of them attacking the preclear while he stands there barehanded. You know, that would be something to confront that would mildly interest the preclear. A pursuit plane coming straight down, the person is in a closed space, can't run two feet to the right or left and the pursuit plane coming straight at him... Well, it'd be an interesting thing to look at for a moment, you know?

You have to add up how tough a thetan really is. Persons too often work against themselves. A person who has a great deal in life is more able to work against himself than a person who doesn't have very much. Do you follow that? Because a person can defend himself against the elements. Anyone in this American society could be called rich. There are very few who aren't. Compared to America as it was once, or Europe as it exists, and so on, these people are rich people.

Look, they got a telephone company. They've got a telephone company. It carries messages for them instantaneously -- a very small charge. They don't have to walk over to look at anybody. Call him up.

They have all sorts of machinery that takes care of this and that. You know, to eat you don't even have to go out and look at a deer and, while it looks at you with limpid

eyes, cut its little throat. How do you like that? You don't have to do that anymore. These people are rich. But they express that richness, not by getting in and pitching in life, but by failing to confront it.

Now, at first it's merely a failure. You know, „*We've got so much to do doing nothing that we just don't do it.*“ Got it? There isn't any real determinism about it. They're just not confronting life that much because it is so easy not to. See? And all of a sudden, the amount of confronting catches up with them and they suddenly say, „*Uhh-uuuh! I couldn't possibly confront that.*“ How do they know?

Now, we're at this level of Scale of Havingness, this tolerance- willingness band. The Scale of Havingness is a quantitative band, and it goes from one level to the next, up or down, by quantity. It's a quantitative level. How many raging fathers have you confronted? Probably the most that you've confronted is one -- well, in this lifetime. So the old man rages and you flinch. Why do you flinch? There aren't very many raging fathers. Quantitative answer. Got that? You don't flinch because Father could harm you! You got the idea? You don't flinch because you can't face rage. You can figure this way all you want to, but the truth of the matter is you flinch only because there aren't enough raging fathers. You got that? Okay?

Look, you'll have to get this. I mean, you'll never crack a case that is a real rough case. You'll process a lot of people and heal their broken legs, and they'll tell you they feel a lot better and they'll pat you on the back, and so forth, and you'll just never change a human personality worth changing if you don't know this, see? It's one thing to heal up somebody's busted tibia and quite another thing to change a human being.

This individual doesn't have enough to confront, hasn't had enough to confront, has had every opportunity not to confront! And having done so, his quantity of confrontingness goes by the boards and then he conceives his willingness to confront has gone by the boards. Got that?

Havingness runs through willingness, runs through assumption of difficulty. In other words, as his havingness moves, and as the Havingness Scale increases or decreases any point thereof, so his willingness is monitored. And the thing that monitors this willingness directly is havingness; the Havingness Scale, which is Waste, Substitute, Have, Confront, Contribute and Create.

There's also an inverted scale under it, but it doesn't process very well and I'm not even mentioning it. The bottom of the scale is Created. The next point up is Contributed to; a person is contributed to. A person is created (is the lowest), is contributed to. Must Be Confronted is the next one up -- your exhibitionist. Had („*I've been had. They ate me. I'm a victim*“) is the next one up, and immediately above this is „*I've Been Wasted.*“ And above this you have a Substitute, and probably above Substitute you have another Waste. And then you've got Substitute again, and then you run into Have and run into Confront, Contribute to and Create. And that's all ability to out -- to do. You do, see? And the bottom is done to -- the way this inversion sits on this scale. Now, I've got to go into this scale more before this unit is over, but I'm just mentioning it just to that degree.

Willingness actually gets monitored by quantity. Now, that is the wildest thing... And any further significance you want to draw from it, you'll just have to look upstairs into the problems of comparable magnitude, problems, game conditions per se, and so forth. And up above that you'll have to look into postulates and how people make postulates, and continuing consideration. You'll have to look up above that to „*How does he not-know enough to be a schnook?*“

But those ranges, whereas they are quite workable, are overwhelming ranges to the preclear. Because up above the upper scale of games, which... Games, as they lie above problems, are not even comprehended by people; they don't even know they're playing games. The highest game that they could possibly reach is to have a horrible problem. They don't even want that. So you could run problems, but sometimes problems mess up and run down havingness, and so on. An individual is not willing to be totally processed in that band. You have to go down to these tolerances and willingnesses before you get there.

You go into tolerances and willingnesses, that's fine, that's fine. If you can process him there you'll change the rest of it. But he keeps slopping up into problems and back into havingness and up into problems. So you really are processing a preclear not quite wholly on the Havingness Scale and not quite wholly on the Games Scale, but a little bit on both and with both. See?

Quantity of confrontingness. Now, you can do the doggonedest thing to a preclear. You can say, „*Mock up something that you wouldn't mind confronting*.“ You get these havingness things, they've got a lot of „*wouldn't mind*,“ „*that you could do if you wanted to*,“ return-self-determinism-and-power-of-choice types of commands. See? „*Look around the room and find something you wouldn't mind having*“ you know. You see why you call it the tolerance scale.

All right. And we ask this preclear to do something like that, and he looks around, „*Oh, I.. I wouldn't mind having that light*.“ Really, was he able to have the light? Well, the light told him that it wouldn't mind his having it, or it's a substitute. He actually means he wouldn't mind having the ceiling, or he wouldn't mind having the electrical energy, or he wouldn't mind having something. He tells you a substitute for what he actually could have, and identification starts running off at once when he's running this type of command.

But we ask him something on this order (and you'll get these things hooked together here very shortly): If he was a light, he would have a lot of things to confront, wouldn't he? See? He could have a light. Well actually, he'd have to be quite a few things. If he were really a light and couldn't be hurt any more than a light can be hurt (because, you see, it doesn't have any feeling and so forth; a lot of rationales go on this), he could look at the walls and he could look at the people in the room and he could do this, and they couldn't do anything to him. You see? This'd be an interesting game. But he'd figure this'd be kind of monotonous, but there must be some sneaking hunch that the beingness of a light -- havingness; occupation of this particular area -- wouldn't be too bad. See? He's just got a ghost of a notion. And you haven't asked

him to do it, you've only asked him if he'd be willing to, so he's happy to talk concerning it.

Sometimes a case is so far below this, by the way, that you can only run on lines or something to pick up any reality on the case at all. But we're assuming that you could run lines, communication, mimicry, that sort of thing. And you actually can get him to respond to a havingness computation, so his willingness of it is handleable.

Actually, you're asking him just a slightly upper-scale question when you ask him to mock up something he wouldn't mind confronting. And you get some of the wildest automaticities you ever heard a preclear get when you ask preclears that command. „*Mock up something you wouldn't mind confronting*“ is a terrific technique. Here's a big technique: „*Look around the room and find something you wouldn't mind having*“ See? That's a big technique. „*Look around the room and find something your body can't have*“ You know? „...*you'll decide your body can't have*.“ That's Trio, see, sort of thing. „*Go around the room and find something you wouldn't mind letting remain where it is,*“ and so on, is actually asking the preclear to confront it.

Such commands are blood brothers with „*Mock up something you wouldn't mind confronting*“ *Mock up something else you wouldn't mind confronting*“ He might have an awful time getting into gear with this, but his willingness to confront is monitored by his belief that there ain't none, no more, no how. He can't confront it because there isn't any more! So, of course, he's unwilling to confront it. He will be right. He will be right, so he's unwilling to confront it.

No murdered mothers. „*Oh, I couldn't stand the idea of my mother being murdered. I just couldn't look at such a scene or a view.*“ Oh, yeah? This is a horrible sight. What makes it horrible? It's a rare one. Got that? He can't have it, there isn't enough of it. He's unable to possess such a thing. See, he can't have it, there isn't enough of it. Those things that there aren't enough of, you can't have. I mean, that's obvious, isn't it? That's one of these horrible elementary things, you know? So if you can't have it, of course you can't confront it. You can't let it sit out there. You got to have it.

You ask a fellow to mock up an acceptable girl and he mocks up this horrible old hag! You know? It goes snap! It's not the kind of a girl he can confront, it's the kind of girl he had to have. And the way you think about this is „*That woman was so horrible that he mocked up, that he couldn't confront it, so it snapped in on him.*“ See?

Well, that's all right for the public to think that way but it's not all right for you, an auditor, to think that way at all. You got that? It's just not right because it doesn't work! The truth of the matter is there weren't enough horrible women involved in this. See? There weren't enough horrible women. So the ones he did mock up were precious -- too precious to confront.

You know a thetan confronts things and they as-is? One of the things a thetan learns: Direct confrontation too often results in complete disappearance of. You better not knock things out if there aren't enough of them. You better take this horrible woman and press her to your bosom, marry her at least. You got the idea?

I dare say, there's this oddity (I noticed this one time down in the Southwest), that any man with a criminal intent and background, with horrible social presence and manners, never lacked for women. Now, of course this is ne-plus-ultra positive as a fact in Hollywood. It's one of the darnedest things you ever saw!

And we have perfectly good-looking guys around, and everything of the sort, and this beautiful doll -- this gorgeous piece of stuff, you know? -- you see her going down the street with this sloppy, crummy, dirty, stupid... See? You say, „*What is going on here?*“

It's as much as your life's worth to walk around a studio dressed like a tramp. Really is! Really is. Acceptance level. There's an awful shortage of horrible-looking men. There really is. Most of them are fairly passable. In Hollywood there are too many good-looking ones, but not enough horrible-looking ones. Everybody who goes out there to star for a part is a good-looking young guy, see? That's stupid.

If you were to walk along the street and see a horrible old beggar with tobacco juice and deep creases in the sides of his mouth, and he had crumbs, and he scratched all the time, and his skin was scrofulous, and he was dressed in horrible rags, why don't you say to him, „*Go to Hollywood, son. Make your fortune.*“ If you could persuade him to go to Hollywood, he would at once be a star, see? Terrific scarcity. Nobody could confront him; they'd have to have him. Get that?

It's a thetan's effort to be decent which debars him from society -- makes a monotone of decency. You get that final thing: a total ant world. See, everybody is good.

What happens to such a world? They've stamped out evil so completely that one day somebody shows up with a VM pistol buckled on his left hip and a horrible leer on his mouth, and he bumps off the first three human beings in sight and the world runs up the white flag, see? Nobody can confront him. They're licked at once.

Quantitative. If you can just get that through your head on the subject of confronting, you've got it licked; it's a cognition you'll have to get, I'm afraid. It isn't how horrible it is, it isn't how good it is, or it isn't how bad it is -- it's how scarce it is. And if it's so scarce that it isn't here at all, nobody can confront it.

Sitting right here in this room and not exteriorizing from it in any way, and not introducing any pictures, books, into the room or mocking up any pictures, I want you at this moment to confront -- now, remember, you're not supposed to mock up any pictures on this -- I want you to confront the Rosetta stone. Don't mock up any pictures now. Confront the Rosetta stone. Can you?

Audience voices: No.

No. All right, confront a floor. Good, now confront a floor. There a floor here?

Audience voices: Yes.

All right, now if this floor is thin to anybody, there have been times when he couldn't have a floor to confront. You know, he fell out of an airplane or something. See? And after that, why, he says, „*Ooh, I'm very afraid of space. I can't get off the ground,*“ or something of the sort.

What's he saying this for? Scarcity of floors. I mean, it's not that he has been convinced that they were dangerous -- that he hurt himself falling out of airplanes -- but he finally found out that floors were scarce. At ten thousand feet they build no floors. You get out of the airplane cockpit and there is nothing to walk upon at all. And you get the notion at that time that there is a scarcity of floors. And this sticks with you as an idea, and after that floors are thin. You don't like floors; you think they're dirty or you've got something else wrong with them. You get the idea? All kinds of significances you will add in, but the truth of the matter is floors got scarce. You see that?

But because, mainly, a person cannot confront that which isn't, „*that which isn't*“ is then something he is either totally unaware of or seared to death about. Hence radiation fear -- great scarcity of radiation. There isn't enough on Earth anymore to bother with, in good old space-opera terms.

You don't see any kids playing with it. They keep it in vaults, and so forth -- big scarcity. Secret. Terribly valuable. The government spends lots of money to the uranium miners, see, terrific sums to engineers, billions of dollars to build a three-pennyweight bomb of plutonium. See? You get the notion? So, boy, you certainly can't confront that one, but you get just a whisper of the stuff in the air and you say, „*Oh, man, I can't confront that.*“ Got the idea?

Yes, you can confront something which is, but you can't confront something which isn't. And I'm afraid it's on that idiotic, that completely stupid thing, that all willingness hangs. The person who hasn't anything to confront for a long time gets the idea, of course, that because it isn't there he can't confront it. And then he says that „*I must not be able to confront it and there is no way for me to confront it and it upsets me to confront it.*“

Every once in a while I ask auditors to go down to the accident ward of a hospital and hang around for a while and salvage some of the boys that come in, in bits and pieces. Oh, you know, they haul charred bodies in and mangled stuff that they dug out from underneath trucks, and they haul in this, that and the other thing in through the emergency entrance of a hospital. They leave them downstairs for a little while before they're pushing them on up into the hospital. And actually, very few auditors go do it. It has to be a big hospital. When an auditor does do it and he only gets a corpse or two in an evening, he says, „*Well, there wasn't very much to confront there,*“ and he has a tendency to knock it off.

But people are unaware of this sort of thing. They say, „*I cannot confront suffering*“ See, how do they know? They just haven't confronted much. It isn't true. You can confront all the suffering you want to confront. You just have to find out that there's enough suffering. Then, after a while, if there's enough suffering, you can confront it.

Which gives us emergency level. Emergency level instantly changes the willingness to exert an ability, see? Bing! See, there's enough of it.

You never saw guys get as brave as they do when guys are being blown up in their vicinity and everything is all going to pieces! Boy, you talk about heroism. I don't know why people give them medals for it; you find yourself doing all sorts of wild things.

I saw a sailor one time standing looking at the breech of an Oerlikon gun -- which I think requires about three hundred pounds of pressure to cock the thing. And it was after an action, and he was standing there looking at it. I thought he was shocky, or something of the sort, and I said, „*What's the matter, son?*“ And he said, „*How the hell did I cock that thing?*“ Sometime during the battle one of his mates had been knocked out, and he had actually reached up and cocked an Oerlikon machine gun without a cable. He distinctly remembered doing it, but he knew he couldn't do it. See? Well, he had enough at that moment, you see? There was enough. There was enough to confront. Came right up and matched up.

Now, somebody else could be in much worse shape. And everything blows up in their vicinity, and that is not enough to confront and it isn't real, and they just go into a vague „*It's not really happening*“ They faint or they get dazed, you see? That's merely an expression of saying, „*Well, it's not really happening*“; they just concluded that, and that's that.

Techniques exist to alter, basically, the communication, control and Havingness Scale willingnesses of a preclear. They are the barrel which is pointed at the goal, but have nothing to do with what points the barrel. Now, what points the barrel is procedure. But the thing that is done, in the final analysis, is the technique.

Well, it's got to change or alter basically, in most of Homo sap, his willingness to exert or demonstrate an ability. That's about the first thing you look at. If it doesn't change that willingness, it doesn't change anything from there on out and your preclears ride forever in the same state of case. See that?

Unless you change that willingness to perform, you change nothing.

Now, you can always overwhelm him and go upstairs. And there are terrific techniques, and they overpower people and they change banks. And you probably have techniques that could pull somebody out of his head and throw him into the middle of Arcturus with the greatest of ease and leave him there. And boy, would he be surprised. But you haven't done what we're trying to do in Scientology, which is to make the able willing to be able.

Thank you.

[End of Lecture]