MIMICRY

A lecture given on 16 October 1956

[Start of Lecture]

I want to talk to you today concerning the scales of processes which could be developed and actually which have been developed in such a way that more could be developed with rather considerable ease.

We have today in Scientology, here in the middle of October of 1956, carried the fort as far as cases are concerned. Of course, in many of these cases it is a matter of more persistence that you would care to apply to a particular case, to bring him all the way out of the woods. But the order of magnitude of time is still within reason. Perhaps you would not like to apply two hundred hours to a bad case to get them into very smooth operating condition. That would be why you would not attempt it.

This tells you, then, there is evidently room for improvement. There's still room for improvement in terms of folding the time up. But as far as reaching a case is concerned, as far as giving a case an assist is concerned, as far as breaking a very abnormal incapability, this is not the same thing I'm talking about when I say two hundred hours to bring the fellow up into wonderful condition. You see? And that is elementary. Elementary. So elementary that you will be quite interested even amused, with the simplicity.

I'm going to give you an example of this. The HASI, London, is now officially coaching the British Pentathlon Olympic Team. We are coaching the Olympic Team. This, of course, is quite significant. Quite significant. The only reason I mention this -- we're doing some other things too -- is I want to use it as an example.

This is pretty touchy business -- pretty touchy business. You take the headline athletes -- amateur athletes -- of a nation and you put them over the hurdles with modern processing, if you don't really know where you're going and know how certain it is, you're going to have some bad moments. You're going to have some real bad mo-

ments -- such as nine tenths of the team suddenly unable to shoot at anything with anything. How would you like to be in that spot as an auditor? Here a great nation, about to contest with every other nation on Earth of any civilized impulses, trusts you with its most precious bodies and you ruin them! Quite obviously. Quite obviously. Give you a bad moment.

Well, team member number one is of great interest since team member number one was given ten hours of processing. He was an athlete in very good condition. I'm not going to give you this very -- at very great length, but he was an athlete of magnitude; he was a national champion. All right. He had always done pretty well; done better than anybody else. And he was given three hours, and he went through various phases of this and that. Finally, being a British soldier, he became curious as to what was going on, because his auditor had instructed him in how to hold the body still so that he could hold a gun still. *„Oh,"* he says, *„You mean that! You mean like when I really sometimes manage to get in a don't-care thing myself, you see, and I make the body lie down there on the sandbags and hold the gun and just fire, and I'm not particularly worried about it, and I keep getting bull--. You mean that kind of a condition?"*

„Yes, yes, yes. That kind of a condition," says the auditor.

All right.

Now, here is something fascinating: This fellow took Creation of Human Ability, at the end of about five hours of processing, more or less, and after a couple more hours of processing, he really wanted to know about this now. And so the auditor simply gave him a copy of it. So he went through the Axioms, zip-zip. *„Oh, that's what... Oh, yeah. Then that means... Uh-huh. I got that. Um-hm."* Cognite. Cognite. Cognite. *„Co... um-hm-hm-hm. Yeah, that's fine. Yeah. Of course. Um-hm. Right. Now, wa... now, wait a minute... Oh, yes, yes, got that, so on."* Zoom. Make an HCA student look like he was standing in the mud, you know? Got it taped. He assimilated game conditions and no-game conditions and so on. Remember this was an athlete in top form who, although he had never realized it, was exterior already.

Well, he got his ten hours finally. And he went back on the range, and he promptly broke the British national record. Now, I'm not giving you a very lengthy account of all this with all of the particulars and so forth. But just for your own interest, his shooting ability had leaped from 120 to 190. Nobody had ever shot that before. That was that.

Of course, the general staff and other people like this were at once stonied.

A week later, with only two or three hours apiece of processing under their own belts, the rest of the team suddenly couldn't shoot at all. Nobody could shoot, except this first guy. It was quite remarkable. These other fellows would stand there in the best of form and plink away at the target, and their bullets would go everywhere, even through the brigadier's hat, see?

But this fellow, without much form, would simply stand there holding his gun real floppy and bow, bang, bang, bang, bang, bang, bang, bang, bang, bang, bang, bang, everything through the bull. It didn't matter whether he was riding a horse, it didn't

matter whether he was doing anything; he still just -- bullets went through the bull's-eye. That was that. Perfect.

Well, how about these other guys? How about these other guys? Some randomity developed about there which I might as well mention, is one of them was thrown from a horse and was sent to the auditor, and the auditor said, *„This man has a broken shoulder,"* and sent him over to the medico. Medico took a picture, sent him back to the auditor. The coach was just going mad because this was one of their brightest hopes. And the auditor gave him some auditing and got the shoulder from an inch and a half out of line to half an inch out of line (the break) -- collar bone; inch and a half out of place to half an inch out of place -- by having him keep it there and so forth. *„Keep it from going away,"* and so on; other minor processes. Did this in a relatively short time.

Harley Street specialist was called in by the British Army, who were very alert concerning this. And the Harley Street specialist came in, took a look at this -- a lot more randomity about this than I'm giving you -- and says, *„This is impossible. The man must at once go into a cast, and he will not be able to be of any use to anyone for many months to come."*

The auditor, by that time, finished up his processing, and I think, if I remember rightly, my last report was that his shoulder was in perfect condition. Well, they developed, then, the sets of X-rays, and the first one shows the shoulder this way, and the next set shows the shoulder somewhere else, and the next one doesn't show any break. This really had people going in circles, but incidentally were listening to this auditor in high places. He is being called into conferences about all sorts of things, not just this sort of thing.

Well anyway, what about these other chaps that couldn't shoot? What had happened? What had happened to these other chaps that suddenly couldn't shoot? Why could they shoot and then not shoot?

Well, obviously, their marksmanship was on total automatic. And they ran it halfway out. And having run it halfway out, they of course had not yet faced up to the fact that they had to shoot and their machinery couldn't anymore.

Now, their machinery could never shoot a perfect score. Machinery can't. So halfway through, or a third of the way through a course of processing, what would you expect? No ability to shoot.

Well, these chaps not only couldn't shoot, they couldn't ride, they couldn't swim, everything went by the boards -- gone. Team shot.

Well, that was the state it was in when I left England! Anyway...

You never saw a less worried auditor, however. He had that all taped. Everything was going along swimmingly.

The upshot of this sort of thing, though, happened in this wise: Wherever they had a disability, they had been carefully taught that no duplication was possible. And that's the point I'm bringing up. Wherever they couldn't do something, they had been taught that no duplication was possible.

Give you an example. They'd been taught this way on horses: *„You can know all there is to know about the jumps, you can know all there is to know about form, you can know all there is to know about a track, all there is to know about equipment, harness. There's only one thing that you never will know: what the horse is going to do.“* This was their basic in horsemanship. Every one of them had been told this early in his riding career. And not any of them could control a horse. The only point where they were weak was horsemanship.

But let me tell you that their point of weakness on the subject of horsemanship was just this: They were simply average champions. You get that level. But where couldn't they go? No better than an average champion. No better than a riding meet where they would expect to place second, third, sometimes first. You know? They were still in contest. And the auditor in auditing them had them hold horses still.

One of the difficulties of this whole coaching program, by the way, is the Olympic schedule -- because they were right outward bound for Melbourne -- could not be interrupted by the auditor. And halfway through a session you had them standing up taking their exercises, you see, because they were supposed to do such and such at 3 o'clock. And he couldn't interrupt their schedule in any way. So what he did do, he did all on the scene. And he had them with their equipment, for instance, their actual guns, their actual equipment, the actual horses and everything else. It was quite interesting.

Now, when they first tried to hold a horse still, the horse in appearance to them was wobbling all over the stable, practically into the manger, out of the manger and every place else. These people were all more or less thetan exteriors already, as you would expect of a champion. And the horses were not still. As a matter of fact, at first the horses, I think, were a little bit more restive than usual. But before the auditor got through with one of these boys, when he held the horse still -- get this, now -- the horse even stopped chewing for the duration of the time the horse was held still. Then he'd stop holding the horse still and leave the horse totally uncontrolled, and the horse would go on chewing, look around, say, *„What are you guys doing now?“* and so forth, and go on through his normal motions. Next time he'd hold him still the horse would just freeze. Got it?

And this datum blew off on each one of them. Get that datum. *„You'll never know what the horse will do!“* In other words, *„No action of this horse in the past will ever be duplicated in the future with certainty.“* Well, just chew on that for a moment and add this up into duplication and *„it mustn't happen again“* and other things.

Now, evidently, in any part of their training they had some datum of this character introduced into that training. A nonduplicative function had been introduced. In other words, they'd been restrained from duplicating. And having been restrained from duplicating or demanding duplication or expecting duplication, they thereupon became unable. And when that restraint was no longer present they started to shoot international -championship scores to pieces. Follow me? That is what athletics might be said to be all about.

Until the man is questioned about how he does it, his native ability to duplicate carries him through. But then when he is asked to arduously -- and questioned: is he doing it?

-- to duplicate some feat that he has just done, why, he strains at it a little more. And then one day somebody introduces the doubt into his mind about duplicating a certain feat, and the first thing you know we have generations of baseball pitchers who cannot throw silver dollars across the Potomac. Why? Because it's celebrated as a great feat. What is a great feat? It's something that can't be duplicated.

And so this factor amongst all factors becomes the bug in athletics. That is the bug in athletics: that it is a contest and that a fellow has unrepeatable wins. If he's sold on the idea of an unrepeatable win or he's given just enough silver cups or shaken by the paw often enough about having won some particular contest, then I'm afraid that you have entered the question into his mind as to whether or not he could duplicate it. And when you've entered that question you have entered in Pandora's box. You've entered in enlarged heart, old age and everything else. What does old age consist of but the unwillingness to duplicate youth. That's all.

Now where do we find the entrance point in a case? Now, we won't find the entrance point in a British Olympic athlete downstairs somewhere. These boys, to be that able, are already in pretty good physical and mental condition.

But we take somebody who is running some department of the government, we have to go south. This man might have been at one time or another an all-American. He might have been. It's not usual; they all sell bonds afterwards. But he might have been a great athlete in his day, but he's not a great athlete now; he's not exteriorized now.

He's in a condition now of preventing this and preventing that and preventing something else and inhibiting something else and hiding a few other things, to a point where the duplication factor has all but vanished from his life. The usual thing he says to an employee is, *„Well don't let it happen again.“* That's the usual statement, isn't it? And this is the song he sings to the tune of his aging violin; and there he goes.

And he gets less and less able, less and less capable, less and less on the ball, his health becomes poorer and poorer, the enlarged heart which he may have acquired in high-school football or something, that starts to swamp him. He's really jamming on the track, but thoroughly. Because it mustn't happen again; because the events of the past must not be duplicated in the future. Under the heading called discipline this must not occur. Under the heading of efficiency this must not occur. Under the heading of foolish expenditures this must not occur. Eventually a man can get so bad off they elect him president or something. There's no telling, no telling where this can end.

Now, out of the communication formula -- given a communication formula of cause, distance, effect, with a cause point and a receipt point and some space -- given this formula... Understand, I'm not announcing to you the senior datum of all data of all time everywhere, but given this formula (order of magnitude), given something live at cause and something live at receipt -- all those conditions fulfilled -- then we have duplication assuming a fantastic value. And given that formula, we have in duplication, then, the datum of greatest magnitude in the comm formula -- with a lot of other data treading instantly upon its heels and almost swamping it and able to rival it and able to work by it and able to do a lot of other things. But it isn't, you understand, the king with the golden scepter sitting unreachably upon a high Himalayan mountain. It's just

a fellow slightly taller than the rest of the fellows standing down on the plain, half a head taller amongst the other data in the communication formula.

You know what the communication formula is. It's given in the Creation of Human Ability: attention, intention, cause, distance, effect.

Well, of course, to have any communication you've got to have cause and distance, effect, see? So that's senior even to the duplicative factor. But if we understand that cause, distance, effect exists, then duplication is half a head taller than intention, attention and all of those other odds and ends that are in the communication formula. You understand that?

And that's what gives power to a Mimicry Process. That's what gives power to it, and why it'll very neatly blow into the limbo and blow out of existence almost anything else.

Now, I want to let you in on a little thing about research. You see, Scientology is not a science of monotone values. It is not a philosophy of monotone values. The moment you say that, you take it out of the hands of Schopenhauer's work, you take it out of the hands of Sneezkee, you take it out of the hands of Krishnamurti. It comes out of this classification. But remember, these chaps said very, very wise things; there is not doubt about that. They said very wise things. What was that old one down there at the -- Lucretius -- right about the time that there was all that fuss over there in Jerusalem, why, there was this fellow writing about atoms in the Roman Empire, and so on. Well, he sins that way too. He's got some monotone values.

Now, if somebody -- and you will find somebody amongst your practice, and you know somebody right this minute who is doing this: He is finding Scientology of a monotone value with, let us say, Schopenhauer or the Vedic Hymns or Krishnamurti or something of this sort. He's finding a monotone value there between Scientology and... Do you get the idea? Then he has missed the essential point of data. The essential point of data is that some data embrace other data. That's the essential point of data: Some data embrace other data. A monotone value says that every datum has the same magnitude as every other datum: every drop of water in the ocean is like every drop of water in the ocean.

Now, you could have 10 to the 159th power drops of water, each one of which was a pearl of wisdom, each one of which was a magnificent bit of structure -- very wise. And you'd just have a pail of water. That's all you'd have. That's all. But if you discovered what there was about a drop of water that was common to all drops of water and uncommon to itself, you could take apart water. You could put something else together that looked like water that wasn't water. And you could just make water too. So you see what this is?

You look, then, over a field of information; you can learn everything in the field by learning everything in the field.

Let's take the oil industry. Supposing in the oil industry you went out to study oil -- the oil industry -- and you read every textbook on the oil industry. That, by the way, is one of the masterpieces of monotone data. Structure of materials in the oil industry

and so on: These are unformed subjects. They are unorganized subjects, utterly unorganized. They are chaos. The most horrible things to study you ever tried to study in your life. They're just sentence after sentence which is fact after fact; and the facts may or may not bear relationship to anything. Sometimes they even bear relationship to the chapter heading. It says „*Tanks*" you know, and we go on from there about the viscosity of the various oils, necessitating something about tanks, some kind of relationship. This is gorgeous stuff to study. After you've studied it for twenty years you become an expert. Why do you become an expert? Well, you become an expert because you're the only one that can remember that much nonsense.

Of course, the real fellows that are accredited experts in these subjects have done something equally incredible to this state of chaos: They have simply established the reputation of being an expert and nobody else knows enough about it to push them out of the road. That's all.

Now get this singular difference. Krishnamurti has a chapter on time which is an interesting chapter. Very, very wise material in that chapter. There's no doubt about this chapter at all; it's a fine chapter: It's well written, it's very wise, his observations are very sharp. We don't even say he contradicts himself from paragraph to paragraph. (He does that.) But it's real sharp stuff.

Scientologist reading that looks it over and he says, „*Boy, you know, this guy knows his stuff!*" Yeah, I used to make that mistake too. Don't feel that you're in poor company. Other people make that mistake all the time.

He doesn't once tell you anything in the chapter which then permits you to handle time! Not once does he tell you an exact, italicized definition of time and tell you that this is the datum of greatest magnitude in defining time. It's all a monotone. So that his data, then, does not embrace his data. And we are reading -- no matter how prettily -- we are reading a basin of water, each drop of which is like every other drop. And when you finish up you are in the most horrible confusion you ever wanted to get into in your life. It's a squirrel cage!

Now, what is a stable datum and what is a confusion? A traffic cop standing on a corner is the stable datum to the traffic's confusion, or should be. Of course, in these days of traffic experts, he is actually the confusion in charge of the stable datum. The stable datum is, there is traffic.

Now, by consideration, then, any datum can be stable to any confusion by consideration only. The subject of insanity itself is the study of stable data. What is this man's stable data? „*Horses sleep in beds.*" Takes care of the whole subject of wives. Well, it does. You look into his head, you'll find out that the whole subject of wives is entirely answered by the fact that horses sleep in beds. This explains wives.

Now, you want me to tell you some bridge to make this logical, and that's what you want him to tell you. And that's why his insanity annoys you. There's no gradient scale; there's no jump. And so we say it's insane. But actually „*horses sleep in beds*" does not explain the behavior of all wives everywhere at all time so, therefore, cannot act as the stable datum to wives. It's only his stable datum.

But if you took that stable datum away from him, you would make him twice as mad or ten times as mad as he is now. It's a terribly bad stable datum, don't you see: *„horses sleep in beds"* and that explains wives. *„Therefore, the confusion of my wife going away and coming back, and I find these men's handkerchiefs in her handbag, and I get these strange hotel bills and motor court bills and so forth, and it's all explained. I mean, horses sleep in beds. Well, that's the way it is."*

Now, you take away this crazy datum -- as crazy as it is, it's still a stable datum -- he then goes into a frantic confusion on the subject of wives.

Now, you say that's the cause of his insanity. No. That is the cause of the pattern of his insanity. Get this singular difference: The cause of his insanity is a lack of stable data which is stable data. That's the cause of his insanity. The cause of his insanity is not stable data, nor is it confusion. Confusion isn't the cause of his insanity either. The cause of his insanity goes way back on the track to the postulate and consideration that he needs a stable datum to remedy a confusion. Now, that's the cause of his insanity, if you want it that way. But of course, he wouldn't have any kind of a game at all unless he had some kind of a confusion-stable datum game.

Now, what is this, then, as we look this over in terms of duplication? We ask him to repeat, *„Horses sleep in beds."* Now, you old Dianeticists know this one. Just look at this real carefully, huh? Look at this very smoothly. *„Horses sleep in beds"* disappears if it's duplicated. Why? Why does it disappear if it's duplicated?

It's not really a stable datum; it's just standing in the stead of one. It really doesn't explain wives; it isn't related to wives, and so it explains out, and unfortunately leaves an awful confusion about wives. You just use repeater technique on that and it would disappear.

I'll tell you something very funny about this, is you take a real stable datum and use repeater technique on it, something else happens which is quite peculiar -- very, very peculiar. The more you repeat it the more confusion about wives would run out. Boy, that's a funny one, isn't it? In other words, if the stable datum isn't the right stable datum, it runs out, because it's after the fact. It is not the postulate from which proceeds all wives. See that?

Now, therefore, we would have to -- very, very definitely have to -- go back and get the postulate which preceded all wives which led to wives. And if we started repeating that one, what we'd get is all of the confusion about wives running off as an engram. And the more we'd repeat this datum the more confusion would run off because it is the tiny cornerstone that's holding all of the other top-heavy logic structure in place. You follow this carefully. It, then, apparently stands up to duplication. It stands up to duplication.

Now, these days we don't dare run truth. Truth is a no-game condition. The whole list of no-game -- I'm going into this very thoroughly as time goes on -- but this whole list of things called no-game condition are the truths for which all of the great soothsayers, thinkers of history have searched. And if you run them on a preclear, you kill him.

Why? Everything he has and every game he has will start to run out, leaving him with nothing. You'd disenfranchise him in a hurry.

Well, I don't know that this is the intention of yoga, to just disenfranchise everybody and make monkeys out of the lot of them. But it's essentially what it does. Because they're going after truth, truth, truth, truth, truth, truth, truth. See? In the process of going after truth, truth, truth, truth, truth, they of course run out all kinds of odds and ends. But because they can't run anything out, they really only restimulate confusion and they leave people in a hypnotized condition.

Now, what, what would you call all these things called a game condition, then? They're a pack of lies. So we can make this postulate: Man is unhappy (according to an old Latin proverb) without laws. Very, very old proverb. Well, the Scientology proverb is: Man is unhappy without lies. It's a fact, too -- literal, demonstrable fact in all auditing. You take away one too many lies from him, you force him just enough further into truth, and he'll collapse. The reason for this is all contained in confusion and stable datum, and duplication.

A real stable datum can stand a terrific amount of duplication. A false stable datum can't stand any duplication. You got that? But confronting this fact is something else: It takes a certain amount of false truths to enter randomity into existence. That argues against this other fact, don't you see? These two balance, one against the other.

Therefore, a straight duplicative process without the entrance of some randomity is a more difficult, deadly process than a complicated one with lots of vias and variations. He has a terrific number of vias. Vias. He'll run vias, vias, vias, vias, vias. Ah, he's happy, he's smiling, that's fine. *„That process is really biting,"* he says. But you just run a straight duplication on somebody, and you're pushing him in toward truth. And if he can't take it he just ignores the whole thing. And he keeps doing it but he's not paying any attention to what he's doing -- carefully not paying any attention. So he can do the process with such ease, doesn't have any effect on him. *„No effect on me, you know? I can do it."* Yes, he sure can: He's not participating in the game at all. He's not in session. The process is too high for him. And so it apparently runs flat; it runs without change and without comm tag. You've got to get used to that phenomenon.

There are two ways that a process runs without change. One, it's flat. And the other, it was too high for the preclear. You'd be amazed at the number of people that could do Opening Procedure by Duplication, just back and forth from book to bottle: It's easy. Nothing to it. Back and forth. Doesn't do anything to them.

But those people are insane. That's a funny thing. They aren't participating at all. They're not noticing anything. They're avoiding the whole thing. They're not in session. I guess what the auditor is looking at is some kind of an illusion. But if you looked at it very carefully, they are worming around a real duplication; they are altering it just enough to keep a duplication from factually occurring. Yet, if you're not very sharp they will appear to be doing the process. But they aren't really duplicating, are they? But they say that the process is flat and it has no bearing on them whatsoever.

Now, this becomes a very interesting phenomenon, then, to an auditor. Very interesting. When you come around and tell somebody, *„Well, I don't know. This process of keeping something there and not letting it go away... I don't know about that process. I don't know, I ran it on this fellow for an hour and a half, and there was no change."* You've actually just confessed that you either ran it on somebody who had been audited several hours on it and had it flat, or you had just overreached the case with the process.

Now this is a fascinating thing, the no-change phenomenon of a process that is overreaching somebody's ability. That's fascinating. But if you watch it carefully there's a variation in it: they're really not doing the process.

Now, wherever you look in auditing you will discover this phenomenon at work. If you run a process that is too high for the preclear, you will get no change, or he just can't do it, or he won't do it. These three phenomena you get. But of these, the most important to you, because it most often goes by unnoticed, is too high for him. That's too high for the preclear.

What do you mean too high? Well, he couldn't tolerate -- here's where we come in with duplication, see -- he couldn't tolerate that much duplication, so he just skidded the whole thing. So the process must have included entirely too much duplication for him to do.

Well, we get off on to Mimicry. These are the theories behind Mimicry. I hope you see something in these theories. They're quite interesting. Tells you that if you forced a preclear into perfect duplication of what you were doing, with a totally duplicative-type auditing command, you would overreach him like a rocket ship in many cases. And he wouldn't improve. He wouldn't even change. He'd just say, *„Oh, that's easy. I can do that. Huh- huh,"* so on.

You've seen a lot of fellows say, *„Look at the wall."*

„Oh, yeah, I can took at the wall."

„Look at that wall."

„Yeah."

„Look at that wall."

„Yeah."

„Look at that wall."

„Yeah.

„Look at that wall."

You, in desperation after a while, think, „If I could really make him look at a wall just once, ra-ra-ra-rmm! something would undoubtedly happen."

So what do you do? You take ahold of him, and you make him go and feel the wall and punch it and kick it and look at it and lean on it and so forth. And finally he says, *„Huh, well, what do you know! Huh-huh, I didn't notice that before, but that's a wall."*

Now you may make a horrible mistake. You may have him look at that wall now and look at another wall and the next thing you know he's right back there to, *„Oh, yeah, yeah, I see the wall, yeah, yeah."* You've improved him just as much as you made the process of looking at the wall complicated.

Get this now, because its all I'm talking to you about: You didn't really make him feel a wall; you just made feeling the wall complicated enough for him to understand it. Please look at this! Please look at this real good.

For instance, there's many a man that could not sit down at an easy job that paid him a thousand dollars a minute that merely consisted of two buttons, and when this button was pressed, why, a little light would go on up there; and as long as the light burned he was supposed to not press the other button. But when the light no longer burned he was supposed to press this button and the same light went on. But of course it wouldn't have gone on again if he had pressed this first button. You'd find no candidates. Same light goes on, two buttons to press, and that's all you asked him to do and that was his eight-hour day.

Now, you understand he's not doing this with the consideration of therapy; he's doing it with the consideration of making some money. And he is just a average Joe. His abilities might be pretty considerable in various ways. In fact, if he was a real bright fellow he couldn't do it at all.

Now, your mistake would be in believing that a stupid person could then do it. And that -- if you've ever made that mistake -- that is the mistake of psychology. And they've built that into the idea in the society that the very stupid can duplicate. The hewers of wood and the drawers of water -- they get this mixed up with duplication. I don't know how much duplication there is mixed up with hewing wood and drawing water. But when you get very stupid people doing it, some fantastic things start occurring. Such as, oh, they drop buckets down the well, and they fall in, and they get wrapped around the rope and go spinning around the drum -- the windlass and...

If you've ever lived around stupid people -- who were hewing wood and drawing water, and you got some distance from the action of it, you considered yourself, at length, lucky that they didn't hew your head. After a while you realize that you would have been much better off if you'd just chopped the wood and drawn the water yourself and not had all of that confusion in your vicinity. Because stupidity is an inability to duplicate and, in essence, is an inability to work. But they make motions. And don't ever confuse making motions with work.

Almost every personnel director and executive in every corporation in the country somewhere or another makes this mistake: He thinks confusion is efficiency and alertness, and he thinks that effort is a good denominator for the amount of accomplishment. *„Took the fellow twenty-five days to draw up this set of plans: they must be good plans."*

If you're on the ball you would say something entirely different. You would say, *„The man took twenty-five days to draw this little set of plans here?"*

He'll say, *„Yes, yes, yes."*

„Oh, you better get another architect."

„No, we're already overdue on the building."

„No, no, no, you get another architect. You get me one that'll draw these up this evening." You'll wind up with some buildable plans. The twenty-five-day-long plans, you would discover, three- quarters of the way through the construction of the actual building, did not provide for either floors or roofs. It's a comm lag, it's not a plan.

By the way, this even goes into very high-tension, intellectual pursuits, such as literature. I don't mean writing now; I'm talking about literature. And all the literature that they think, in the big literature bins around the country... That's where they keep all the literature; they stuff it into somebody's head and keep him there as a... It's an awfully expensive way of microfilming; costs an awful lot. But, anyhow, we take this amount of literature, and these fellows don't know what they're doing.

They say, *„Well, that book is a very great book. Do you know that that book took seven years to write?"*

You say, *„It did?"*

„Oh, yes, it's a great book. It took seven years to write."

You know, they're usually talking through their hat. If it is a great book and you go back and actually look up the diaries and life of the person who wrote it, you find he tossed that off on weekends between drunks. You know, it's something like this. You know it was -- he did it with ease, speed, facility. Man, can he duplicate! Although he can introduce a tremendous amount of randomity into the action level, you're apt to be appalled sometimes to pick up his next great book and find out that it's exactly the same book. See, something like that.

You get Victor Hugo: Now, he's kind of low-scaled in some respects. But, by golly, you know, Victor Hugo knew his subject and he did a fine job but he's -- nobody's ever written like that, but you read Victor Hugo and you've read Victor Hugo; just pick him up anywhere and you've picked him up anywhere, believe me. See? He's duplicative. Like mad.

Well, all right. It goes into literature. It goes into painting. It goes in all sorts of different directions. You can find this tracing anywhere and everywhere. *„The ability to duplicate"* and *„ability"* might as well as just been said *„ability"* in the first place. Tolerance of it.

But what keeps a fellow from duplicating? Well, that's because he would get no game and you would run him straight toward truth when he has an insufficiency of lies. So if he has an insufficiency of lies, you run him straight over toward truth, he'll collapse on you as a case, I assure you. In other words, you make him duplicate too well and too smoothly and too nicely, he's liable not to get any better. You're running him into a no- game condition.

Always audit toward more game, not less! And when you've audited toward more game and you've all of a sudden gotten the fellow squared around a bit, you'll find out

now you can audit toward more game with less game. You get the... See? Because auditing flattens things, you see? Now we audit toward more game with even less game. Now we audit toward more game with hardly any game at all. And now we can just purely duplicate. Got this now? This is very, very important in auditing.

The reason why the thing didn't communicate is because the fellow is out of communication. So your trick is to get him into communication where he can be gotten into communication. To get him into communication where he can be gotten into communication: that is the entrance point of the case. That, of course, has to do with an ability. You find an ability and improve it. Well, he could talk logically or sensibly about something; so that would be the entrance point of verbal communication, wouldn't it? Hm? That's very simple then; that's elementary.

The formula of auditing is to audit always toward more game. And having done so you will run out an awful lot of aberrated past game. And now you find out that although you are again going to audit toward more game than he now has, he now has less game and he's happy about it. See? So it's a matter of going then -- although this is the joggy look at it -- see, you always audit toward more game, but every time you audit toward more game he can tolerate less game and be happy. Don't you see? So you always audit toward more game, and then you find out that he's happy with less game. And eventually he can make a game out of pure duplication. This, for instance: you can imagine a fellow being happy about doing this?

Well, let's take an even more simple one. Fellow would be perfectly happy to sit here and look at that pencil and study it over. Interesting pencil.

Now let's take him to a point where he doesn't have to sit here and just look at the pencil. He can be perfectly happy.

Now, the funny part of it is, a fellow who's in that frame of mind can get into more game than this earth could probably stand in one fell swoop. Only he would know he was playing the game. It wouldn't be by accident. It wouldn't be by compulsion.

Well, all right. That's actually the background history of Mimicry. Now, I don't say that I put it together in a neat package. I don't say that it has all been said, by a long way. And you don't have to know any of that except, of course, always audit toward more game until the fellow will settle for less game. Always do that. And the order of sequence of processes should be from complex processes toward simple processes. That is the order of sequences of applied processes.

Now don't think when your fellow gets much more able that he will be able to do a duplication with three hands of what you were sending him with two, or some thing like that. It's not that he can do more complicated things, it's that he can do simpler things.

What misses everybody in life is that people are always attempting to do more complicated things and consider this good. This isn't. What people are doing, actually, is losing their ability to do simple things.

Now, a fellow who can lift the airplane off the ground with a couple of beams and lay it down in Chicago is going to have no trouble flying an airplane. And actually that's an awfully simple action. He says, *„Ah, an airplane in Chicago. I'll put a couple of beams on it and put it over here in New York. That's fine.“*

Well, a senior ability is to say, *„Ah, an airplane in Chicago. Airplane -- New York.“* It appears in New York. A much simpler action than that would simply be, *„Ah!“* And an even simpler action, as far as that's concerned, would not even have to notice it. Consciously not even have to notice it. You get the idea? When a fellow gets up in that state, why, he can simply say, *„Chicago!“* and it'll appear some where around the latitude of Wichita. You got the idea? It's toward simplicity, is the whole sequence of these things. That's what's hard to do. That's what's difficult.

„Keep that pencil from going away.“ Oh, boy, how simple that is! There's just nothing to that. It's so doggone simple that an awful lot of your preclears can't do it. See? An awful lot of them. Some fairly representable percentage would monkey with it. Although it's a very basic, far-south process, you will find it overreaches because it's too simple.

All right. *„Use your hands and body to keep that pencil from going away“* they could do, when they can't do just *„Keep the pencil from going away.“* Do you pursue this closely? Well, that's all there is to it.

All right. I want to tell you something else concerning this same order of rationale. The Mimicry Processes which you are running compare to body processes. Spotting processes and other such processes are addressed to the mind. And the third order of process would be exteriorized processes.

So there are three things you're treating. There's the body, the mind and the thetan. We have three categories of process. One of the best of these and certainly the most fundamental is Mimicry, which is the body process. So you are now auditing the body, with Mimicry.

If you are auditing psychosomatics, you will be auditing the mind. Do you see that? If you're auditing out the causes of those body infirmities, then you're auditing the mind in its influence on the body. But with Mimicry you are simply auditing the body directly.

So we have a body auditing process for the first time. And that's why it has some value to us. Okay?

I do believe you could probably stand a little rehearsal on this now. Now, you've been chewing at it all day and you know all about it. You've learned all there is to know about Mimicry. Go ahead.

[Please note: At this point in the lecture, a gap exists in the original recording. The lecture resumes with the class already back in progress following a break.]

.the process is not working on your preclear. Have you learned that the process doesn't appear to be working on your preclear? Doesn't appear to be working. Preclear is not doing a comm lag. There's no real change in your preclear. Are you learning that yet? Hm? Well, whoever has learned that is running it on a duplicative basis when it

isn't complicated enough. Got it? See, it hasn't been made complicated enough to undercut the case. Have you got that?

Now, the case would probably respond to some sort of a command like this. See? The fellow goes... Excuse me. Now, of course, loosely and at first you wouldn't even bother to repeat the thing and flatten the comm. So he didn't do it. He almost did, made a gesture. So you wouldn't bother with it. Then you'd go this way, you know. Let's see... You say, „*That's fine,* " And he goes... „*Mm, that's easy.* "

How come he could do that one? Ah, you jumped your gradient scale.

Now, because we are teaching you what to expect also tells you, at this stage of the intensive, the preclear is being told what he should do and how he should respond. And if you actually undercut this and get this to running properly, you'll find he hasn't got anything to do about it. And that's the joke about the whole process.

How, then, do you undercut a Mimicry Process? Come on, tell me.

Audience: More complicated. More vias.

Yeah. More complicated. More devious. More vias. Less duplication. Cut down the duplication, for heaven's sakes. You got it?

And I'll assure you that if we put out a technique, we all agreed on a technique, that simply, all you had to do was take a pencil and go like this to a preclear and he was instantly Clear -- that simple -- you would find a ten-thousand-word book on the subject in a year or so, written by somebody who couldn't do this. Just remember that.

Now, because your auditor is going to run on you tomorrow, undoubtedly, a more complicated process... Because there hasn't been anybody here run on it long enough or well enough at this moment to consider that a pure duplicative process could be responded to. I mean, it's one of the rougher things. I mean, really respond to a complete duplicative process, wow! That's pretty wild. Tomorrow you can fully expect, you who are preclears, to have a more complicated process run on you. In fact, the process that's run on you might be much more complicated than I have described here. That would not, then, be a criticism of you, but the auditor trying to find bottom on this case. See, he's trying not to find bottom on the case so much as bottom on the process. So don't get insulted or anything. Just let's go along with it, huh? Yes?

Male voice: The bottom then would be -- for your preclear anyway, the point at which you would enter would be the point at which you could get it complicated enough to make him comm lag? Yes?

Yeah. That's right. It'd have to be complicated enough to make him comm lag. Yes.

Another male voice: Yeah, to get him to do it.

Male voice: Otherwise there's no change possible.

That's right. He isn't doing it without a comm lag. But get that funny phenomenon. Let me put that across to you again, here, that funny phenomenon that your preclear can sit there and do this with you, with no change whatsoever. He'd just sit there and

do that with you just as easy. He has no part in it; he isn't doing it; it's just there. And if you look at him carefully you'll find out that he's not quite doing it; the machine isn't quite duplicating you; it's missing. But it looks pretty apparent. And there's no change and there's no comm lag.

Male voice: According to that, then, an Operating Thetan could still comm lag.

Oh, yes. You could give him a simplicity that would be too simple. And he would probably comm lag on it. And you could probably still overreach him.

Female voice: When it's biting properly, the preclear would be aware that he is doing this with his body and he wouldn't in any way be being the auditor's body, or would he?

That's right. That's right. That's very correct.

Female voice: So he is actually creating a action here which is a different action from what the auditor is doing. I mean, he's not trying to be the cells of the body over there and all the rest of it.

Mm-hm. That moment you have given him enough game so that he can even have a body. And up to that time he just had the auditor's or his wife's or somebody's.

All right. We have this taped, and we're going to go on with it. And this time I want you to much better than undercut this process. By undercut we simply mean much better than produce a comm lag. Let's get it down to a point of where it is actually in a state of duplication with considerable difficulty. You know? *„That'll fix him.“* The guy looks it over and... you know. *„Oh yes. Oh, yes, yes, yes, I got it now; I got it now! I see.“*

Yes?

Male voice: The problem is, how is the auditor going to duplicate his own actions?

Male voice: Just get more complicated.

Now, you have just missed the point: If the auditor duplicates the auditing command, the process is more duplicative. So a very complicated process is not even duplicated from command to command. So of what concern is this to the auditor? It's no concern to the auditor. *„That's his problem.“* I mean, *„That's the preclear's problem. I did it. I don't know how I did it. I just did it.“* You'll get some of these things, you think you're pure - - pure, unadulterated genius.

But now if you start driving your preclear into an apathy of being unable to duplicate it at all, even vaguely, of course, you've got the other direction: out of session. You have once more exceeded in the opposite direction his ability to perform. So you have to operate within the margin of the ability to perform. You discover an ability and you better it. Boy, you're going to hear that ninety-nine thousand times in this course! You discover an ability and you better it.

So his ability's bottom level might be something like -- See? He's got it, see? He could do that, see, because there's enough of it. But his level to do this -- he's gone! He's

gone. He can't follow it. Can't follow it. It looks like a blur; he can't follow it. He flops on that one completely.

Now, this takes a nice adjudicative piece of auditing. Because if you give him too many flops, you will actually drop his tone.

Male voice: Would slowing down be making it more duplicative?

You tell me. Those are the little points we're going to learn. Would slowing it down make it more duplicative? Would it or wouldn't it?

Audience: Yes. I don't know.

Male voice: No. Yes and no. It all depends on your preclear. On some it would introduce too much time for them to span.

You run this on some preclears I know and they'd blow their brains out. I know a preclear who can only operate very fast. *„I can only operate very fast. I have to do it very rapidly. I'm way ahead of you. I'm Tone 8.0, you know? Tone 8.0. Now, I keep the mock-ups coming and you'll just have to give me faster commands.“*

You know who I'm talking about? I won't mention any names. Helen.

All you have to do is say, *„Now mock up one, just one. Right there. Good. Now did you mock that up?“* Blow the session. Just gone. Rushed out of the house, run around the street, done everything you can think of.

Now, you don't think that's very much time introduction into a session, do you? You know? *„All right, can you mock up something right there? All right. Well, mock something up right there now. Now, did you mock it up?“* She's gone. I mean, she'd be gone out of the auditing room. She wouldn't be able to stand it. Got the idea? So she must go at it very rapidly.

Now, the oddity is what goes right along with it: she is unable to follow a fast motion. Now, that is the most incredible thing you ever saw. She can't stand a slow one and can't follow a fast one. Where does that leave her? Needing auditing, of course.

Okay?

Audience: Okay.

All right. I'll see you tomorrow.

[End of Lecture]