

5405C05

Number 30 of „*Universes and the War between Theta and Mest*“ cassettes

EFFICIENCY OF PROCESSES

A lecture given on 5 May 1954

This is May the 5th.

I have a fast rundown here on the processes which you will find the most efficacious as of this time. I'll just give you a very quick resume of these processes.

First, in its most applicable form, Scientology directs the attention of the preclear to bring the preclear into an ability to direct his attention. The auditor directs the attention of the preclear so that the preclear can then inherit sooner or later the ability to direct his attention. If you wanted to make a clean statement of what auditing did, well, that's what it does.

Now, let's say that your preclear has his attention stuck on a particular point - naturally an auditor would use processes which would either get the preclear's attention off of that point or subject and onto something else, or he would simply free up attention in general. So he has two choices: He can be very specific or he can just free up general attention.

One of the best methods of freeing up general attention is simply to increase the preclear's tolerance of viewpoint. Every time you increase the preclear's tolerance of viewpoint you, of course, increase his ability to command and control his attention.

There is a subject known as attention span, and this whole subject could very well be studied now. What is a person's attention span? In other words, how long can he look at something without being drawn into it or repelled from it. That would tell you how well he could control energy masses.

Attention span would be the ability, then, to control energy masses and would deteriorate as, and in the ratio that, a person became unable to control masses. And when I say masses, I could say fluid energies or objects.

Attention span or concentration develops two things, two categories. One is, of course, self-determined and the other is other-determined. An individual goes over the first hump of deterioration when he passes from self-determined control of his own attention to other-determined control of his own attention. And having passed that point, he will then invert several times. That is to say, he'll come back into a possession of some control of his own attention and then he will slop off into other control of his attention and back and forth, until actually everything demands that he fix his attention upon it. This condition is manifest in a preclear when the preclear, for instance, looks at an object and the object seems to come close to him. The object is compelling his attention. Now, compulsion of attention results in a shortening of distance. And you want to know what is this thing, contraction of space. Contraction of space, then, is only a manifestation of this compulsive attention. And again we get back to an optimum state of controlled attention. An individual can control his attention.

Now, an individual who is sitting there waiting for an effect - which is a chronic state with preclears that you're having trouble with - who are sitting there waiting for an effect, are simply waiting for something else to shift their attention. You see this clearly - something else to shift their attention. They are very dependent upon other-determinism changing their direction or intensity of attention.

And this is, in the final analysis, the really entire mechanic of auditing. You want to make a very simple statement that you can then use many times, that would be it.

Now, what if we just took this as a definition process? We could do something like this: We could tell the preclear to put his attention on the bulletin board, now take it off the bulletin board and put it on the wall, and take his attention off the wall and put it on the ceiling, and take it off the ceiling and put it on the nothingness in the center of the room, and then put it on the floor, and then put it on the back of his head, and you're liable to find him exteriorized right there.

An individual, when he first begins to handle attention, finds it to be possessed of tonnage - it's heavy. That is the introduction of gravity into the masses he's handling. Gravity or heaviness or co-attractiveness of masses - gravity, you know, is just the co-attraction of masses - is a consideration. And an individual considers that something is very heavy or massive or gravitic and thereafter is affected by gravity.

You can almost effect on automatic - that is to say, an uncontrolled levitation on the part of the preclear by simply stripping out all consideration of mass, which we know as gravity. Gravity is consideration of the attraction of masses. And if we stripped all that out of the case, why, you could fully expect something weird to happen with regard to his body. He would at least feel that it was going to float right straight out of the chair.

And people who can handle their bodies and levitate and pull them into centers of the room off the floor with no further support or anything like that, people who can do that simply have either resolved the problem of gravity - the co-attraction of masses - or they haven't resolved this problem.

Well, of course, co-attraction of masses gets us immediately back to a consideration of attention. An individual wants his attention to be compelling and wants his attention to be compelled. And the harder he wants it to be compelling and the more he wants it to be compelled, the more gravity will occur in the case.

Now, this is actually measurable upon a scale. You can change the consideration of gravity in the preclear and change the weight he has on a Toledo scale. I mean, we're going at highly measurable commodities here. We don't have to guess about these things. We process out the gravity from the preclear and we find out the preclear's lighter. We put some gravity and consideration into him and we find out he's heavier. It's almost that simple.

Now, individuals who are customarily engaged in sports or work in the control of heavy masses will naturally concentrate a great deal upon weights and the controls of masses. And so they will become after a while themselves rather heavy or massive.

Now, this is not particularly bad, you understand, or good, or one thing or the other. The only thing that would be bad or good about it was whether the individual knew he was controlling weights. See, he knew there was weight there to be controlled and he was handling it.

This might seem to you to be too great a simplicity. But let's take the question of a machinist who is concentrating continually upon an enormous lathe. And yet his concentration is not upon the mass of this lathe at all. He doesn't ever consider the mass of the lathe; he only considers his product - the intricacies of this thing he is machining. He's thinking of the planning on this.

And one day you pick him up and, oh, is he having trouble. He's having trouble with havingness. Well, he was standing there actually paying attention to and forcefully ignoring a several-ton mass in front of him, and it eventually showed up in his case very compulsively. Because it was demanding his attention and he wasn't giving it. And as a net result, his concentration of attention being denied, he would have the tendency to look at life as though he were a lathe. What would happen here? In view of the fact that we had pressure (gravity, you might say) from the lathe to him and no consideration as far as he was concerned of gravity from himself to the lathe - in other words, he didn't take this into his computation at all we could expect him then to align with the highest pressure flow: reverse valences.

And this is the basic mechanism of the winning valence. It's a matter of masses. First a matter, of course, of consideration, and then a matter of masses.

So we find machinists going around looking like their machines, acting like their machines. We find railroad engineers, for instance, looking and acting like their locomotives. We find writers looking and acting like their type-writers, and we discover ma-

chine gunners, of course, being either the machine gun or what - the mass of the enemy. What is the biggest mass here?

And a person will eventually, by denying something attention, create a vacuum for attention and sort of pop into it.

Well, all these things are basically considerations, and nothing is more easily demonstrated than this. If you can, by changing a person's mind, change his weight, and if you could measure this directly, I think you would consider that you had solved the problem of which was senior, the postulate or the physical universe. I think you wouldn't have any more difficulty with that problem, you see.

Ideas are senior to masses. And so it is in every case.

Well, an individual's consideration, then, is what the auditor is trying to change. And if an individual considers that he must keep his attention fixed upon something, why, of course he will continue to fix his attention on something, no matter how much you handle the mass on which his attention is fixed.

How could you do this? Let's say this individual had put his attention consistently and continually upon a high mountain, and had put it on this high mountain to a point where he considered that a mountain of that character demanded of him this many ergs, you might say, of attention flow. How many ergs of attention flow are required to concentrate on one mountain?

Now, if you were to gradually get him to associate any rock with this mountain, eventually he would give any rock as much attention flow as he'd give to the mountain. And then if you got him to closely associate or identify a grain of sand with any rock, you would eventually have him giving every grain of sand the same attention which he gave to this enormous mountain.

And so, an individual who is rather bad off has a tendency to regard every grain of sand as a mountain in terms of mass. Now, I don't mean that as a philosophic quip. I mean, literally, actually measurable with springs and balances. An individual who is bad off considers every grain of sand to have the mass of a mountain. It has the weight of a mountain and therefore demands and requires the enormous concentration that would ordinarily be given only to a mountain. And his thought pattern behaves this way. And you see, a secondary manifestation of this is anything that happens in his life demands an enormous amount of attention. The various races have various clichés to characterize this. The American says the „*mountain out of a molehill*“ and so forth.

These clichés could be summed up to be „*He makes mountains out of grains of sand.*“ And the worries in his life will be such that should somebody come along and point out to him that the postage stamp was upside down on a letter he was about to mail, his inability to remove the postage stamp and right it, making it right side up, would amount to so much attention that it would probably persist for several hours afterwards - certainly several minutes.

The individual's persistence upon any given subject on a self-determined basis would be his level of ability. In other words, the persistence, the self-determined persistence on any subject would have a tendency to measure his ability, you see? Consistency, persistency - as long as that's self-determined, it measures his ability. But now, other-determined persistence on any subject would measure his disability - other-determined persistence. And the degree that that persistence continues is a measure of how much this individual is going to (quote) „*worry, be afraid, be upset*,“ hit the top of the curve and not be able to get off of it (you know, that „*survive*“ point), to get into traps and not be able to get out of them. All of this is an other-determined persistence - other-determined persistence.

Persistence - there's nothing wrong with persistence. Persistence is a very good thing, as long as it's in a self-determined category. When it's in a continuously other-determined category, persistence winds up into what you find as aberration. Other-determined persistence - aberration, are interchangeable phrases. You could interchange the word aberration with other determined persistence.

Now, what do you mean by other-determined persistence? That would mean that the individual persists only so long as another determinism demands that he persists. And so we get, as an example, the condition of the worker who continually needs supervision; he cannot work on his own supervision. As long as he is being hounded by a foreman, he will continue to shovel. And the moment the foreman disappears, he no longer shovels.

Now, let's look at this as a problem in an other-determinism. You see that. He's being run by an exterior determinism. In other words, all the persistence in his life derives and stems from another determinism or other determinisms rather than his own. You start auditing this person and this person will bird-dog, watch, fixate upon energy masses in his vicinity and wait for them to tell him when to stop persisting.

And so you get an individual's fixation upon erasure, or wipe it out, or run the concept out, or strip it down, or reduce it in some fashion or another; because he has to keep his attention upon the energy mass as long as the energy mass keeps its attention upon him. So the only thing we could do, naturally, would be to run the energy mass out, down, wipe it out, so that it could no longer have a compulsion on the individual.

This is not what is wrong with the individual, that he has energy masses which compel him. That is not what is wrong with an individual. That an individual has energy masses which compel him is not what is wrong with the individual. I make this very, very clear. It's the individual's consideration that energy masses can compel him that is wrong with the individual.

You see, if the first were what was wrong with an individual, in order to be Clear or be able, a person would have to abstain from every possible kind of energy mass. Therefore, he could not maintain his stability.

The person who interiorizes after having been exteriorized has been audited in the direction that those energy masses which are compelling him at the moment have been desensitized, and as long as they remain desensitized and no new energy masses

show up, the individual remains exterior. The moment new energy masses show up, he's going to reinteriorize, because the auditing gave its total attention on desensitizing the energy masses themselves.

As long as it was concentrated upon that, you had an instability enter into a case. The auditing should have been and should be directed toward changing the consideration of an individual on the subject of attention, gravity, masses, energy, objects, forms, ideas. Changing his mind, changing his consideration, altering his consideration, is a goal - the alteration of consideration is a goal which the auditor can well undertake and well accomplish using modern processes.

The alteration of an energy mass is something that no auditor is ever going to accomplish, not until the end of time. An auditor is not going to be able to take one human being and so desensitize every energy mass with which this individual will be in conversance that the individual can then be free.

This has a parallel in the business of living. It is all very well for you to take a stockade of prisoners who have long been in a prison and simply remove the prison fence - that's all very well for you to do that. But do you know what the prisoners will do? Their consideration is that they are prisoners, that they are imprisoned. They will build themselves a new prison fence.

You can put that to test if you want to. You can go out here and demonstrate to people that certain practices they have are very unhealthy for them and unhealthy for the society and that the greater, higher level of freedom is only attained by the destruction of some of those barriers which resist them in the progress of living. And you yourself; like Hercules, could destroy those barriers. And then if you went away and had a nice quiet sleep on a mountaintop someplace for a year or two and then returned, you would find that these people had carefully built back barriers and resistances for themselves to use as a pen.

There is the heartbreak of an auditor, and the only place where he can experience heartbreak, is that those barriers which he has stripped away have been substituted for anew by the preclear. Psychology and psychotherapy of the nineteenth century recognized this and called it sublimation. But they didn't recognize this intelligently, they merely recognized it to this degree: *„Any time we try...”* (of course, they were all in apathy) *„Any time we ever try to make anybody well, why, he just finds something else to be sick about. And there's no reason to make anybody well, then, because he'll just find something else. And let's all give up, let's die, let's die, let's die.”* Which was the highest tone ever attained by that particular science. Anyway... *„I hope some day that we will get powerful enough to die”* - that was its tone.

Well, if this was the case, then what were these people doing? They were actually taking upon their own shoulders the removal of certain barriers from the patient. The practitioner was the one who was getting in there like Hercules and hewing away with an ax to remove certain barriers. And of course, having removed these barriers, having taken away these energy masses, having desensitized these energy masses, he would only discover, to his sorrow, that the individual had simply erected new masses, new resistances.

He cures somebody of a dermatitis and finds out now that the fellow has developed a severe earache. And having cured him of an earache, he finds out that the individual has now come out with an enormous rash of ingrowing toenails. But there's... this gets to a point where the practitioner who does not understand the principles I'm telling you about - it gets to a point where he believes... he'll believe firmly that there is no freeing of a human being. He'll believe this firmly. He'll go around saying, „*Well, he just wants to be sick, and there's nothing you can do for him,*“ so forth. Anything you do for a human being which is effective, consists of altering the human being's consideration of spaces, masses, ideas, forms, perceptions, colors. You alter his consideration and you have altered the human being.

Now, sometimes he is so overpowered by masses with which he is surrounded that the reduction of the charge in these masses can be undertaken with some profit. An individual who is suffering enormously from a migraine headache is not easy to audit. So we might - just to get him into a position where he could be audited - we might address the migraine headache as an energy mass which is exerting a compulsive influence, a compulsive attention upon the preclear. It's an unwanted attention of some sort or another. It is a mass which is exerting an attention upon the preclear. And we would then use some process to alter this energy mass so that it would no longer be able to do this. There would be many ways you'd do that: you could simply duplicate it enough times or put the pain in the walls enough times or give it enough new headaches - you know, remedy its havingness of headaches - until the attention of it was gone.

You could do this rather easily. It would, by the way, probably stay away. But now do not expect your preclear to remain in a state of beingness which can do without headaches. He can't do without headaches. What you did was just, with malice aforethought, threw away the headaches. You didn't make him able to handle headaches, particularly, and you didn't alter his consideration about headaches. You did something else: you handled the headache. Of course, he was doing it and he was putting that sort of thing up, but he didn't know what he was doing. He wouldn't be able to do it again on a bet.

If he came around and told you what you had done to him a few weeks later, it would be the most altered picture you ever wanted to observe. Well, here is your miracle level of treatment - when it is done rapidly. The auditor has altered a mass. However he did it, we don't care - maybe he did it by putting his own mock-ups into the person's leg (you know, you can do that, too). It doesn't matter how he did it, he accomplished a change in the physical characteristics of the individual.

Now, get this: He didn't accomplish a change in the mental characteristics of the individual, save to the degree that he impressed the individual that he'd been an effect.

This individual might have felt much happier. You see, you'd change the mind of a prisoner that you rushed up to with a reprieve while he was just walking onto the execution platform - you'd sure change his mind and his outlook and existence, you see? However, you wouldn't change any of his basic problems as his consideration for existence. That's why people who reprieve criminals are very often quite upset later on

to find the criminals murdering somebody else, you know, and then getting reprieved again and then they murder somebody else and get reprieved again. This would be the lot of a member of a parole board who had no command of the science of Scientology: He would find himself releasing onto the world... being merciful and releasing onto the world these criminals continually, one after the other, and then finding them right back in prison again. And he spends his time and mercy in releasing them and they spend all their time in trying to get back into prison again.

And he finally says, „*Rrrrr!*“ He becomes upset about this and he doesn't want to parole anybody else. And parole systems start to go to pieces and nonsense enters into a field into which it's impossible to enter further nonsense than currently exists, which is penal systems.

Therefore, the address to the physical self of the preclear will always find the auditor in a position of having altered consideration of masses toward the preclear, rather than in the desirable position of having altered the preclear's consideration toward masses. So a physical address to the preclear, whether with auditing, medicine or any other field, will result in a very minor alteration in the ability, concentration span and other factors of the preclear, or of the patient.

The only gains made by an auditor, a practitioner or anyone else come about when the basic consideration of the being toward masses, spaces, ideas, forms - when that basic consideration is itself altered. If you don't change his mind, you don't change the case.

Now, this gets down into great complexities; gets into the complexities of masses and co-attractions of masses. But it doesn't become more untrue simply because it becomes more complex that a preclear who does not have his mind changed - his attitude, his consideration changed - is not himself changed even vaguely. He's not changed.

Therefore, if the preclear expects you as an auditor to do everything for the preclear, your basic job is to get the preclear to do something for himself and make him change his mind about being able to do something for himself. And he will gradually shake out of his consideration of masses. His attention span and his ability will go up and he will be able to perform without direction those things which he can perform early in auditing only with direction.

Okay. Give you a resume' now of the effective processes. An individual who does not tolerate various viewpoints has abandoned his ability to handle his attention in connection with those subjects. You see, if an individual can't tolerate certain viewpoints, then he has abandoned his right to handle attention with regard to these subjects. You see that? He has moved out of a lot of spaces, in other words. He has moved away from a lot of spaces and he has reduced his attention enormously.

Therefore, that auditing which expands the space of a preclear, is one way to put it, of course is very good. That auditing which increases his ability to handle masses is very good. But above these things, that auditing which immediately addresses the idea of tolerating viewpoints becomes itself optimum auditing.

If you would have your preclear come on up the line rapidly and readily, he would come on up the line simply on the basis of tolerating more and more viewpoints, being able to like more and more people, being more willing to be other people. And the more willing he is to be other people, the less he has to be them.

You'll very often find an individual compelled to be Father. He doesn't want to be Father, that's why he's being Father. And so he is less and less compelled to be Father as he is more and more able to tolerate viewpoints of Father.

So, we have this first and foremost process in Scientology is change the fellow's mind. First thing you've got to change his mind about quite often is change his mind about his ability to change his mind. And the entire consideration here is whether or not an individual can change his mind.

Now, he may be so anxious to change the mind of something else that we have an immediate consideration with the preclear - he may be so anxious to change the attention or mind of something else and he's still carrying a picture of it - that he doesn't change his own mind; he merely concentrates on some tertiary, third-echelon object.

Now, you're an auditor - and I'll call this to your attention again - you're an auditor and you're sitting there auditing a preclear. Well, you want to make darn sure that you're auditing a preclear before you go very far with this case. Are you auditing a preclear or are you auditing somebody who is auditing something else?

Now, that's something that you would only consult, really, if your case wasn't showing rapid progress. Case wasn't showing rapid progress, why, you would just say, „*Well, I'm not auditing this guy; I'm auditing somebody who is auditing something*“

So, no matter what process you used of these various processes we have today - no matter which of these processes you use - let's get into the thought pattern that none of these processes will work on the preclear if you're not auditing him. That sounds like one of these horrible simplicities, but nothing is going to work on a preclear you're not auditing. And if you're auditing the preclear who is auditing something else, like an energy ridge or something out in front of him or back of him, or if he's auditing his stomach... You're auditing the preclear and the preclear is auditing his stomach. You say to him, „*Be three feet back of your head,*“ and he mutters to his stomach, „*Be three feet back of your head,*“ and then wonders why his stomach isn't three feet back of the body or something. I mean, it's quite dim to him; he doesn't even readily recognize what he's doing. But you as an auditor had better recognize it, because a case will hang fire for a long time this way.

So let's find out if we're auditing the preclear rather than auditing somebody who is auditing something else.

How do we resolve this if we suddenly discover that we are auditing a preclear who is auditing something else? Well, we'd discover it first and foremost by the failure of processes. That's the first way we'd discover it. We'd give him a few processes and we got no real communication change or anything of the sort, well, don't find fault with yourself or the way you're holding your little finger of your right hand as you give the commands. It isn't your form that is at fault; it is not the process which is at fault. The

only thing which would be at fault there is you did not observe it more readily, that you were auditing somebody who was auditing something else. The remedy for it is quite simple: even if only in terms of concepts, even if only giving him the idea - you know, he maybe couldn't get a mock-up or anything like this - but preferably with mock-up and Creative Processing, you simply have him audit whatever he appears to be auditing. And you have him give it, if possible, Opening Procedure. If he can make it do Opening Procedure this is magnificent, this is wonderful.

So the first thing you would do when you discovered that your processes weren't working readily upon some preclear would be to discover what the devil he was auditing. And you would simply assume that he was auditing something, and you would... your discovery of it would merely be the discovery that he was doing this; you wouldn't have to know what part of the body he was auditing or what he was auditing or what shadow or chimera in his past he was trying to drill through this and that. You wouldn't have to know these things. You just have him get the idea of auditing something and, if possible, get a mock-up of something like his body or something and audit it. You audit him and make him audit it.

Now, you're just keying out an auditing machine, that's all you're doing. This comes under the heading of machine processing. When we speak of machines, we really mean machines. Preclears have them around tucked away in the oddest places. They look like Linotype typewriters and so forth. Quite interesting bric-a-brac, but just bric-a-brac - look like radio sets and all sorts of things. And he's just rigged up a flock of postulates, you see, in order to do something automatically for him. Well, he's got an auditing machine there and what you do is key that out. Just key it out - bing.

How do you key out any machine you find your preclear has got? By the way, never go in for just knocking out machinery. I mean, it's too limited a process. It'd be a better process to make a preclear tolerate machinery - tolerate the viewpoint of machinery, tolerate the effort of machinery, its noise, its clatter, its this and that. If you just said, „*What machines could you look at?*“ you'd get further, by the way - except in this little special case of what's he auditing - you'd get further by simply saying, „*Well, now just name some machines you wouldn't mind looking at.*“ If you just did that as a process, you would do more for machine processing than is generally done.

But there is a rule of thumb about all automaticities - a rule of thumb: You key it out by getting the preclear to do what the automatic object is doing. Any automaticity will key out by introducing into its functions the self-determinism of the individual, in other words.

Any case will clear up if you introduce into the case the self-determinism of the individual. And don't think that's any less in any part of the case. Any machine he has will key out by introducing his self-determinism into that machine. In other words, you've made him tolerate - and let's get it on the basis of tolerance - you've made him tolerate the operation of a gimmick known as a self-auditor. See? He wouldn't mind a self-auditor. Up to this time, he's saying, „*To hell with these self-auditors,*“ you know, he's kind of resisting it and going on auditing something that he doesn't know he's doing. He's

running on some kind of an automaticity. Well, if you'll just ask him to audit whatever this was, he would take over the function of the machine.

The rule of thumb is: To key out any automaticity, render it null and void, it is only necessary to have the preclear take over and perform the function of the automaticity itself. That's all you need to do. This gives him a tolerance of the action of the automaticity, and as such the automaticity will blow out. So, you make him audit something. You make him do exactly what he's doing. And that's a very good rule in all auditing. If all else forsakes you, you make the preclear do exactly what he's doing, and you have entered self-determinism into the action and performance of his conduct or his thinking. And just by entering that self-determinism into it, you will key out the worst part of it. He will change his mind about it.

Let's say your preclear was rolling all over the floor and you couldn't seem to get him to do anything but roll all over the floor. Well then, by golly, you'd better have him roll all over the floor. And all of a sudden, he'll stop rolling all over the floor.

A person is only ravingly insane because they so thoroughly object to being ravingly insane. If you had them dramatize being ravingly insane, they would get sane, because you've entered self-determinism into an automaticity in which they've been in conflict. Now, let's get the biggest booby trap right here that was planted in this society: If you start doing something, you're liable to keep on doing it. That's the booby trap.

„Don't pretend that you're sick; you're liable to get sick.“ *„Don't pretend that you're crazy; you're liable to be crazy.“* That's what this society tells you and, possibly, that's what your mother told you, and that's what a lot of people told you.

„If you start to do something you're liable to keep right on doing it. Anything you start to do will eventually go out of control.“ This is not true. So far from truth is it that it is a direct barricade across a road to freedom.

So an individual goes and does something. Well, if he does this thing, he will only suffer repercussions from it if he suddenly says, *„That's bad. I'm not going to do it anymore. I'm not going to have anything to do with that. I'm going to fight it.“* Zzzzzz, there he goes.

But of course, a society couldn't function at all unless it was capable of imposing irrational conduct such as *„Be good“* on all of its citizens. Being good is probably irrational conduct, particularly if we look around and find out who's defining *„good“* in this society.

Now, where we have any automaticity carrying forward it is only necessary, to deintensify it, to introduce self-determinism into it. In other words, the second we find the preclear's got a certain kind of machine, now let's have him do the operation of the machine.

If he has a machine, let's say, that makes his right ear twitch, let's make him make his right ear twitch. And let's make him twitch at a different rate than the ear is twitching finally, and then let's just make him make the ear twitch, and the ear doesn't twitch anymore. He's cut out that automaticity.

Now, don't ever let me find any auditor present who finds himself incapable in the face of some automatic tick or hiccups or obsessive thinking or conduct - if you know that law, don't ever let me find you unable in that direction. Because that is too easy to do.

An individual thinks all the time about his past. The immediate answer to you as an auditor to get over a compulsion or an obsession which is this marked, in order to get the case on the line and get the fellow up the line - your immediate answer, you have nothing else to do, you have an immediate choice. And of all the choices there are, you've certainly got this one. You could do lots of things, but all you have to do is make this individual think obsessively about his past. And you only have to do it maybe for a couple, three minutes, and this obsession which has been ruining him for two decades is gone.

The only reason he is thinking obsessively about his past is because it's an other-determinism thinking about his past. And as long as that thinkingness is other-determined, he will continue to think about his past because he doesn't take control of the thinkingness about his past; all he does is sit there and worry about the fact that he's thinking about his past.

So, you'd have him worry about thinking about his past or just have him think about his past. *„All right, now, let's think about your past. Now, let's think about 1935. Now, let's think about 1986. Now, let's think about 1937. Now, let's think about being murdered, butchered, raped, burned, divorced or insulted.“*

And, *„Yes, yes, oh-oh, yes, yes... Well, what the heck am I doing this for?“* is his reaction. You get a quick blowup of these things.

Now, some little time ago I got a letter saying that so-and-so had just been down to see an auditor who sure should have known better - he hadn't picked that up, that's why I'm stressing it for this Unit - had been down to see this auditor to remove a tick of one eye.

And I was interested enough to correspond back and discover what the auditor had done for this tick. Well, he hadn't done anything for this tick one way or the other. And so I asked the auditor what he'd done for the tick. I was incredulous this whole time, you see, because this auditor had been trained in automaticity and randomness and so forth; he'd been trained in this, if he was ever trained in anything. And it never occurred to him to make the person have his eye tick.

Now you can be as incredulous as I am. This person had been trained in this and he's being asked to cure an eye tick and it never occurs to him at any time to make the fellow introduce self-determinism into ticking eyes. You'd say, *„The guy's hopeless.“* No, he wasn't hopeless. He has got to come back here for a couple of weeks. Now, here's the problem in any case, is that what the case is doing isn't being done self-determinedly so the case is worried about it. The case is basically worried about not being self-determined.

Now, what's this got to do with processes? I told you I was going to tell you about processes, didn't I? Well, I'm afraid I've just told you about processes. And if you only

knew that about human behavior, that an individual compulsively or obsessively did things only because they were continuing to fight and deny self-determinism (or take responsibility for) these compulsions and obsessions - why, if you knew that and if you knew that all you had to do to get them over such a thing is make them be that compulsive and obsessive about the thing on a self-determined basis, there it goes. And we've got tolerance of viewpoints, tolerance of action. The second we've introduced tolerance of viewpoint, tolerance of action into the thing, boom, it's gone. Can you see that clearly?

All right. Now, the one thing the individual doesn't want to do above all other things, then, is assume various view and action points. You're getting his expressed manifestation; if you observe that an individual only fights those things which he isn't doing self-determinedly, then he must be abandoning a flock of viewpoints, mustn't he? Huh?

Well, let's make him reassume viewpoints. And let's make him reassume viewpoints - or just assume viewpoints, rather than reassume them; reassume them and assume them - in the mildest possible way, upsetting his own self-determinism the least, and we'll win.

That's actually all there is to auditing. You'll find somebody auditing himself. When you start to audit him, you're auditing somebody who goes on auditing himself. Well, let's introduce some self-determinism into it, that's all. Let's have him simply, overtly take over the auditing of some part of him or some idea or something of the sort. Let's make him do it. Let's make him audit something. Put it through Opening Procedure or something. And you'll find out in a very short space of time the individual feels much better about it.

If it takes him a long time to do this, well, that's just an index of the fact he's having an awful time with his case, that's all.

Now, supposing we found the individual totally incapable of disobeying orders. I mean, pardon me, totally incapable of obeying orders - that's the first thing you have to get, you know, before you can get him to disobey orders with a free heart. An individual has to learn how to obey orders before he can learn how to disobey orders.

It's necessary for him to learn how to disobey orders because all through life, the world is telling him, „*Be dead, be dead, be dead*“ - he'd better learn how to disobey orders. That's an order, isn't it?

Mothers, fathers, teachers, police: they're saying, „*Stop motion, quieter, slower. Stop motion, quieter, slower.*“ In other words, „*Be dead, be dead, be dead.*“

All right. So he'd better learn how to disobey orders. Well, the first step toward learning how to disobey orders is obey orders. Why? Because he's negating against obeying orders, so you better make him obey orders. This takes over the self-determinism, you see, of obeying orders. That's all. Makes obedience of orders a self-determined function. That's why you make him obey orders.

All right. And when you're in the process of trying to get him to be a little more self-determined and obey your orders, you know that's more self-determined than he is ordinarily. Obeying your order is more self-determined than he routinely, usually is. You know, that's upscale, see?

All right. And we find this individual is incapable of obeying any of your orders. You know, you tell him to go to the right and he goes to the left. And you tell him to touch his foot and he sort of tries to touch his head first and so forth. Well, you're on the second inversion, aren't you? Well, it's very simple - with the normal... with the usual run of preclear, you have to make him obey orders so that then you can make him disobey orders; in this case you have to make him disobey orders so that you can bring him around to obeying orders. He's on a second inversion; he's just plowed down that deep.

What do you have him do? Then you just have him self-determinedly receive an order and do something else. You say, *„All right. Now, every time when I tell you to go to the right and so forth, why, you receive that as a command and then change your mind and decide to go to the left. And when I say, 'Raise your hand up,' then you change your mind and put your hand down.“*

See? And we just do this as a routine fashion. We self-determinedly have him arrange the command. When he was doing it automatically before, there was some little gimmick in there that was a machine that made it danger... You see, actually direction reversal comes about solely from the formulas of communication itself: An individual is faced by people who are talking to him. Eventually, if he's overcome by people talking to him, he will eventually get a direction reversal. This is rather simple: The person will be on him backwards, in other words.

Well, we've got a machine of this character, and we say... when we say... You found out, by the way, when you said, *„All right. Now run a concept,“* or do this or think that or something or other, well, he did something else, you know. He wasn't obeying the order. We've got him on the disobedience echelon, so let's make him consciously, self-determinedly disobey orders. And then he'll come up to a point where he'll obey orders.

And after he's been audited for a while - obeying orders, obeying orders, obeying orders - he's self-determinedly obeyed enough proper orders to a point where he is perfectly free to disobey orders without any rancor whatsoever, and that moment he's well.

He can look an order right straight in the teeth and do something else, you know, with a perfect happiness about the whole thing. No compulsion or obsession about feeling guilty, or well, he should have done it, or anything of the sort. That's about the neatest test of Clear there is.

TBD

Well, again, we have merely introduced self-determinism into the automaticities of the preclear. We have again made him capable of directing his attention, haven't we - directing and maintaining his attention. We have made it possible for him to selectively, on his own determinism, put his attention on things and take it off things. We have

changed his ability to change his mind, to an ability to change his mind. We've changed his ability to change his mind from an inability to change his mind to an ability to change his mind. And when we've done all that, why, we've done about all there is you can do, regardless of exteriorization or interiorization. All right. Therefore, your understanding of the case should be broad in the realization that the case is doing, on one inversion or another, something he doesn't want to do. He's sitting in the chair: This is obviously something he doesn't want to do.

If this case is having a terrible time - this case is in awful shape - the last thing in the world he wants to do is sit in that auditing chair. Why don't you cure him of it? Have him go to the door, come in, say, „*I want to be audited,*“ and sit down in the auditing chair. Just have him do this several times, you know? And the fellow will sit in the chair comfortably. He doesn't sit in the chair fighting you and fighting himself and so forth.

He'll think after a while, „*You know, this is kind of idiotic, the kind of games you play, your ideas and so forth.*“

I had a fellow one time, I couldn't get anyplace with him with auditing because he insulted me all the time. So, I just had him sit there and insult me and insult himself and insult the walls. I didn't have him go into apathy about this - you know, I didn't do it on the basis of punishment. Now, if you ran it too short a time, it would appear that you were doing it as a punishment mechanism, because you'll find his tone will decline at first. His tone will go down, he'll get more apathetic. And then finally he'll laugh about it. Well, make sure you carry it on through to where he's bright about it - not necessarily laughing about it, but he's perfectly relieved about it.

„*You play your game*“ and „*Those peculiar ideas of yours*“ - in other words, until he's relaxed, not just to the point where he feels he's being punished. That's the first thing he's willing to assume about you is that you're trying to punish him. Of course, with some auditors, he's probably right, but...

Now, the list of procedures which you should be very conversant with and which you should change very willingly one procedure to another, as it might appear effective are as follows: 1. SOP 8-C. 2. SOP 8-D, as itself; and SOP 8-D with an entire wheel. Very effective procedure.

Viewpoint Straightwire combined with Be, Have and Do Straightwire. Oh, you ought to know that one cold because that's a lot of process, believe me.

And you should know how to do a Grand Tour.

How to spot spots in space and remedy havingness as just a process, you know - spot a spot in space; remedy some havingness. Spot a spot in space; remedy some havingness. I don't care in what form it is, you should be able to do that just as a process.

You should be able to start, stop and change avalanches as a process. You know, run avalanches as a process.

You should be able to do Change of Space Processing, just as a process.

And oddly enough, for patchups, you'd better know Reach and Withdraw from various interested objects as a process, because it's a sure way of getting your preclear's attention off of things that you can't seem to get him off of one way or the other. For instance - Reach and Withdraw - we had a case here that kept talking about a certain auditing session that he had experienced. Actually, one of the ways to take the attention off that auditing session, we'd simply make him Reach and Withdraw from where he was toward the auditing room.

This has an application in real life, too. An individual who has a compulsion to go to a certain area: He doesn't have to go there; all he has to do is stay where he is and Reach and Withdraw for it a few times and the compulsion will vanish. What you doing there? You're just duplicating what the thetan ordinarily does, which is reach and withdraw. And you're putting it on a self-determined basis, so you take away the compulsion.

Now, additional processes you should know, just for the curiosa in it, and because you will find preclears suddenly snapping into this: Beingness Processing, just as such.

And then you ought to know the drills incident to turning on a thetan's perceptions and rehabilitating his ability to handle bodies and build universes, which we call 8-O and which has never been very thoroughly codified - because it's a very loose process, that's why it's never been codified. But you should understand that its theory is to return to the thetan all those abilities which the thetan would have as a body - give to the thetan all the abilities the body has. That's 8-O. And more. Really, you pick up more ability than the body has.

Now, that's a list of processes. Now, that isn't very much to ask an auditor to know how to use, is it?

You ought to know those processes well enough so that you don't have to look at a sheet of paper in order to audit a preclear. There's nothing caves in the confidence of a preclear like an auditor reading the process off of a piece of paper. Believe me, nothing caves a preclear in as fast.

They're very easy to memorize - very easy to memorize. They're not long or arduous. And as you use these processes, you, of course, choose amongst them and change them one process for another as told to do so by the communication lag of the preclear. Right? We use any of these processes I just mentioned - fast or slow, whichever they are - but we use one for a while and we get no communication change - the communication lag of the preclear does not get longer, it does not get shorter; the preclear's state of perception remains about the same; his attitude toward existence remains about the same - just swap to another process.

How can I tell you how to do this, beyond just, if he doesn't change and if you're not going in the direction you think you ought to be going, just shift to another of those processes which I just mentioned.

Now, I don't mean to another process of the thousands of existing processes there are. I mean just shift amongst that little group of processes I just gave you, one to an-

other. If you find that this isn't working with him or if that particular question isn't doing anything for him, know then, change.

Now, don't particularly either depend upon an E-Meter. Depend more upon your own information and knowledge of communication lag. Watch his communication lag and depend upon that rather than depending upon any other thing.

If you know these processes and you know enough to shift them when they are not doing as much change as they should be doing at the moment - you know a process could be very effective for twenty minutes and then reduce in its effectiveness for some reason or another, and the fellow's communication lag stay right there as a pretty fair lag for the next half-hour - oh, you've just wasted a half an hour of processing.

If the fellow's communication lag does not change every three minutes, change the process - or change your position in the process, rather. You see that? And if the process itself just doesn't seem to be working on this case as a whole, by golly, change the whole process to another one of the list I gave you.

And when you get an effective process, stay with it as long as you get communication changes. And if you know all this about auditing, you're a wise man.

(end of lecture)