

SIMPLICITY

A lecture given on 8 November 1956

[Start of Lecture]

Okay. We have some discussion concerning the rudiments, control and ARC.

But first, before we go into that, I have a joke on you good people. I have a joke. The entire last lecture was devoted to the fact of nonrelatedness and nonsignificance of putting it there and perceiving it. Got this now? I merely talked about there was there-ness and perception, and these were nonrelated factors. Then you could go ahead and add to them, if you wanted to, but the isness of that is the isness of that, and that is all the isness of that there is. See?

And I've had, since, a half a dozen questions which wanted to know the more-ness! So I want to tell you, first and foremost, that the relatedness, and so on, of a mock-up is zero. It is! See? And you perceive it. And if you can get a pre-clear simply to put it there and perceive it and just knock off any additives -- see, this is not particularly workable; it's just a fact -- why, if you can do this without any additives whatsoever, you got it made. Got that?

Now, the only thing that gets difficult about processing is the degree of complexity which is required. And yesterday, after the lecture and so forth, I got a considerable number of additives to this fact. Because since the lecture was about, directly, the isness of a mock-up and there are no additives -- see, it just is.

And after its isness, why, then you could put on additives and cross-relations and associations and so forth. But a mock-up simply is, and the perception of it is simply the perception of it. And that is all there is to it. Now, we add: Is it good or bad, artistic, perfect or imperfect or... You can add things, you see? „*What is the significance of what we have just done?*“ Well, the significance of what we have just done, which is the deadliest and most important significance, is that a mock-up is. You see, it just is.

It is not an illusion. One does not think he sees it. You get the idea? One does not suppose, in some peculiar way, that he is deluding himself, that it's a hallucination, that energy then isn't. You know? These are all additives. It simply is.

You look around, you see the universe. There's the universe and it is. Now, the significances of how it is and where it goes and what it does after that, that is quite interesting, that is very fascinating. But these are all significances. Basically, the universe is.

Now, the only joke I had was that obviously I didn't make my point. I didn't make my point, because my point simply was, there is the mock-up and now we have to cross-associate and add significance to have anything more than simply the isness of a mock-up.

And to get a preclar to just abruptly put a mock-up there and say that it is and that he perceives it and just get him to do that without any postulates or anything else -- you know, just no additives of any kind -- well, it'd practically be the end of his case. See that? But it, again, is too complicated. I mean, it's too complicatedly simple, you see? The joke was that I was immediately handed some additives.

All right. Now, let's look at this. Let's look at this. This is an evaluation of importance. Now, it comes under this heading: What is the most important datum about a mock-up? The mock-up! Got it? What is the most important datum about perception? Perceiving, of course! Just that.

Now actually, it is not on a logical chain. There is no logical chain connected with it. But a logical chain can be connected with it, and you can pretty this thing up in the most wild and peculiar ways that you ever wanted to see.

For instance, the most powerful motor I ever saw was a Fiat. Way back when. I don't know what year that Fiat was. There's undoubtedly people around here that are experts on this so I wouldn't -- authorities -- so I wouldn't venture. But this Fiat had been made sometime shortly after World War I -- this motor -- and it merely consisted of four huge barrels. And I don't know how they got as simple as they did, but all it was for, all it was supposed to do was supposed to take in some gasoline and explode it and turn a crankshaft. See? And there just wasn't anything beyond that. It was an internal-combustion engine that did just that.

The way it fed its gasoline in was ghastly as far as economy is concerned, but it was certainly simple. When the thing went down it pulled almost whole gasoline into the chambers from small pipes. This is a very fascinating engine. And that thing was the doggonedest, goingest engine I ever cared to look at in my life.

Some boys got some railroad rails and they put them on some axles, and they decided that wasn't heavy enough so they got a whole bunch more railroad rails and put them along there too, you see, in order to get enough ballast to hold this thing down, and put some wheels on it and mounted them.

Well, they did an interesting job of putting this thing together. They had a nice heavy chassis, and it was sitting there and everything. And it just never would do anything else but run them into any handy ditch because it went too fast, too suddenly. The gas

was fed quite directly into cylinders. The vaporization in it, I suppose, was noticeable, but you could burn almost any kind of gas in it, I suppose. It ran best on aviation gas. The oiling system on it was very, very peculiar; it had big cups, and you put oil in the cups and the cups dropped oil onto everything else. Here was simplicity. Here was simplicity. It had tremendous horsepower.

Now, an even simpler engine than that was an old Frisco Standard. They were a two-cycle engine; they ran around 1912. And you see them occasionally still in fish boats. These things have never worn out. They consist of one cylinder, one gasoline-injection device, one crankshaft, you know, one bearing, and they fire every time. You see, they come up and they go down and they fire. Not four-stroke but a two-stroke engine. Those things are powerful. They're huge. You could throw a Great Dane through one of those cylinders, you know? It's just one cylinder sitting there. But, of course, they had to have an enormous flywheel to keep that thing turning over through its dead spots and so on; and it has one. But hardly anybody can make one of those things stop. If they get started it then becomes a contest of wit to stop one because there's so little that you can regulate.

Now, compare that to a modern Alfa Romeo or something. I don't know, eight blowers on a side or... These complicated modern engines are turning up enormous horsepower for their weight; that is for sure. But you try to follow the lines and so on, that lead here and there and do this and that -- I imagine mechanics today just look at one of those things that comes in and call up the local watchmaker. It must be a very difficult job to keep one in repair and running.

I had a mediumly complicated engine, a two-and-a-half liter Jaguar, and that was a very peculiar engine. It ran beautifully, it ran splendidly, if it was set just right. Very delicate. Very high compression, so on. Just right, it just ran wonderfully if you ran it exactly at 95 degrees centigrade. I don't know what 95 degrees centigrade is. I imagine it's about 199 degrees Fahrenheit. It's up there close. If it ran too cold it didn't run. And if it ran too hot it spat out its con-rods. But if you could adjust it just right it ran wonderfully. Got the idea?

As you go into complexity -- there are many better examples than internal-combustion engines -- but as you go into complexity you do not necessarily go into workability. It's not necessarily true that as you move into simplicity you move into action either. There is a certain level of complexity demanded for any maximal efficiency.

But there is every reason to believe that this level of simplicity demanded is almost always exceeded by man. He does not try to simplify, he tries to complicate. And the action of complication follows the curve create-survive-destroy. As we look at that curve, we see from this point of „*It is*,“ you see, the isness of this mock-up and the fact of its perception -- just got that; just no more than that -- the isness of the mock-up and the fact of its perception. See, there's no additives there. We only get a curve by adding complexities. In order to make it survive now we start adding complications to this isness. In order to destroy it we usually add many, many more.

Actually the destruction of a mock-up is simply its isness and perception. It begins right where it ends. That you get in perfect duplication. You know about perfect duplication in The Creation of Human Ability: You make a perfect duplicate of anything, it'll disappear. Well, of course, what is a perfect duplicate? That is the isness of its creation. It is; we perceive it. So if we say, „*It exactly is,*“ and we exactly perceive it, it isn't. See, it already exists; we really run out what we just did and it disappears. That's a perfect duplicate.

But why doesn't the thing have persistence? That's because it hasn't got any place to „*went,*“ and because it doesn't have any future to go into; it is. Don't you see? We have to invent past and future as the first invention to get off the first point of the cycle of action. Now we start moving up into more creation and more survival and more destruction, and we do this by adding. It's an additive process.

Now evidently, destruction is a subtractive process. Everybody thinks it is. But the type of destruction which is utilized in this modern world is additive. Man, they certainly leave debris around! Now, let's take the atom bomb. You say the atom bomb is a great destructive weapon. I don't know that it is even a weapon. In fact, I doubt that it is a weapon. Not from a standpoint of its industrial use, but it just isn't a good military weapon. It is insufficiently directive. It's like using gas in a high wind which is liable to shift in any moment. It just is not a weapon. It's liable to affect your own personnel more thoroughly than the enemy personnel. You're liable to get all sorts of complications in using it as a weapon.

But we take this thing called the A-bomb or the H-bomb, fission, fusion, and we do destruction with it. And now we get additives nobody can solve. You see? We get various compounds and derivatives and et ceteras that are far more complicated than the original ingredients. It's very wonderful. I mean, how much more complicated things get the moment we explode one of these things. And yet obviously when we explode the bomb we have no bomb. See, the bomb is now gone, it's exploded. But what have we got left? Wow!

Now, man believes that when he destroys something it disappears, and therefore, he is totally uneducated -- he's at an educational level, let me say, inadequate to the handling of destruction. Because the more he destroys something the more difficult he may find the situation. As we seek to destroy things we're liable to add complications to the situation.

Now, man himself is adding these. It isn't a phenomenon of nature or something like that. Man adds these complications all by his little lonesome with no assistance whatsoever. He is on this kick of addition, additives, more of it, more complexity, to such a degree that if it didn't make complications he'd invent some for it to make.

Let's look at what happens when we attempt to destroy a person in this society. We shoot the person. Probably the randomness occasioned by this would consume several hours of the day. One would have to do many other things after he shot the person. Then ensues the Dragnet television drama of rounding up the killer, and then the comedy of a fast and speedy trial as called for in the Constitution that drags on for two or three years. And this complications, complications, complications. And even-

tually there's difficulties concerning the execution of the murderer. And not only that, but having executed one of its citizens, the government of those citizens is now in more trouble than it was before, because it's now executed somebody, which is a crime of murder, after all. There's the difficulty of the disposition of the body.

But the disposition of the engram is just left up to happenstance. In other words, one never did do anything but add, from the moment he sought to remove somebody from the environment, straight on forward. It's quite interesting that I don't think any living being or any living thing can be wiped out with total impunity. It's not possible. There are always consequences. Man would have it that way. Because he wants consequences, and he gets complexities.

Let's look it over now. He wants consequences. They are protective consequences, and so forth. He wants to be safeguarded, he wants certain things and certain parts of the game to stay in certain grooves. And so what does he do? What does he do? Right straight along the line, what does he do? Just adds complexities. More of them he gets, why, the more of them he has and the more complicated he will make those things.

You couldn't possibly come out with some little square box that you would plug into your house circuit which would give you current from there on out and sell it for a dime. You couldn't do this. This is a fantastically simple thing. It'd be some sort of a little box that was inexhaustible, and it maybe had very simple constructions, and it'd be plugged into your house circuit, and there would be juice from there on out. Now, you think that would be very nice and there wouldn't be anything to this at all. But the funny part of it is, introduction of that much simplicity brings -- in the anxiety of man to get along the cycle of action -- brings almost immediate chaos.

The more simplicity you try to introduce, the greater the chaos which is liable to ensue. It's a little law involved with it. Of course, if you did that you could look at the expanding spiral, just in the field of economics, of what would happen if everybody started to plug in one little box into the light lines which furnished him with all the light he needed from there on out. We say, „*Well, it couldn't possibly affect us because all it would affect would be the power company.*“ No, the power company has stock; the power company owns real estate; the power company owns the Federal Reserve Bank; the Federal Reserve Bank owns the government... And here we go! See? We're on some concatenative chain.

Now, the trick is, then, to achieve a simplicity which does not then fit on any logical sequence. Got that? The moment you could move off, totally off, of a logical sequence, then you could have a simplicity. And so we get the invention of death, exteriorization after, and a new life.

It's against the law practically to... In fact, you couldn't possibly sue somebody who died last year for the debt he owes you. You could sue his estate, but you couldn't sue him. Even if you isolated him. Even if you found out that this little baby now over in the Jones family was actually Bill Kraft, and he owed you 8,642 dollars and you waited for Bill (now Jones) to grow up to his majority. And even if he inherited a large amount of money in the Jones family in some fashion, and you sued him for it, every-

body would conspire to knock this thing silly. Because they have a complexity invented called continuance in death, and you are seeking to wreck a complexity by being very simple. You're saying, „*Bill Kraft is Bill Jones.*“ No, they want a complexity of identity. There must be identity changes. Do you see how this is? The society is set up, then, to follow along certain complicated lines and it tends, normally, to make them more complicated.

All right. What's this got to do with a preclear? Well, it has everything to do with a preclear. The preclear is hellbent along a curve called create-survive-destroy and if not processed off that curve or in some other direction, he will destroy himself, even with good auditing. Be alert to that. Be alert to that.

He'll follow that curve from simplicity to complexity no matter what you do. Now, he'll get a cognition, let us say. He gets a cognition, and he sails along with this cognition. Now he adds something to this cognition; he adds something else to this cognition; he adds something else to this cognition. And he's finished the auditing you've given him. He's gone his way and so on. He's had this cognition. Now he will add, add, add, add, add, add, add, add, add. If you yourself have not broken him off of this curve to some degree, if you have not reversed this direction, if you have not boosted him into some kind of a cognition that he can accept some simplicity, you simply will have aided and abetted his hellbent career along this cycle of action into a destruction of one kind or another. Do you see that?

Now, the simplicity which he can achieve then becomes our study, not the complexity. As far as ability is concerned, we do not want to know how many balls he can balance on the tip of his nose. This we do not want to know. That's a complexity, you see. We want to know if he's got a nose. See that?

Now, it actually would probably be easier to establish an ability to balance three balls on the end of his nose than (without Scientology) to establish the fact that he had a nose. See that? So it requires a simple technology -- and Scientology is basically a simple technology, in spite of the complexities which it apparently gets into sometimes -- to cut back through this morass of complexity.

Now, there are three ways to handle a black panther. Three ways: One, attack him. Two, avoid him. Three, neglect him. Three ways you can do it. Of course, avoiding him also includes running away from him. We used to erroneously call this the Black Panther Mechanism. The Black Panther Mechanism, we thought, was simply „*Neglect it,*“ and it became synonymous with „*Neglect it.*“ Actually, it all came out of this story in Book One about three ways to handle a black panther.

Now, what would happen if you neglected the complexities of a case? It's a very interesting question. You better look it over. You better look it over very well. What would happen if you just abandoned or neglected the complexities of the case?

Male voice: He'd make it more important. You'd get sidetracked.

Male voice: He'd simply persist on the create-survive-destroy.

Male voice: He's going to bring them up even sharper to get you to look at it and say, „*This is effect.*“

Female voice: I think he'd move quite -- right along quite well.

Well... Well, it's a funny thing, but it's the preclear and his body that make everything there is complex there. And there's a possibility that if you don't get him to make them, they won't ever be made.

Let's look at this very carefully. You have to process as though you were adding complexities -- do you get the lie? -- in order to add a simplicity. Now, there's a fundamental formula. That's very fundamental. That's more fundamental than any process we are using at this moment. More fundamental. In that way you achieve simplicity. That is the fundamental of modern auditing. That comes under games conditions. It satisfies all sorts of things. To state it differently, you go at it as though you're going to make it so complicated nobody can do it, you see, and just throw him the curve of simplicity continually.

How would you go about such a thing? You want him to touch a wall. That's a simple action. You're trying to get him the isness of the wall; the wall is there and he is perceiving it. You add a games condition anytime you make the preclear do it. The common denominator of a games condition is cause-distance-effect, which backs him along the create-survive-destroy curve. Now, if you can get him to do a cause-distance-effect, then you back him up toward create. See? They're parallels. They're curves, you might say. You get him to do cause-distance-effect.

Now, the rule actually is, is anything that's happening to him you get him to do. That is a general rule. And allowing for the simplicity-complexity pattern or mechanism you can then effect almost anything you want to with the preclear, allowing for his acceptance level of complexity. It's cause-distance-effect. That is what you process with the preclear sitting at cause, so on.

Two cause-distance-effects are in existence at all times. The preclear is doing a cause-distance-effect upon his environment and the bank, and the auditor is doing a cause-distance-effect upon the preclear. This is a simultaneous action. Preclear actually doesn't too well notice the auditor's cause-distance-effect. He has a tendency to ignore that as a causative thing because the interest of the auditor is in the preclear, which gives the preclear the idea of cause too, you see? But the truth of the matter is, the auditor is doing a cause-distance-effect on the preclear; the preclear is doing a cause-distance-effect on his bank and the world around him.

Then that tells you that we wouldn't have the preclear run himself as a victim unless we ran him causing himself to be the victim. You got it? So you could even run him as the victim by having him cause the victimization. But this is not a victim situation. You got it?

So the basic fundamental we use is this thing we call a games condition. We process a games condition. A games condition is no effect on the preclear, total effect on the environment. To achieve what? A total effect on the preclear.

Now, we have just stated, in a slightly more precise or mathematical way, the first thing: In order to make it simple, make it more complex. They're not parallel statements; they don't substitute one for the other. One is what you do, and the other is how you do it.

Now, look-a-here: The amount of complexity which a preclear can achieve will always exceed your imagination. That's a safe rule. It's not at all true, but it's a safe rule. Got it? Amount of complexity which he can assume -- always exceed the auditor's imagination. It's a safe rule. Because he's doing it unknowingly, he's had seventy-six trillion years to dream these things up, he's got them all in his hip pocket and Lord knows where he's been and what he's done on the track. And all of it sums up to this: How to be complicated.

Well, now, a body can't breathe unless it has lungs. Why not? Well, it can't breathe unless it has air, and the air has to go into the lungs and the air has to be distributed through the bo-- I want to know what the devil this air is doing in here. How'd the air get in here? Oh, well, you have to have air. That's so you get combustion with something or other so you'll have heat! Oh, heat now! Uh-huh. Well, all right. Well, how do you get heat? Well, the food he eats. Hey, now wait a minute; we're off on to food! You get some sort of an idea of this?

To have something fall you have to have gravity. That's an interesting thing to have. What do you have to have, to have gravity? Well, you have to have a planet, of course. You do? Well, to have a planet, you see, you've got to have space and a universe, naturally. Oh, wow! Not really! You mean a fellow just can't say „*Gravity*“ and have gravity? Yes, I'm afraid he can; he can say „*Gravity*“ and have gravity. But this exceeds his desire for complexity.

Now, what do we mean by all this complexity? We could mean just game. We could mean just game and that's all. He wants more game, more problems. And they're not good for him!

We're in the position of threatening to give the preclear all the ice cream he can possibly eat, but because it would, and we know it would make him deathly ill and knock him off ice cream forever, why, we give him the bare spoon and convince him he can create the ice cream. You got the idea? He feels better afterwards. It's quite interesting that the auditor seeks to achieve a greater simplicity by inviting the preclear to do it in a more complicated fashion.

Now, I'll give you one of the ideas of this: „*Invent a worse situation.*“ Now, this is a rather fabulous process -- just that process all by itself; „*Invent a worse situation.*“ It's a sort of a common denominator of all processes.

He said, „*Oh, I'm having a terrible lot of trouble with my girlfriend.*“

You say, „*Well, could it be any worse?*“

„*Well, I don't see how it possibly could be.*“

„*Well, you invent a worse situation.*“

And after a while he has worsened it sufficiently that he can look at it as a simplicity. It no longer is a complicated problem. Why? You satiated his appetite for complexity. Just as easily as that. „*You invent a worse situation*,“ you've said, „*than this situation you have with your girlfriend*.“

Now, a problem of incomparable magnitude is an interesting mechanism. You know that you can find a problem of comparable magnitude to every fundamental, single data in this universe by a problem of incomparable magnitude as a process. Why does that work? Well, it works very simply: He's trying to suppress the unimportance of his problem. You ask him for a problem of incomparable magnitude, and he has to think of the problem he has as far more important than it is in order to think up something far less important than the problem. You get the idea? He has to throw out his evaluation of that problem. That's what happens. So problem of comparable magnitude and problem of incomparable magnitude aren't actually comparable processes. Problem of incomparable magnitude is incomparably superior.

Now, I'll tell you one of the data ways this is used. This is actually usable in research. We ask somebody for a problem of incomparable magnitude to time. He can give us tons of them. Incomparable magnitude to time? Wow! That's easy, simple. Nothing wrong with this. Easy to run. And all of a sudden he'll come up with a problem of comparable magnitude to time. Ah, but you say at this moment that there is no such thing. Yes, there is. There are many problems of comparable magnitude to time. But you cannot get the preclear to think of them directly.

Now, that is a simple comparison; problem of comparable magnitude is a simple comparison. You ask for a non-simple comparison; you ask for incomparable magnitude. Now, boy, that takes it around about four more vias, don't you see? He has to look at time, and he has to look at something or other, and he has to compare these two. And then he has to make sure that they are not of comparable magnitude, and then he has to say they are not. And the next thing you know he achieves the simplicity of a problem of comparable magnitude to time.

Now, that's quite interesting because that is more than any philosopher has ever done in this history of this planet. It's quite a stunt. You get your sixty-nine-IQ preclear into getting problems of comparable magnitude to time; that's pretty good. You mean there are other data as important as time? Well, you devalue the importance of time as a datum and you devalue the whole causative action of time. Time ceases then to be a causative action.

Preclear is cause. Why is a preclear cause? Well, he achieved something as complex as time. He did it on a via. We don't ask him to solve time, we ask him to get a problem of incomparable magnitude to time. He finally comes up with a problem of comparable magnitude to time. We ask him still for problems of incomparable magnitude to time; he will eventually come up, on this fantastic number of vias, to a problem of comparable magnitude to time and then eventually a problem superior to time.

Now, you think at once, space being such a dominant thing in a universe of this character... You can actually get any preclear -- if he can be held into session, if he's workable at all -- to find problems of comparable magnitude to space. He actually can

find things that are of comparable importance, quite brilliantly. In other words, you're off on a track of inventing up a whole new universe. And you do that by a problem of incomparable magnitude to space. Incomparable magnitude, however stated. You could say, „*No matter what you think of time, give me a problem now which is infinitely less important than your worry about time.*“

Now, what is this? We can get him to get a problem of comparable magnitude to space. We can get him to invent. And if we can get him to invent we can get him to create. If you were to take all the stable data of Scientology, one right after the other, you would find that you could do a substitution. And it becomes a Substitution Process, which is the simplest process of all. And on a look at it, just as processes go, on a solid front of comparison, we find out that if you can just substitute -- he thinks A is important -- if we can substitute B for A with as great an importance, then B and A are first equally important and then, of course, A ceases to be as important as B. Grading and value. You want somebody to go out of this universe, zoom? He'll certainly go out.

Now, how does this effect this thing called a stable datum? Stable datum is terribly important here because you can only get him to shift his stable data by showing him that he can create data as stable. And therefore, problems of incomparable magnitude to any stable datum as listed in Scientology walks a person straight out of the universe. This is one of the more fantastic actions that can be taken. You've asked for something very much more complicated than a datum of comparable magnitude. That is a simple comparison. You ask for a problem of incomparable magnitude -- a problem not nearly as important; a problem anyway you want to state it -- and you'll get the whole substitution mechanism carrying forward neatly and smoothly. And the next thing you know, you've got it.

Now, just take time, space, energy, mass -- take the entirety of the sixth dynamic: problem of incomparable magnitude to radiation; problem of incomparable magnitude to gamma rays; problem of incomparable magnitude to the past. These are big data. These are the fixed data of the track. Now, why are they fixed data of the track? Because there's only one of them. We have a law that fits in there: A datum becomes important by its absence of a comparable datum. Got that? Fixed data. Now the fixing and unfixing of attention and data itself then compare in these two things. Right?

Now, I'm just giving you an example here of how we go about this. Let's look at this far more simply. There is a simpler process than this. That's just make the preclear do something simple, and add the complexity by threatening to kill him if he doesn't! You got it? That's not always the most therapeutic process, but it's certainly direct. We say, „*Touch that wall.*“

Now, the complexities tend to run away and so forth, because you won't let him create them; you make him neglect them. And if they are neglected then they aren't created. Actually, 8-C is apparently a much tougher process than many figure-figure processes because of its fantastic simplicity.

Now, of course, you can keep it from being too simple in the preclear's eye by permitting him to be awfully significant about it. The actual truth of the matter is you're

merely demanding that his obsessive creation of complexities cease and desist at this moment, that he walk over to the wall, that he touch the wall, that he let go of the wall, that he turn around and see another wall, that he walk over to it. You got it? Wow! You're saying, „*Cease and desist. No more complexity. No more complexity.*“ And if you run it so that he's really there and in session, and he can't wiggle sideways from you, and he can't think of anything else to amuse himself as he walks, you've had it as far as the preclear is concerned. He's going to get over it or die in the attempt!

Well, you get two breeds of cat: You cater to the mechanism of complexity with a problem of incomparable magnitude; you neglect it utterly -- just let complexity go by the boards and insist on simplicity. And there's even another way to go about it: Just keep telling the preclear not to get complicated; tell him to avoid it. In other words, you could go on with long discussions about how he wasn't to get complicated and so on. See that? He'd have to look at complexities in order not to get them. He'd have to do all sorts of interesting things.

Now, there are two techniques on Connectedness which are terribly interesting to the auditor. They're both game-condition techniques. They are apparently quite similar. One is „*Look around here and find something you wouldn't mind making connect with you.*“ This, by the way, is a fine process. It is amongst the best. Fascinating process.

There is a more complicated version which runs out his complexities. The first one merely exteriorizes him, rather directly, and makes him neglect his body and everything else. If anything, it's too direct on some cases. So you say, „*What wouldn't you mind making connect with you, on how many vias?*“ „*What wouldn't you mind making connect with you?*“ And then, „*How many vias can we get in there?*“ And you'll find out that the case runs more longly and more smoothly and runs out many more things and settles down eventually at its own speed to a direct connection. More self-determinism involved in that process. See? I don't care which one you use.

The 8-C Connectedness version is fascinating: „*Look around here, find something you wouldn't mind make connect with you.*“ Bang! See, just boom! And they go out of their heads rather easily if there's any reality on what they're doing at all. But if there is no reality on it, „*On how many vias?*“ puts the reality into the process. You downscale for complexity to get the reality. You got that as a process? Hm?

All right. Now, why have I been going into this under the terms of rudiments and auditing procedures and so on? Well, it's just because an auditing session is too damned simple for most preclears, and -- I hate to say it -- for many auditors.

The rudiments exist in this fashion: There's an auditor, there's a preclear, there's an environment. One, two, three. Those are the rudiments. But get the simplicity of their establishment, the fantastic simplicity of establishment here: You just say „*Auditor. Preclear. Environment!*“ and, of course, he's on his way. Naturally.

Except that's what's wrong with his case: There's nobody else alive in the world, he isn't in any environment and he isn't present. That's the totality of wrongnesses as far as the case is concerned, don't you see, unless you get awfully significant and very additive to it. He isn't where he is: Well, that's an error in environment. He isn't who he

is, so that's an error in personality. And the person that is with him is somebody else, if he's there at all. But this is the working atmosphere of this preclear.

Now, if all you knew about auditing was this -- establish the auditor, establish the preclear and establish the environment -- and you insisted on these three things occurring from there on out, from the beginning of the session to the end of the intensive, I am very much afraid that you would have achieved just about all the gain possible. You see the possibility of that? I just give it to you as a possibility.

So just move the auditing situation as a synthetic situation into a real situation, and you've got it made. You've got it made: He can recognize that somebody else is present; he does recognize that he is in an environment; he does know who and what he is. And, of course, you would have a Clear on your hands and that would be that. You could almost state it as a definition of. It'd be a person who knows where he is, when he is there, who he is and who he's with. That's getting awful simple though, isn't it? Hm? But your auditing situation is a synthesis of life. It's an artificial livingness. Well, how come it's artificial? Why don't you just then proceed forward and make it real? Then you would see an auditing situation in every person you contacted anywhere. It doesn't just put you on „*always audit*.“ Doesn't put you into an always audit. What other kind of a situation is there in this universe? Well, there's the fellow by himself and the environment around him, and the fellow by himself and the environment around him and other people. But is there such a situation as the fellow by himself with the environment around him? How are you going to get out of an auditing situation? Now, I'm being overly simple, I'm sure. But yet anytime you become somebody's auditor out in the society at large, boy, do you win! I mean, the situation becomes under control at once, if you really do it smoothly. It's a fantastic thing.

I even had it pulled on me once. I was arguing with a Scientologist about something or other and he all of a sudden woggle-woggled me an auditing command. He did! He threw me an auditing command. He did it by accident. I immediately became aware of this fact that this guy was not fighting with his weapons. I'm unfortunately usually without opponents -- people don't fight with me for some reason or other; doggone it. But he slid one in and I was at once aware of the fact that if he had proceeded along that line just about two more sentences, that would have been that as far as the argument was concerned. In the first place, I couldn't have kept a straight face. He was feeling a little bit desperate, and he was trying to throw himself into the situation he invariably is able to control, which is an auditing session, see? He was cutting for cover. And he was just discombobulated enough to throw out an auditing command. But it had such impact that I was fascinated with the thing.

So I watched this thing -- so I watched this thing -- and I found out that there hardly is any argument or fight involved that a couple of auditing commands thrown into wouldn't blow up. That's a fascinating thing, then. That's a fascinating thing. So you aren't just learning about auditing, you're learning about this thing called a person, another person and the environment. Right? Those are the three.

Now, it isn't always true that an individual should, at all times, be in control of his environment. That is not necessarily true at all. Do you realize, if that were true, no mo-

tion-picture image would ever unfold before you on the screen; you would simply stop the projector. See? Because you don't control that which entertains you. You have to be able to make things controlled or leave them uncontrolled at will. And the definition of good control is to control or to leave totally uncontrolled at will. That's the two sides of control. Neither one is more important than the other. They are both important.

To be able to do either of those two things at your own determinism determines the happiness and success of your own life. And that's for sure. To control or leave uncontrolled anything in your environment at will. Boy, this is really superman stuff, see? You would certainly exteriorize at will. You're busily controlling the body and all of a sudden you don't control the body. Well, you would be elsewhere if you weren't controlling the body at all. Do you see that clearly?

However, for the purposes of auditing session and getting along in a rather aberrated world, you should be able to control or leave uncontrolled the people you are with. You control them while you yourself are talking to them, and you leave them uncontrolled when they're talking. And we have it as a two-way comm, and then we have some interchange and randomness in existence, and so it becomes livable. In other words, when we're talking to them, why, we have control and when we're not talking to them they have control. And that's all. And if you're satisfied with either side of this -- how fascinating -- people never worry you anymore. That is the end of people as a concern, see? Got that?

Two-way comm consists of an ability to do this. And where people fail on two-way comm, they can't do this. See? Got it? For instance, a person almost never can speak effectively to people unless he is totally willing to leave them uncontrolled and let them speak to him. See? You see at once a little factor that interjects there: A person who is afraid of an audience cannot control one. See? That's obvious. Well, that's just low ARC, isn't it?

And we have the totality of ARC regulated by the degree that the control formula is followed. An individual who is willing to control others and willing to leave others totally uncontrolled... You understand, I didn't say, „*Be controlled by others.*“ This doesn't necessarily follow in there at all. It's still cause-cause basis; he's willing to control others or leave others totally uncontrolled, at which time, of course, he would or is liable to fall under some control of others. But if he can control others, this control then could be thrown off at will.

Now, this individual, then, experiences varying emotions in comparison with his ability to perform this. His ability to control others and to leave others totally uncontrolled -- from an auditing standpoint, of course, assumes that others will inevitably, from time to time, control him -- rather establishes the amount of ARC there is in the environment. Remember I said willingness to control.

Now, let me assure you there's practically no ARC involved in a situation where an individual is totally unwilling to control anybody around him. Funny part of it is, it may sometimes look a little bit like ARC. If you dig at it a little bit it is, however, apa-

thy. And things go apathetically in his environment. See that? ARC is monitored by control, factors of.

Now, I don't mean to tell you that control is more important than ARC. That is not what I said. I said control monitors ARC. ARC can be too, you know; you simply postulate it or carry it along at that level and it is. But with a cross-exchange we find out that control can monitor it. And you know that you're liable to have a better ARC with a positive control, even in one direction, than a no-control situation. That would be a horrible shock for somebody in churches and back in the Dear Souls Area, and all that sort of thing, to realize.

They wonder why the country went mad the other day and voted for some person that has just been doing nothing but cut comm lines for the U.S. He's having one hell of a time. Now, why did they?

I've studied this whole fact of bad government. I've made a very thorough study of bad government here in the last two years. Had ample opportunity to do so, not just on our own scene, but in many areas and scenes. (Last three years, I should say more accurately.) I've studied this historically, and I've been fascinated to discover something which is evidently an indisputable fact: What we normally would look at with a careless glance and consider a bad government inevitably lasts longer than a good one.

We could add this up, if we didn't know any Scientology, in lots of ways. We could say at once, well, people are so thirsty for overt acts that they immediately buy this, or people are so hungry to be knocked around, or they're all masochists. No, this isn't so. No, a government which will exercise positive control over a people is better than a government which will not. But when a government really does exercise control over a people, being a pretty aberrated organization, it's normally conducting its affairs, here and there and spottily, in a rather brutal way.

The government really doesn't come up very high on the Tone Scale when it begins to control people. It's too disinterested; it's too... it divides the people off into masses -- there's masses and there's us, and so forth. But those governments on Earth which have not controlled people but just hoped prosperity would happen, or something of this sort, have been brief and have ended unhappily, rather uniformly, for the last two thousand years. This is a very broad study.

Why, for instance, does the rottenest government Constantinople ever formed last fifty-three years, and then they get an heroic leader -- a good boy, nothing wrong with this fellow at all, evidently, pals with everybody -- and he lasts a year and a half? Well, this fellow might have been pals with everybody, but he did not reach out to the degree that he should have to have controlled the entire population of the area.

The government that was so lousy, was so bad, in spite of its mechanisms and so forth, still was exerting a positive control. It was enforcing its laws. Its laws were not to be sidestepped. Those laws existed. The game was there, the lines were rigid. And no matter how bad conditions apparently were or no matter what terrible consequences resulted from this control, the people wanted that before they wanted a no-control situation.

You know what I'm telling you? I'm telling you that even if you badly control a pc you will get better results than if you get some synthetic no-control ARC going and sit back and let him wander all over the place. You got it? To that degree, bad auditing is better than no auditing. Got it?

Now, your control is as good as you can actually exert -- exert it and leave uncontrolled the preclear. Your control gets better and more positive, and you become better as an auditor to the degree that you can control it and to the degree that you can abstain also from the use of force and duress. When you're really good at controlling people, you don't use any force at all. But don't ever make the mistake of looking at the lower harmonic of no-control and saying, „This is *just good ARC*,“ and think you're doing a good job. Because you're not! You're just afraid to knock his head off, that's all that's wrong. Now, you see where this stands? You see how this fits?

Therefore, the establishment of an auditor, a preclear and a session is certainly mandatory because there must be something there to do the controlling, something to be controlled and an area in which the controlling happens. So, once again, we get the establishment of the rudiments establishing, actually, the ARC of the session.

Thank you.

Thank you.

[End of Lecture]