

The Freedom Congress Lectures
Washington, D.C.

LEVELS OF SKILL

A lecture given on 6 July 1957

[Based on clearsound version and checked against the old reels. In this case there were no omissions.]

Good evening. Good evening. How are you?

Audience: Fine.

Good. Oh, I'm fine.

Audience: Good.

I understand that a congress is in progress.

Audience: Yes!

All right. What do you know!

Now, I don't know whether you like these demonstrations or not.

Audience: Yes.

But one can have too much of that sort of thing, of course.

Audience: No.

And if I was to continue on with these demonstrations this evening, you'd probably be very disappointed, wouldn't you? Probably wouldn't like that.

I did, however, in view of the fact that evening – for some reason or other people are more dead in the evening so evenings have more dignity than afternoons. The sun goes down, you see, and the little algae floating on the face of the sea, you see, can't get quite as much energy from the sun. I don't know how they manage this, but they do. And so therefore, the body – remembering this – they're all deader. Well, that's beside the point. The first thing I... We'll continue on with some of these demonstrations then if you like.

Good. Fine.

All right. But there's something I'd like to mention with relationship to auditing. I would like to mention this; and it's just said to me that this can't be mentioned too often. And that is simply this: that there are various grades of auditing skill. The first of which is the skill

of the Book Auditor. Now, the Book Auditor is a long-time mainstay of auditing. Every once in a while somebody who is auditing out of nothing but a book – he just reads it, he gets what he understands of it and applies it as he imagines it possibly should be applied – every once in a while somebody doing this gets the idea that he's looked down on in some fashion. No, he isn't looked down on; he's eight grades above most of Homo Sapiens. He's actually doing something about it. And far from looking down on a Book Auditor we rather look up to them. They have a lot of nerve; they have a lot of guts.

And there's hardly an HDA or an HCA that wasn't a Book Auditor before he was a certified auditor. And if we start frowning on Book Auditors, why, we will be in an interesting state of affairs. We want everybody to start off in the high gear of HCA, Academy courses – not necessarily at all.

Now the question is, what can a Book Auditor audit?

I can get it now, there'll be a lot of old-timers that will just groan, if they haven't already groaned, over the list of things that a Book Auditor should be permitted to audit. These are rather ghastly. Book Auditor processes would include: engram running as described in the first edition, Book One, Dianetics: Modern Science of Mental Health; Fifteen Acts of Scientology, The Handbook for Preclears; Self Analysis in its entirety (and every once in a while a Book Auditor gets really stuck and we say, "Well, run Self Analysis on the preclear," and preclears snap out of it); the processing section of Scientology: The Fundamentals of Thought; the various assists which have been listed in many publications and the Co-auditor's Manual processes.

Such books as these and such processes as these have been audited successfully over a great many years without very much kicking back.

The funniest thing I ever heard about a Book Auditor – he was absolutely sure that he had audited his brother into an insane asylum. He was sure of it. Because he started auditing his brother, his brother promptly went into the insane asylum – was committed. And the Book Auditor almost died in his tracks over the situation. Girded up his loins, so to speak, went into the asylum, finished running the engram, got his brother out. And his brother confessed that he had been feeling that crazy all his life but hadn't dare say anything about it.

Well, now, that was a high level of emergency.

And as a matter of fact, there is another level of action there, also having to do with insane asylums. Although why they have very much to do with the mind I don't know. An insane asylum is a perverted physics laboratory these days.

I wonder if you've heard the newest operation for schizophrenia. Schizophrenia means a split personality, according to Kraepelin's schedule. And this split personality has been giving people an awful lot of trouble. A fellow gets stuck half in and half out of two valences and therefore is a couple of personalities on the rampage, neither one of which are under control. All right. This schizophrenic condition is being answered up these days in the field of neuro-ha-ha-surgery just on this basis. They take a silver plate and they put it in, separating the two halves of the brain. I'm afraid that is the latest operation. It hasn't cured any

schizophrenia yet, but it certainly keeps surgeons busy, which is, I suppose, what it's supposed to do.

But you talk about Q-and-A'ing with the preclear! They figured out that the two halves of his brain are in argument and each one has a different personality. You see, there's nothing there but brain – that's the first mistake they make.

And, boy, I tried to audit a brain one time. Went down and got some calf's brains and tried to audit it. It didn't work! It's probably because it was calf's brains.

But auditing brains is not a paying proposition; doesn't accomplish very much.

But Book Auditors auditing the reactive mind do accomplish quite a bit.

Now there's only one set of processes that were missing in Book One that are not to some degree with us yet. There's one type of process missing in all these things enumerated except the last three.

If we'd had Havingness in 1950, we'd have had it made. Havingness: the possession of mass; the experience of mass. We'd have had it made. That was all that was missing.

And just the other day I was running an engram and told the preclear to make it a little more solid when the preclear got stuck in the middle of the thing, and made it come loose, and kept on running the engram. I was just a few days ago running a Dianetic engram just like that.

But we didn't have Havingness as such. And so this was a considerable missing tool. Now, we keep forgetting Havingness. And people doing CCH are liable to forget Havingness.

Now, I recently found out something of considerable interest to you, and that is that cases you cannot do anything for easily cannot make anything solid. Got that? The resistive case is simply that case which cannot make things more solid. And cases which can make things, even if a tiny bit, more solid, respond easily to processing. So the difference between a tough case and an easy case is solids. And that is the make-break point of the cases. That's all there is to it. Behavior has nothing to do with it; IQ has nothing to do with it. Just the person has this ability or he doesn't have it.

Now, if he doesn't have it, we have Keep It from Going Away and Hold It Still as a gradient scale into solids. And they move a person straight into solids. You see that? But this is not a large proportion of cases.

Now, if a Book Auditor were to run into one of these can't-make-it-more-solid cases he might feel himself stopped. But there is a way for him to un-stop it. And that is given, oddly enough, in Scientology: Fundamentals of Thought, under "Havingness." And there's a Havingness Process in there which says "Objective Havingness." And it is run exactly in this fashion. It says "Look around the room and find something you can have." And when that's a bit flat you would have him "Look around the room and find something (blank) cannot have."

And here is the great oddity on Havingness. There are many preclears, particularly those preclears who cannot make things more solid, who also cannot actually run "can have." See, they can't look around and find something they can have. They can't do that; it's a

stopper. But they can do this: They can look around and find something somebody can't have. So we talk it over with them, not talking too much because their havingness is down anyway, and find that person immediately adjacent to their present time existence who is a can't-have sort of fellow, a fellow who is hard on his possessions, a fellow who does not receive things graciously, an individual who is... specializes in old possessions, something like that. And we have this person look around the room and find something the can't-have person can't have.

Now, let's suppose with a little conversation we found out that it was Aunt Emma. And Aunt Emma was a can't-have case. And this person's been around Aunt Emma for some time. Now, we don't much care whether we get the right person or not because "can't have" will run when "can have" won't. But we take one of these more or less can't-have cases – we don't have to be particularly certain that it is the valence which needs cracking on the case – and we simply tell this person, "Look around the room and find something that Aunt Emma can't have."

Now, he's liable to start out very foolishly and say, "Well, Aunt Emma isn't here so she can't have anything."

And you say, "Well, just one thing, if you please – just one."

And you run that a bit flat and you will find out that your preclear will develop, ordinarily, some somatics on this.

Now, if the person developed no somatics on this and you were still in an argument about this, just pick another can't-have valence.

And if you got brutally savage about it – preclear still very resistive about the whole thing – we see that the preclear has some disability of some sort or another, like he has a bad leg. We tell him to look around the room and find something his leg can't have.

Now after you run this for a while, any of these "can't have's," with any success at all, he can then run "can have."

And if you knew nothing else than what I've just told you about the mind, you would be successful; more successful than medicine, and more successful than psychology and psychiatry, and certainly more successful than psychoanalysis. In other words, you could simply set up shop and say – you've got somebody in your vicinity and you don't like the way they're spinning, well, you could just use what I've just told you. Talk it over and ask them if they ever knew a person they couldn't have... that couldn't have anything. "That's fine. Well, look around here and find something that person cannot have." Make them give you one object. Maybe you have to change your mind about the person, but that won't damage it any. And after you've run this for a little while then you say, "Now look around the room and find something that you can have." And that would be the safe approach to any case.

And here is sort of a shotgun process that would always wind up with success. It's always successful. When in doubt, remedy havingness. When in doubt about what to run, if you can't make up your mind at all, run what I just told you. I would run it if I were confronted by a preclear of low reality.

All this "can't have" is, is a below solids. See, it's below solids. The individual cannot have that pillar. Why can't he have the pillar? Well, he can't have anything as solid as that pillar. That's all.

Well, you ask him bluntly and first off, "Look around the room and find something you can have," and he's below solids, then he may tell you he can have a few of these things, but he can't. So the alternate and the best approach to it when in... it would simply be isolate a can't-have personality that's been in his vicinity, ask him to look around and find something that that person can't have. The next thing you know, things start to appear more solid to the preclear.

This is also a cure for psychosomatics. Quite interesting. I cured up some bad teeth on somebody one day just by asking him, look around the room and find something his teeth couldn't have. He found out that his teeth could tolerate nothing of any size. The door, he couldn't have the door because the door was too big. And at first we had nothing but conditions; there had to be conditions about the "can't have" on the teeth. But after a while it simply... he could say, "Well, they can't have that and they can't have that and they can't have something or other – Ow! And they can't have something or other and they can't have – Ow! What are you doing to me? They can't have something or other, they can't have – Ow! They can't have something or other... Huh! Mouth feels different."

"All right. Now look around the room and find something you can have." You pick up "mouth feels different" as the "cognition." Huh! Kind of a weak cognition, isn't it? Nevertheless, you could change the process at that point with no damage.

Well, this is a successful approach. And when you can take Dianetics and Scientology and in these very few minutes at the beginning of this evening's sessions give you just that much and say, "Well, that solves cases," well, you're fine.

Now, a Book Auditor would not run into enough outright randomness, he wouldn't run into enough difficulty to change that too much.

You understand, though, that he is not going to go all the way south with all cases everywhere. As you walk up to a psycho and say, "Who was the most can't – have person that you knew?"

And the psycho says, "Goobley-gobbety-gooh. Drool. Drool." Well, that's beyond his reach.

He couldn't take a person all the way north. But he could certainly change the attitude and states of beingness of people quite markedly and remarkably simply with that.

Now, I don't say he should just abandon everything else he's doing and use only that. I'm just telling you that that itself all by itself will work.

Now recognize, if you please, that this isn't the same statement – such and such works uniformly – isn't the same statement as "all other things are now passé or bad." Because I can get as much progress on a case in a couple hours or three hours of Two-way Communication as you'd get with about a fifty-hour intensive on Havingness. You got the idea?

So the question is, something is good and something is workable and something is uniformly successful, well, we've got another factor entering in here which is quite amazing and that is: How fast is it successful? See, there's a speed factor. Also the north and south factor. How high could this person be placed by reason of auditing? And how low a case could you audit successfully?

Well, the Book Auditor certainly ought to be able to do those things. And I personally respect him for the auditing he has done. And remember that in the beginning, I was a Book Auditor!

I also want to mention in passing that every now and then we say validated certificates or something of that sort – we say upper processes – we aren't saying, everything you know is bad and false. We're not saying that. We're saying simply this: We've hit a new level of action. We've hit a new level of action. Well, that is not the same statement as: You mustn't practice all those successful things you have been doing up till now. And don't confuse those two statements.

If you do confuse them thoroughly, you would just be barring a bit of progress. You would resent the progress which is being made. And that progress is, it is actual and so on.

Now, we've been exploring all the way south. And if they go any further south than we can reach right now, they aren't. As far as we're concerned, they're totally, completely out of communication of all kinds. Because processing the dead is not unsuccessful today – and I don't wish to bring up this necromantic note, but necromancy is a solved science. They've been trying to solve it for a number of thousands of years and finally went into apathy on it and went into religion.

You're aware of the fact that more than one Scientologist have sat down alongside of the cadaver and said, "Hey boy, come back here and pick up this body" – and the thetan has. You realize that? You know that this has happened. But it doesn't happen very publicly because everybody says, "Well, he must have still been alive." There was one case where the doctor actually had pronounced the person stone dead. However, a Scientologist says, "Come back here. Come on, pick up this body. What do you mean, running off like that? You can patch it up – come on." And all of a sudden, why, wham!

It was a little girl, by the way, and she had run into a concrete wall or something and hit her head and she fell dead. And the doctor was called, applied the mist test with the mirror, you know, and stethoscope to the heart and all that – very, very, very dead. A Scientologist happened to be on the other side of the park and saw all this and went over and got the medico out of the road and got the doctor... got the cops out of the road and so forth and sat down alongside the little girl and took her hand and said, "Come on. Come on back here and pick up the mock-up – come on, pick up the body. Let's not have this now; come on." The little girl: "Da-da-da-da."

The Scientologist had a conversation with her. She said, very clearly, "My mother does not care what happens to me; my father does not care what happens to me – why should I go on living?"

And the Scientologist says, "Well, there's certainly some way to make them care!" The little girl bought that and that was the end of the process.

As a matter of fact, Mama and Daddy were so frightened over the incident, it subsequently worked out that they made the girl welcome.

Now, the various levels are talked about here in this Ability magazine, Issue number 50. I have no intention of going over all of this. But we won't stop going north. We're just now starting – we're starting seven years from scratch. In other words, for about seven years we've been trying to explore what are Black Fives; we've solved that. All you have to do is make them mock up blacknesses and shove it into themselves. Even if they go anaten, just keep up the process. And they have a tendency to clear up.

There are ways to solve the "Invisible Field" case. We've solved one of those of long standing. Glass objects on a table, one after the other, make them keep the objects from going away with their hands.

These various far-south problems: the little baby, the comatose person, the people in spinbins – so what? We've processed them all by this time. As a matter of fact, the main surprise that I would get if I found that some auditor trained to do so had failed to get results on a case that was way down south, I would say offhand that what had happened there is the auditor had skidded in some fashion. And I would put my total attention on the auditor and patch him up so he wouldn't skid. There must have been something wrong with his training or skill. That's the way it's come about these days – it is no longer whether or not the technique works, it's whether or not the auditor can work the techniques.

That's very true of CCH. CCH results are as variable as the auditor who does them. Hence this validation program. There are people around that are not trained in them that if just suddenly started doing CCH without any of the Training Drills at all would just lay the most colossal egg they ever laid. They better just sort out the valence of "can't have" and run "can't have" on it. Because they'll get no place with CCH, see? It's the intention. The preclear stays in-session just as long as the intention is there, and various other things.

Now, CCH itself is compounded, by the way, of practically every successful process that we have had since 1950. Or every item we have had since 1950 in a successful process that handles it. And that is basically what CCH is. It is not new. It is a new organization. What is new is this Tone 40 stuff. That is new. But CCH itself and its basic organization contain such things as the process I just gave you about havingness. That's one of the CCH processes. There's a whole rack of them on the subject of havingness. There's also Subjective Havingness, Remedy of Havingness – years old.

This thing about Then and Now Solids, which is an upper CCH, is quite remarkable for being nothing more than Dianetics run Scientology-wise. You get the same phenomena. Except you run more confounded engrams in less time than you ever could have counted back in 1950. Whir-clank! There's speed on running them if they're run properly.

But indoctrination on a Comm Course level is necessary really to any auditing that is going to be uniformly successful. And on an Upper Indoc level we have a necessity of drill

there, if we're going to make any of these Tone 40 processes work. They don't work without Upper Indoctrination.

Now, there's a process called Give Me Your Hand; Thank You. Now, we're going to take this up later on in this congress. And it possibly could be run ten thousand ways, but only one of them is right. And you could run Give Me Your Hand on somebody – Give me your hand, give me your hand, and so on – just get nowhere. And you would say, "Well, what's the necromancy here?" Well, the necromancy is, is we stopped the idea that the process was going to do it all and entered the faint notion that the auditor had something to do with it. Because we know the results which can be obtained by CCH, because they've been broadly tested and broadly run by a great many auditors on a great many preclears. We know what CCH is capable of doing. Because every time we have found it falling down is by reason of the auditor. And we've taken the auditor and run him back through Upper Indoc and put him back in on the same preclear and had improvement on the preclear then, as expected. You got that?

So it's auditor failure. But we knew in the past that we could have such things as such auditor failure, but there was no sense in hanging it around people's necks. I would much rather carry the yoke of responsibility and make the processes better. Which was the course which was taken. Processes anybody could run was the hope. But now we've gotten these training skills. Now these training skills exist. And as they exist and because they exist it is now possible to say to an auditor, "Your auditing requires improvement." And it's only possible to say that to him because his auditing by the training drills can be improved rather easily. In other words, we can say something about it because we can do something about it, don't you see? So it becomes very allowable.

Now, nobody would look to a Book Auditor to have a very smooth approach. As a matter of fact, do you remember the old canceler way back when? Well, I had an old Book Auditor give me an auditing session one day and I was doing... we were doing some experimental work. And he was maintaining something or other, something or other – she was, rather – maintaining something or other and something or other was the case; and she was going to show me this phenomena. So I thought that was fine. And she reached over and picked up a copy of Book One and opened it up to the "Beginning of session" and read it to me, installed a canceler and went right straight through by reading the text at me that wrote it. And I obediently went into session and we investigated the phenomena. She brought me up to present time and cancelled the canceler – also out of the book. Pretty wild. Pretty wild.

We used to have such things as stenographic auditors – stenographic auditing. We haven't heard of these things for ages and ages. The auditor didn't do anything but sit there and write down whatever the preclear said – stenographic auditing, 100 percent. Preclear would just run on and on in some kind of an auto-fashion. The auditor would put him vaguely into session, head him vaguely into the beginning of an engram someplace and then sit and write down everything the preclear said from there on; and every once in a while would look up and say, "Go over it again," obediently, see?

What we've conquered essentially is an earlier inability to reach that which is the motivator of the being. And we have conquered this disability. And we can communicate with

that, we can change that, we can do something about that. We understand the innumerable phenomena which arise from these various things. And as such, why, we can afford to, one, oversimplify the whole thing. See, when you know all about it you can say, "Well this is what's important about it and the other things aren't." Don't you see? That's easy. And without at the same time invalidating the rest of the data-it's still there. And we can also do this thing: We can take somebody who is auditing over a long period of time, he's been auditing for a long time, and we can do remarkable things for his auditing – utterly fantastic things for his auditing.

You know how I know this?

Well, I used to consider myself a pretty good auditor because they used to bring me in all the tough cases. Running a clinic, something like that, or some auditor that was working somewhere on some preclear. They'd come in; they'd brought the case to an unsolvable impasse. Maybe two or three other auditors, pretty good, had also drawn a blank, and they'd bring the case in to me and I'd do something with the case somehow or other. And most of them would work out and start running again and so forth, see. Well, I'd thought there was nothing but tough cases during the entire first year of Dianetics; I thought that was all there was. Up to that time I'd had nothing but easy cases and suddenly got nothing but tough cases. No wonder we kept on trying to crack tough cases – I got them all.

Well, there was a time when I considered it was a myth that I was a terrific auditor. I said, "Well, it must be just mythical. You know, a thing builds up, you... must be better auditors around." And in Phoenix we did... all the staff auditors did twenty-five-hour (over a long period of time they were doing this), they were doing twenty-five-hour intensives on preclears. And I was doing five-hour intensives on preclears and I got a little bit better results. Five hours to twenty-five.

All right. Now, my auditing wasn't bad then. It wasn't terrible. It was quite workable. Cases would untangle, start running for various reasons, whatever they were – altitude or skill or knowing more about the subject. Who knows? But the point is, I went on auditing a long time like that. And then I coached the staff at the FC after I came back from England – I'd coached the auditors in England up a little bit and hadn't finished the job over there. Came back over here and did most of the coaching which... we called it coaching then, instructing now-coach became something particular. And I was running them through these Training Drills personally, just making sure that they came up to snuff. There wasn't much anything else to do it.

But I was teaching these people Comm Course – you know, Dear Alice, Acknowledgement, Repetitive Question, Pc Origination, Hand Mimicry, simple 8-C, High School Indoc, Tone 40 on an Object and Tone 40 on a Person – I was teaching them those drills, just one right after the other. And I was in there almost every night. After a day at work, why, we'd pitch in and we would get some more of this validation out of the road. We were trying to get ahead and validate all of the staff certificates that were on deck at the FC. And we were trying to make it before this congress and we made it. And the auditors are validated through all of these coaching steps, which is a pretty good thing. They worked real hard to do this for you. You ought to give them a hand.

Okay. Now, in view of the fact that I was pounding their ears in with this information, I was hammering and kicking them around... And by the way, there was... for 24 hours there was nobody at the FC would hardly speak to me. I mean they'd gotten up to the blow point. I mean it was just too whfff you know. Just one more time of putting that ashtray down on the table would have been enough! And all of a sudden they blew through it and it all blew away and we were all friends again. That's the way it works.

All right. We were doing beautifully and I said to myself I said, "You know, I wonder if you audited exactly according to these Training Drills and no other way, totally in present time, doing nothing but audit the preclear exactly according to these drills, exactly according to CCH, if you wouldn't produce an interesting result. Now, I'm going to do this just to make sure there's nothing missing – I'm going to do this, see." And I sat down and wogwogged through my first two sessions of a couple of hours apiece with a duplicative-type process, using nothing but Tone 40, present time, using the Comm Course responses, not varying one iota off the line anywhere – did it just exactly the way I'm telling you here at this congress, you see? And I did it.

Now, I'd had a little earlier experience of driving a car in present time which almost removed me from this Earth. I just ignored all my driving machinery and did everything in present time. Well, this was auditing in present time.

I'd been auditing a lot of people for a very long time. And I started auditing right up there on top, right totally in present time, using nothing but Tone 40 intentions and acknowledgements, using nothing but the exact school solution. Knock me down with a feather. At about the fifth or sixth hour I was really grooving it, I was doing it well, and I thought, "Who was that lousy auditor I used to know? Who's that... What did I think I was doing in 1953?"

In the first place, the results on the preclears were going up just like that, see? I was ending up sessions feeling fresher than I began. That was not too unusual for me, but I was feeling remarkably better! And I was riding right up on top all the way through, and the hours of the session were just going by swish. And I was doing nothing but what I am talking to you about here at this congress.

Now, I'm not trying to tell you how good an auditor I am. I'm trying to tell you that there may be some things outside the perimeter of these Training Drills. And there are, because we have some additional little drills like Fishing a Cognition and that sort of thing, how to conduct two-way communication, how to begin sessions, end sessions and that sort of thing. But the point is that I didn't use any of these things. I merely used Training 0 right straight on up to Training 9, inclusive, and the exact process, and got better results on preclears than I'd ever gotten before in my life.

Therefore, I can stand up and tell you very didactically that this is a workable set of drills.

(applause).

Thank you.

Now, it's quite amazing, it's quite amazing to see somebody auditing who himself is restimulatable in ordinary life. But after a fellow has audited this way for a very little while, he doesn't get restimulated anymore. That's for sure.

My existence as an auditor was made random because I would sometimes get preclears pitched at me, even in later days here, I didn't want anything to do with. And I finally found out why I didn't want anything to do with them. They would occasionally be so enturbulative in the auditing room that they'd sort of tire me out, you know? I'd get tired on the thing. I don't get tired anymore; it's sort of a state of "bring on your lions." I think that we've got this licked.

There hasn't been too much change, as I said, on the Comm Course for a year, and there hasn't been too much change for about four or five months here on Upper Indoc. And I don't see any reason to change it.

There's some other versions of Upper Indoc which are quite interesting. One of them we haven't shown you. It's a sort of an ACC variation. The auditor sits down and the coach sits across from him – this is a seated High School Indoc – and the coach simply carries on the most invalidative yak that he can possibly think up. Like, "Who taught you to audit? Boy, is that a comm lag! That's a communication break – you broke the Auditor's Code that time!" Yak-yak-yak-yak-yak. And turns on misemotions – becomes very apathetic or becomes raging and so on. And the auditor is expected to go on calmly delivering the auditing command and acknowledging in spite of all this. That is another form of High School Indoc.

We've found out, however, that this levels out to a marked degree on Tone 40 on an Object and on Tone 40 on a Person and is not terribly necessary; it's merely very good. And it's kind of fun. If you feel mad at the world someday, why, get somebody... hold somebody and tell him you're going to teach him how to audit and...

It's a wonderful feeling to give people advice about something with a totally clean conscience. And that's what I'm doing tonight, what I have done all along, but what I've done particularly with these Training Drills.

Now, the reason I've been talking to you this long is I just wanted to make awfully sure that nobody here was under the misconception that, one, because we have found something new, that all old things were bad. That is not true. And the other thing is, is that the Training Drills form an artificiality which bypasses natural aptitude.

I found a horrible case of auditor intuition the other day. Preclear hadn't gained for hours and hours of processing either. But the auditor had a feeling, he had a feeling that something or other ought to be run on that case; he just had a feeling. He couldn't account for it and no data on the case would corroborate the fact that this was on the case. I got hold of the auditor and I audited out the feeling. He knew what should be audited on that case.

Did you ever see the experiment of the two E-Meters, by the way?

You take a co-auditing team and you put the auditor on one E-Meter and the preclear on the other and then you call off the list of things which have been audited – not because they were restimulative or had been flattened on the preclear, Lord forbid; they had not even

vaguely been flattened, they'd merely been restimulated on the preclear. The auditor's E-Meter responded to what had been run on the preclear. But the preclear's E-Meter didn't respond. In other words, what was being run was wrong with the auditor. Auditor was running his own case. Well, it's all right to do that, too. It's probably real good for you!

However, even if you do that, why, Scientology still works. And even if you do that at Tone 40, you'll still produce results – something will happen.

Now, you had a Group Auditing session here yesterday afternoon. And I actually audited you straight on a Tone 40 Group Process, much as I would have audited you as an individual session in an auditing room. Now, I mentioned to you afterwards that there was some difference here, that there was a different type of Group Processing than I had done before. And those of you who had been group processed by me agreed with this very thoroughly. They said, "Yes, this was a different type of auditing than you have done on us before."

Well, it was nothing more nor less, what I did, than these Training Drills exactly combined into a production of a Group Auditing session. And that was exactly what happened. I think you would agree with me because I gave you the command and made sure the command hit all parts of the hall – each person in the hall – before I went on and gave the acknowledgement. I didn't give the acknowledgement until some execution had been performed. And then after I said the acknowledgement, got the intention of bringing that cycle to a full stop, at which time this occurred, and then let it off the full stop and slid on to the next auditing command for a new cycle. And that was exactly what was happening. We were running each cycle, each command, followed by an acknowledgement, making a full cycle of action which stopped with the acknowledgement. And then we went on to a new cycle, and then we went on and did a new cycle and a new cycle. In other words, we weren't doing one auditing session or two auditing sessions in the two hours. We did a great many auditing sessions. Each command was an auditing session, don't you see.

Now, I know those things got across because I've heard on the grapevine and so on, through messages passed through and so on, that there were a great many people present who got their first reality on processing – even some old-timers – on those two group sessions yesterday. Is that true? Or is this just rumor?

Well, we had several exteriorizations, which hadn't happened before. That's right, isn't it? All right. In other words, here was an interesting thing. We ran a Tone 40 group session, and I will confess to you that it was nothing but calculated. It was totally calculated. It was a calculated process. First I gave you the realest havingness you could meet – pressure, remember? – and then blew you out of your heads, of course. I didn't try to do anything else but that. Now, if I didn't blow you out, I loosened you up. That's right, isn't it?

Audience: Right.

All right. Now, here's the interplay of Scientology is carried in just vignette in those two hours of Group Auditing. First hour was devoted to a havingness-type process which I knew very well people could do and from which they would get havingness. See, that was the first hour. And the second hour we had to assume that havingness had been increased to some

degree. And in view of the fact that it had been increased, then there was a possibility of giving a few people a higher reality on exteriorization simply in the course of holding the body on Earth, because what else are they doing, you see?

Furthermore, by pressing the floor down against the ground, you have a tendency to go up, see? And you found yourselves doing that, many of you. Didn't you?

Audience: Yes.

The least that would have happened to you is you would have felt lighter.

All right. Havingness versus separateness. And this is really the limit of action necessary in auditing. You can't run separateness very well; you have to continue to run put-togetherness. But you can run put-togetherness – Hold the floor against the Earth – in such a way as to make a Separateness Process out of it. Don't you see?

You make a fellow push hard enough against the wall and you're going to accomplish a considerable reaction as far as he's concerned, see. See how that would be? In other words, you're still running togetherness – you're making him push the walls together – but the action of pushing the walls together will push him out.

Now, running separateness all by itself is a very difficult thing to do. It can be done. But it evidently requires terrifically smooth auditing. It requires a tremendous repair of havingness. It requires all sorts of things. Separateness is quite a lot of process. I can get away with separateness. A lot of auditors around can get away with separateness, but generally it can't be gotten away with.

And yet, what do we have?

We have possession and separateness from the possession. And of course, the more vista the thetan has, the more havingness he has. The more he can see or experience, the more havingness he has. Isn't that right? So havingness is dependent upon communication and having a broad view. Now, a thetan becomes so anxious about things, he says, "Look, I'll stick in this head and at least I'll have that! At least I'll have that. And I'll just say, 'Well, I don't want those other things; at least I'll have this skull.'"

Well, the only reason he is doing that is because he is worried about having a head. He thinks if he no longer has the head, why, he won't have anything else either. In other words, he fixes his attention much too closely.

So what is life?

Life is getting into things and getting out of them. Isn't that right? About all there is to it. I mean, you get into something and then you get out of it.

To audit this it is necessary to run getting into things. Don't run getting out of them. Got that? It was getting into things that gave him havingness, he thought. So you're going to have to run more getting into things so that he has enough getting into things. And after a while he says, "You know, I'm into so many things I can drop one or two things." It's just more or less on the order of a business executive, something of the sort, and he's been awfully fixed on his job, let's say. He's been doing nothing but his job, nothing but his job. One day,

why, he finds how to do his job a little bit better so he picks up a hobby and then he picks up another hobby and he picks up another hobby. And he finds out how to do these pretty well and he's still got these possessions and life goes on this way. And one day, why, his business picks up and requires more attention than he was giving it previously. "Well," he says, "well, I've got enough hobbies that I can drop stamp collecting." See, he could do that one thing: he could drop stamp collecting. But let me assure you that if he didn't have that many, why, he'd just fix down into the business. He doesn't let up somewhere, he just sort of mires in.

When a person has only one fixed interest, like their lumbago or sciatica or something, ask them to give this up is almost impossible. But you can certainly take somebody's interest off his sciatica by coming along and giving him a kick in the shins. He won't think sciatica for some minutes. Well now that's violently done, and it is not by power of choice and therefore he is upset about it.

So auditing is not good when done simply on the kick-in-the-shins basis. See, that's not good auditing, that's good coaching. All right. Therefore, kicking people in the shins takes their mind off... well, you by auditing can give them a number of possible kicks in the shins. And pretty soon they say, "Well you know, I've got twelve kicks in the shins now. You know, I think I could possibly get along with eleven." So you give him fifteen. And he says, "You know, I think I could get along with ten." So you give him twenty-five. And he says, "You know, I could get along with five of these." I'm talking about have to have them, you know. Finally, why, he's quite content; you give him eighty-five synthetic kicks in the shins, not actual ones, you see, and he says, "I don't have to have any kicks in the shins; I can make them up. It's okay." So he's willing to let go of this and he doesn't need a kick in the shins. And at that moment the bruise will heal. Do you see that?

It's just getting into things. You give him the opportunity to get into a lot more things than he ever had before and he'll get out on a couple. Got it?

So that's what auditing works as. It works on the basis of getting into things. Therefore, havingness; therefore, pressure. See this?

Now, in the present level of CCH and in the Training Drills there is really – but you did it yesterday but in the school solution – there is no proviso for this one interesting factor. And I'd like to wind up this data lecture on the subject of these drills before we get on with more of them, which we will all ... entirely in the second hour. I just want to give you this one more piece of data that's of great interest, is: escape from pressure is the retreat into small-size degradation, mired down, blindness or anything else. It's the retreat from pressure. Now, that is an accurate, technical statement. A person is afraid of pressures; he doesn't want that much pressure; he feels that pressures are too much for him.

You can take somebody who's having a rough time and all you've got to do is pound your fist on the table once and he gets terribly upset – that was too much pressure.

Now, the suddenness of pressure is as important as the amount of pressure. You got that? I mean, there are two different things. There's the suddenness of the pressure as in an automobile crash, bang! You see? And the amount of pressure is merely the foot-pounds in the thing. And it's quite a mechanical thing. People who are having trouble bodywise are

escaping from an imagined pressure in that area of their body and they withdraw from that area. They say, "I can't stand that much impact. I can't stand that much pressure."

And an interesting field of research which is going on right now is the way north. And that is the research that's going on. I'm reporting to you on a fait accompli. I'm telling you, of all things, that I audit differently than I used to – that's quite an announcement all by itself – and more successfully, which is a confession, a confession that I couldn't have been auditing perfectly. I didn't know it. I thought I was auditing perfectly. I thought I was perfect, didn't you?

But this way north, the direction out, would lie along some facet of havingness. And the one which is being explored at this moment is pressure. Trying to get somebody after he's leveled out and he's under good subjective control – you know exactly what he's doing, he's got his mock-ups in good shape and so forth-mocking up pressures which do not depend upon the physical universe. That is one method of going out.

Now, a person becomes so dependent upon the physical universe to give him these pressures that he has a tendency to hang around and get stuck in various parts of the physical universe, you see?

So the area of auditing which is experimental today is, how do you get a thetan to overcome his fear of; his back up from, his need for and all the other things of pressures? Now, that is the primary field up.

Now, by that we then hope to get a thetan to be willing to experience or let other things experience a very high level of impact. You know, a high enough level of impact so that an individual would have no dependency. He would think of two cars coming together as being a rather uninteresting brush on a powder puff with a feather. Two cars traveling 120 each hit head-on: that's a brush with a feather on a powder puff. You got it? This is changing somebody's reality on this.

As far as I can tell at this moment this is the – many contributing factors – but this is the sole central factor of a trap. An individual cannot tolerate the pressure which he imagines to be outside the trap or which would be experienced if he tried to get out of the trap, see? A fellow stays in a jail simply because he can't tolerate the idea of ramming his body through the jail bars or wall, see. That would be too much pressure. See that? That's the only thing that would keep anybody in jail. The only thing that would keep a thetan trapped is this condensation-by-pressure mechanism, as far as I can tell.

All right. Now, that is apparently a major factor on the way north. And I'm not reporting to you on this anything except that it's just very experimental.

Now, would this reach all the way south?

Well, an acceptable pressure will reach pretty far south. But let me assure you, you have to be able to control to a marked degree people's thinkingness before you can run a thinkingness process on them. And the trouble with most people that are having a hard time is that their thinkingness is out of their control and everybody else's. You see? So this is not

really a far-south process at all. It just appears to be. And all these thinkingness processes don't go far south.

Just because you could run acceptable pressure and just because I could run acceptable pressures on you and you could get results from this is no reason that the process would work at all on the average Homo Sap. Your expectancy on it shouldn't be that good. It's evidently something that would come after you had pretty well flattened something like CCH.

So we're up to the level of Homo Novis. And we're about to take off into the thetasphere. And this is possibly the most data – just theoretical data and discussion – which I care to give you at this congress. And I hope it's been acceptable to you.

Thank you.

[End of lecture]