

AUDITING REQUIREMENTS, DIFFERENCES

A lecture given on
3 January 1955

If you can move, you can audit. That's all there is to it. If you can breathe, you can audit. If you're still slightly warm, you can audit.

And as far as actual cases level is concerned, your case level will be as good as you can control, handle, regulate and pan-determine the minds you audit. And when that factor is real good you won't have any more trouble with aberration. Now, we've determined this time and time again.

There are two types of Clear. One is the fellow who is processed into Clear. Remember that man always has a god: his auditor. Here we have a case of one – well, “Bud,” anyway, is a long way from what you would consider an optimum case along case behavior. And yet Bud has pushed himself up to a point in case level by auditing an Operating Thetan that is utterly fantastic. He has an Operating Thetan case, one Dillingham, who was out in the Los Angeles Foundation real early and we sent back to Kansas City to open an office. Dillingham, back there in KC, gradually went to pot and Bud picked him up and got him outside, polished him up, put him in good condition. Dillingham is doing beautifully in the world as far as MEST and so forth is concerned, but casewise has become an Operating Thetan through the auditing.

Well, Bud – as we all might know, some of us old auditors who have audited most of the guys around – was not a black five but a black five cubed.

Well, Bud's in excellent condition. He's really in excellent condition. And this is on no-auditing; this is the auditing of Dillingham. He is doing some fabulous things with this Operating Thetan. He's picking up people around town who are spun in, sick, this, that, the other thing and they're straightening them up without these people knowing anything about it. So that Mr. Glumph will come out in the morning without his arthritis and so forth. It's real amusing. But they are having a lot of fun, a tremendous lot of fun.

And Bud said to me, he says, “You know, I can't understand this,” he said, “Here this man – here this man is right up there next door to a full Operating Thetan and I am auditing him; and I am having no slightest difficulty auditing him at all.”

Well, here you have experience, training – Bud has been, from one time and another, he's been in practically every functional position you could be in. I don't know that he's ever been in instruction, but he's been in research, investigation; he's been in processing. He's done practically every kind of an odd job you could do around the Foundation – this man has a lot

of knowledge, tremendous amount of knowledge. Now, in putting it to work he is finding, one after the other, that this knowledge is not just an analytical ball of something or other that he guessed was right; he's getting more and more and greater and greater certainty. And of all things, Bud is coming on up toward Operating Thetan and he isn't getting audited! Now, the other type of Clear, of course, would be one who audited himself up in that direction.

Now, this is no curve I'm pitching you. It doesn't mean that an auditor should have no auditing. This is not true. An auditor who has no auditing has no subjective experience on the phenomena of Dianetics and Scientology. To get that subjective experience actually requires auditing. And an auditor gets audited for the subjective experience of the phenomena involved and gets Clear by auditing.

Now, this is an entirely different thing than your preclear that somebody walks up to and says, "Be three feet back of your head. That's fine. What are you looking at? Copy it, copy it, copy it, copy it, copy it and put it all together pull it in. All right. Now, let's..." And then we go on through Route One. This is an entirely different proceeding.

All right. 'Cause that person, of course, is – gets subjective awareness entirely of all the phenomena involved. He sure gets subjective awareness of it. He gets to be real bright. He gets all over the place, and so forth.

But there is a difference of level when the final end result is in. This individual has no objective experience in the handling of Homo sapiens. That is an entire missing chapter in his career in existence. And always, to some degree, the body will continue to be – from a standpoint of somebody else's body, you see, in handling it – will always continue to be a little bit of a mystery. Because he's been created on another level.

Now, it's true that he can go around and unmock somebody's energy, disconnect their machines, do all sorts of odd things to bodies, but he's doing this all as a thetan. He feels, "Now, look, if I were really in and spun in and, you know, I was in a body and so forth, and I ran into one of these people..." He wouldn't know what to do.

Every thetan actually has an instinctive ability, you can say, to audit somebody if he's exteriorized with wonderful perception and good control of energy. There's nothing to this, you see. He can audit people while exteriorized and in this condition. But he will never know completely that he could be utterly dug in, pounded in, cemented with blacktop and still make other human beings function. And that's something he would never find out.

So you see there's some big differences around here. They really do show up, but the place that they show up is actually in experience. This is not theoretical data I'm giving you, this is straight data. Now, one of the remarkable things we have noticed is the difference in a course with this difference of philosophy. Our first difference in the course was noticed when we had a bunch of bad cases in a course and we decided that we had better clean up these bad cases so that we could teach them anything. Now, that's the most reasonable thing you ever could reason yourself into, isn't it? That if you have a bunch of bum cases in a course and the course is not proceeding, that the best possible thing that you could do would call yourself in some DSens in the area and say, "Hey, audit these boys, get them in good condition and then we will teach 'em." And that is an assumption which we have made since 1950.

And it is an incorrect assumption! What's fabulous, what's utterly fabulous is that this did not work. We had made these individuals doubly into an effect: One, the effect of instruction; two, the effect of auditing. And they were not getting a chance to relay – to act as a relay point and put out what they were pulling in. You get the idea? And boy, you talk about digging people in, we sure did.

So, we turned around right away and adopted the opposite pole. According to Aristotle everything swings between the two extremes. So we swung. And we swung clear over and we said to these people while that – when that course had advanced pretty well – we just could see that we were just getting nowhere – so we started to say to these people privately and individually, say, “We have decided that in your case, if you are slightly warm you can audit. Now get in there and audit.” And we stopped validating, on an instructor level, any slightest beg-off on the part of the individual, because you know what happened? Nearly everybody in that unit was begging off from auditing anybody else in the unit.

So we just turned it around completely and said, “Get in there an pitch.” And all of a sudden we got some smiling faces and so on.

Now, because the processes do work, these individuals – if the processes didn't work, this would be an impossible thing. And maybe if you had to instruct in very, very complicated processes, this would not come about, you see? But in view of the fact that the processes do work and they are relatively simple, you can almost drill an auditor into line on this like a private soldier. I mean, just almost. And then all of a sudden he starts to come up and suddenly he will pay some attention to the data and he'll get out of the woods.

But what happened in this particular case is every single individual that had been able to learn nothing up to that time suddenly began to pick up the information and the data. And we all of a sudden realized that we had been committing this sin: We had been making the student into a total effect – the total effect of auditing; the total effect of instruction. And there he was unable to get rid of this outflow in any way, shape or form. So we turned it around and the student then becomes a relay point.

Now, the only facsimiles that you've got that are in bad condition are those you've never been able to dramatize. You know, you got shot and then you couldn't shoot anybody. You had a lot of things stolen from you and then you could steal nothing from anybody. So the facsimile of having had a lot of things is just right there, see? And you just say, “No. No. No, I can't do that.” And you've got this facsimile, you see? Well, it came in and unless you can put it out you'll never get into a winning valence.

So these people were never in a winning valence. See? They were just put, perforce, in the losing valence all the way on up the line. “You got to know this data. You got to know this data. You got to know this data. Now we're going to audit you. Now we're going to audit you. Now you've got to know this data.” And there wasn't anybody to – for them to turn around to and say, “You've got to know this data. You've got to know this data.” And – and nobody for them to audit.

Well, actually the inflow of the data can be handled by an outflow of auditing. There's nothing wrong with an inflow of auditing; there's no particular balance you have to achieve in this.

But, a student under instruction is in much, much better condition if he is operating upon the philosophy: If you're warm you can audit. If they stir slightly when kicked severely they can audit.

All right. So much for that.

Now. Let us look at the exact condition of an individual in life. We find out that he is holding to his bosom a great many illnesses which he cannot master or handle or does not want to master or handle. Now, this is the condition in which you find that person walking up and down the street out there. That person is unable to handle or unwilling to handle the things that are wrong with him. And so he will go down the street gimp, gimp, gimp; and he will do all sorts of odd things.

And an auditor comes up to him and says, "How would you like some auditing?"

And the person says, "Oh, no!"

Well, you have run into an unwilling to handle or an inability to handle. He either knows that an auditor could not handle this illness – great subjective reality on this because he's been treated so many times with failures – or he is unwilling to get rid of that illness.

Now, some of the people are unwilling to get rid of these illnesses and this is demonstrated by the fact that the second that you get rid of one illness for them they will find and pick up another illness.

All right. This in itself is the primary obstacle between the auditor and the public. Well, if it's an obstacle in between spreading of affinity, reality and communication, if it is an obstacle between the auditor and the preclear, if it's an obstacle there, it must be one between the organization, the HASI, and the public – right? – as two groups. And therefore, must be a considerable obstacle between two races: we get war. And must be a considerable obstacle, then, between species on the fifth dynamic, and so we get war there. And so we have life trying to stamp out life in all directions.

Now, let's look at this again. Recognize that the anatomy of war and the anatomy of an auditor trying to process a preclear are very much the same thing. There are two nations involved here and these two nations are in disagreement with the basic purposes of each other. And each nation considers that many things are wrong with the other nation. And therefore these wrongs must be corrected.

If you could convince the American public, utterly, that the Russian people were being castigated, chastised, ruined, mopped up, stepped on and NKVD'd – no – Gay-Pay-Oo'd sufficiently, the American public, regardless of what Russia was doing to the United States, would probably go to war with Russia to free the Russian people. Get the idea?

All right. Before this could occur, before war could occur between these two countries, one of these countries would have to believe there was a great many things wrong with the other country. Well, maybe these things really are wrong with the other country. Then why the hell doesn't that country clean these things up? The nation which is the stand off nation, which, simply, is the one that's going to go to war, then cannot conceive that the government of a country is competent if it will permit this many wrongs to exist within the boundaries of

that country. So it finds fault with that government. And its effort is to replace, transplant, alter, change or improve that government. You understand that?

All right. Now, let's take the auditor and the preclear and discover that the auditor takes a look at the preclear and here's the preclear gimping around; here's the preclear coughing; the preclear is saying nasty things; unable to build things; unable to work or simply nasty to his relatives. And the auditor says, "Look at that. That government is incompetent. Let's improve it."

The police look at it and say, "That government is incompetent. Let's destroy it."

But the auditor says, "That government's incompetent. Let's improve it."

And so the awareness of awareness unit becomes the immediate target of the auditor.

The auditor can at first try to straighten out these wrongnesses without straightening out the government of the preclear. You see how that would be? It's a kind of a covert approach. He straightens out these wrongnesses and doesn't straighten out the preclear.

Well, actually, this was Dianetics. We straightened out the wrongnesses without particularly straightening out the government. We simply took enough wrongnesses out of the way so that the government, we hoped, could then function.

Well, Scientology has an entirely different approach. And that approach is: we straighten out the government. We tell them, "Be three feet back of your head. Copy it, copy it, copy it. Do this. Do that. Something else. Drill. Drill." And all of a sudden the guy looks around and recognizes that there are some things wrong with him and he can patch these things up if he wants to. And this is about the way we go in Scientology. You see this? We straighten out the government directly.

Now, it is absolutely true that the society at large could run at a much higher, better level. It is also true that no organization or government on Earth today has the right to destroy either your beingness or your possessions, your land or your pocketbook. This is utterly right. There is no organism known as a government which has the right to exert the power of life and death over an individual because governments are not alive. Governments do not bleed when you cut them.

Now, this is not a revolutionary speech or statement. This is not revolutionary. It happens to be something that's been true for an awful long time.

Unless we consider the whole state as an organism – if we consider the state as an organism, then, we see we are dealing with a preclear. And just as we object to a psychotic preclear so would we object to a government that insisted on destroying its own members. Just as we would see no real sense in this madman running up and down the road cutting his fingers off, so we see no sense in a government executing its population.

We see no sense, for instance, in Stalin killing 10 million peasants. He did. He even talked about it and wrote statements about it. It was too bad. And so on. But this is Russian level of operation; 10 million peasants, poof! Population of 200 million, he had 190 million to go.

But we see some objection to this type of operation, just as we would see an objection to a psychotic preclear.

All right. If we are to grant any beingness at all to a government, if we are to grant any beingness at all to a government, we would then have to consider that it is going to behave more or less as a preclear and it would have to be straightened out more or less in the same fashion that a preclear would have to be straightened out. Right?

All right. Now, therefore, it isn't really an easy thing for an auditor to walk into Russia or Germany and suddenly see that this condition and that condition and some other condition in that state is at fault and is bad and decide to straighten up each one of these conditions without even vaguely consulting the government.

Do you realize that we're doing that – this – at this time with the United States of America? But this is our country and by consent we have some share in the government. And we are told many times that we are the government, so we either are doing it without the consent of the government or we are the government. And in Great Britain we have practically the same type of philosophy extant. The country belongs to the British people and the British people, therefore, have a perfect right to correct and alter the wrongs and misplacements and social conditions they object to, presently. The British people have a perfect right, they feel in themselves, to alter these situations. So, they either are the government or they are operating inside the country without the consent of the government. Do you see this?

Now, if they are operating inside the country without the consent of the government, they would be practicing Dianetics. If they are operating as the government, they are practicing Scientology.

There is a very intimate difference. Here is a very intimate difference which you can envision immediately. The running of engrams exactly approximates going down and straightening up the number of hungry men on the south side of the tracks in town. The straightening up the condition of; well, the poor condition of teachers in the schools; straightening up this or straightening up that; it's like running engrams, isn't it?

All right. The oddity is, is they're two different types of auditing. These are two different types of auditing. One is an auditing with a very, very high level of responsibility and the other one is an auditing with a more covert level of responsibility – but still a considerable level of responsibility.

Now, people who want to throw you over and make nothing out of you try to tell you that you have no business interfering with the woes and horrors of the world. They tell you this. They say there's something weak and bad about you if you would object to other people being in bad condition. This is merely an effort to make you fold up and become a speck without power or ability. You've got that? I mean, there's nothing wrong at all with your wanting to straighten up or square up a situation. Nothing whatsoever wrong with this. It is highly unnatural not to.

Actually, today, the two highest toned countries on Earth, from a standpoint of the philosophy, of their people are Great Britain and the United States. There we have the

populace taking responsibility for the action of the government and still conceiving themselves to be the government of the country.

Now, compare this to Spain. Although the population of Spain runs on its own social strata, as far as the government is concerned it has dropped markedly in responsibility. The government passes so many laws that nobody under the sun could possibly do anything to follow all these laws. So they say, "Well, the guardia civil is down there and they're there," and the fellow says, "Well, they might not notice us," and just walks on by. In other words, the government of Spain, bad or good – it doesn't matter.

The communists, by the way, in Spain would certainly alarm the Russian communists. The communist in Spain has a definition for communism that has nothing to do with Russian communism. Here is a word getting perverted. By the way, a British communist doesn't even vaguely know how wildly and widely – or maybe he does – he is departing from the party line of the Kremlin, what tremendous differences there are. For instance, Spain, the communist has a very fascistic, class-conscious outlook. Now, how we could get a communist conceiving that he was superior to so many and had so many superiors and that these levels in the society inevitably had to exist, and how we could make this compatible with Lenin or Marx, we're not quite sure.

But I talked to a communist in Spain and this communist said, "Oh, yes, we should have communism. It would mean better, better conditions for the working classes and so forth." And this mechanic went on and on. Well, this fellow was a master mechanic, that is to say he had charge of a general repair unit. And we walked down the street shortly after that to repair a car I had stalled down the street. And he took along one of his workmen. And that workman did not speak unless spoken to; said "sir" very carefully; walked six paces exactly behind his boss and had himself a helper that he did not speak to at all but which helper had to have all of the tools. And we had this little parade going on and the man who was leading the parade was a communist. Oh, yeah?

So we use these words and we get way off because the practice is one thing and the word is another. The word may be the same, the practices change.

All right. We take, then, this country of Spain and we find that the people of Spain are no longer taking responsibility, actually, for the conduct of their own government. They elected a government by popular election in, I think, about 1935 or 36. They elected a government, you understand, just as we in this country or in Great Britain would elect a government. And this was a widespread – a majority opinion on the part of the people of the country. And a guy jumped up with the support of a church and a couple of dictators and hired himself some mercenary troops and went in and conquered a nation. Just like that. That's what happened, you see.

And the people of Spain did not particularly object to this. And the government of Spain today is not bad. But they know that they are not the government. They've been taught this: They are not the government of Spain. And so they do everything they do to better Spain on a completely covert level. They will run out a little engraving over here by going and making the tree planting in the park a little bit better, you see, something like that. They carefully hire the poor to do odd jobs around the house – there's no social security program – and you'll see

somebody of about ninety-nine years of age up on the roof washing clothes at a slow rate that you'd think that you were looking at a slow-motion camera, but this person is making a peseta or two and will get a loaf of bread.

You see, they're taking care of the poor very covertly. And all of these activities engaged upon are done in this fashion and not through the government. See that clearly?

Well, the philosophy of the Scientologist is to straighten up the government. But now, we're not asking a Scientologist to work on a national scale; we're just talking about the preclear. He says, "Now, look," he says, "there's no sense in running out all these engrams. Let's just straighten the guy up so he can handle these engrams and pat him on the head and let him go."

Well, this requires a much higher toned outlook. This requires a far, far higher toned outlook because it requires some confidence in the fact that you are the government. Get what it requires – that you are the government. You at least have a lot to say about the government.

So, therefore, Scientology has a concept known as pan-determinism: The ability to control two or more parties, whether or not opposed; two or more, whether or not opposed.

Now, that means that we don't have to fight everything. That means that we could just as soon be the other side, too. A much broader outlook. This actually is tolerance. The willingness to control two or more entities whether or not opposed.

All right. This is the case, then; we are not looking toward the wrongnesses of the person. We are looking toward the ability of the person to correct wrongnesses. Follow me? We are looking toward the ability of the person to correct wrongnesses.

That tells us that each and every one of us, then, must be totally confident in our ability to have as many wrongnesses as we please.

As long as a Scientologist believes that he has a scarcity of wrongnesses, he will attack the wrongnesses of the preclear and he will keep his own.

And so we find the government of the United States attacking Russia. And we find Russia with lots of problems. And we discover that the United States has not solved its own problems at all.

It's sort of cheating, you see, it can go over a field and solve somebody else's wrongnesses because that person has an abundance of wrongnesses and the cutting out of these wrongnesses will not undermine one's own store of wrongnesses. Do you see that?

So that we have in these organizations a condition which very often arises of the individual whose own department is in a horrible mess but who is attacking other people's departments and getting all the things wrong in other people's departments. But his own department has tremendous numbers of wrong things in it, but he won't correct any of these.

Why won't he correct them?

That's because he has a scarcity of wrongnesses.

Now, let's see how a scarcity of wrongnesses comes into existence. You're a little baby, you're crawling around on the floor and you, all of a sudden, decide that the very thing

to put in your mouth is the safety pin your mother just dropped. Well, boy, would that be wrong! You're liable to swallow it or get it in your lung channels or almost anything's liable to happen.

So Mama comes over and she says, "Ah-ah-ah-ah-ah. Little precious lambkins mustn't put 'em safety pin in his mouth." She takes the safety pin away from you.

A little bit later you're walking around and you see this beautiful stove. It is the nicest shade of cherry pink you ever saw in your life. And so you decide to pet it. Nobody will let you pet it. You know, actually, that you'd get burned if you pet it, but you feel like you could use a burn at that moment. It's something to have, isn't it? And so nobody lets you pet the stove. So that's another wrongness that you can't have.

And then you go somewhere else and you decide that – you're in your teens by now; you've had thousands and thousands of incidents of each one of these character – and you're in your teens and you get this jalopy. And it is a terrible looking old jalopy. But that's all right, your acceptance level might be much higher, but you've at least got this jalopy, you see? So one day you decide to let it have a flat tire. And it sits outside with this flat tire. You even decide maybe you'll run it on this flat tire, you see? And there's Papa, and Papa says, "You know that the tire on your car is flat?"

And you say, "Is that so?"

And he says, "Well, we will fix it up."

You can't have a flat tire. You see that?

And then you've gone through your teens and you're in your early life and you decide that – this, by the way, is the big wrongness which sometimes turns up for a girl, less often for a boy, but occasionally, and is a very upsetting wrongness – you decide to marry the wrong girl or you decide to marry the wrong boy. And then the family manages to talk you out of it. And that's another wrongness you couldn't have. That's a big, serious one.

And then you go on and you're sorting envelopes in this company you're working for and you decide to make a mistake. And the boss comes along and corrects it. He shows you that all those envelopes in the center pile are turned upside down and he turns them right side up.

About this time a person goes into apathy about wrongnesses. But all the way along the line he has an enormous backlog of scarcities of wrongness.

Now, remember that significance amounts to practically nothing; we care nothing about significance, really, in processing – significance of things. But we do have factors like good and evil, right and wrong, win and lose. A person is driven continually to only win. And everybody takes his losses away from him. And he begins to believe that a loss is more valuable than the win and so he starts going through life losing. But he only dares lose in those areas that nobody else will notice – loses which can't be taken away from him.

And life could be said to be a structure of loses which can't be taken away. Life could be said to be a structure of wrongnesses which are sufficiently covert to be let survive.

Now, remember that a scarcity of anything is a scarcity. And what the thetan objects to is a scarcity. This is what a thetan objects to – a scarcity. I'll say it again – He objects to a scarcity! Not a scarcity of anything. But any scarcity is objectionable.

And when one loses one's ability to create wrongnesses, he begins to hold them because the whole society is manic on the idea of grabbing away from you every wrongness that you have.

And you, as an auditor, come up to a preclear who has already been robbed deaf, dumb, and blind of all these scarcities – you see, I mean, it was already scarce and he got robbed even of the scarcity, so he doesn't even know that it's wrongness that is scarce that's holding him there – and you walk up to him and tell him you're going to take some more wrongnesses away from him and he, of course, shies away from you and says, “I don't want any auditing.” You're about to make him right again. If there's anything he detests, it's to be made right again.

There's evidently a tremendous abundance of rightness. His mother kept carping about it, his father kept talking about it, there's evidently, from his viewpoint, a tremendous number of rightnesses. There's the rightness of God and he's everywhere. There are all these rightnesses in all directions and no wrongnesses that anybody can have.

And, boy, does he get covert. He sets up circuits, he sets up invisible engrams, he sets up all kinds of odd and weird and bizarre things that nobody could have or take away from him.

An auditor who has an insufficiency of wrongnesses will start solving them in the preclear and picking them up himself. Most gorgeous thing you ever saw. And we have the mechanism of transference noticed by Sigmund Freud. And this is the exact mechanics of that mechanism of transference. The auditor – the psychoanalyst, in his case – had an insufficiency of wrongnesses and so when he could take a bellyache away from the person he was working with he, of course, got it himself because, by golly, there sure is a big scarcity of bellyaches.

Now, Freud tried to read into this some terrific therapeutic value, saying that the somatic had to transfer in order for any good to take place. But this was an earlier thing. This was spiritualism. The spiritualist goes around and/or the faith healer goes around and, laying on of hands, takes the illness into his own hands and so forth and then throws it away. Only we find him practicing quite a while and he's no longer throwing them away – he's got them. He's merely fulfilling, almost on an awareness level, his scarcity of wrongnesses.

Now, here we're looking at the – at the basic phenomena concerning the mechanisms of restimulation. And we are looking at the basic phenomena with regard to preclear resistance. And we are looking at the basic phenomena here, which makes an individual put wrongnesses into facsimile form and hold on to them. Nobody else can get at them.

But being a mean, wicked, cussed fellow – I got a lot of methods together where you could get at these things. Fascinating, huh? We could tear them to pieces.

Well, now actually, all that is wrong and all that is right is what we believe is wrong and believe is right and what we say is wrong and what we say is right. This is pretty reactive

on a computational level. Nevertheless, there is this thread of logic going through it: That there is a scarcity of wrongnesses and an individual to have a wrongness has to be very covert about it and it had better be a very covert wrongness.

So, as we look over the problems of human behavior we discover that individuals are trying to get more and more covert and that any effort to heal is like an effort to stop war; any effort to heal is met by an objection to losing any of these wrongnesses and we get individuals so goofy that they will actually start piling up wrongnesses and no rightnesses at all.

Now, on an analytical and rational level you can have rightnesses. There can be a difference between right and wrong. But reactively there is no differentiation between these things.

All right. Let's take a look at something else and discover that we have laid bare the anatomy of fighting. The rationale for fighting is, the reason why for a fight is something is wrong with one's opponent and, therefore, one has a right to fight an opponent.

Let's take somebody here that pulled an overt act in the community. He made himself an outlaw by shooting somebody. A private citizen thereafter could take a rifle and hunt this fellow up and hunt him down. He actually could.

Let's say that there is some known murderer in the community here and he is slinking around from alley to alley and so on. And suddenly a private citizen recognizes him and whips him down with a pistol. Do you think the police or the public are going to say anything to this fellow who whips him down? No. They're going to say, "Public deed. Here is a small tin medal." Get the idea?

So here's are – is a person who has enough wrongnesses so that he can be fought. Anything by one rationale – and the rationale and the set of agreements on which we're aligned is that you can't fight anything unless there's something wrong with it. If there's something wrong with something, then, you have a right to fight it. But if it's all right, you see, we really don't have the right to fight it at all.

You have no right to get out here and pound on the side of a brand-new Jaguar or Oldsmobile with a hammer. Do you? But you've certainly got the right to pound on one which has been wrecked. Let's say it's been ditched.

Well, it's got a lot of things wrong with it, hasn't it? Ah, so you could just pound it to pieces, can't you? Get the idea?

But if it's all right and running perfectly, people – your best friends – would say you were utterly insane if you went out with a sledgehammer and knocked in its doors.

Yet you could do the same act after it was wrecked and nobody would think a thing about it. Think you were a little sore at it or something, maybe. You understand?

But they would consider that you had a right to fight. And what is this thing called right to fight? It's a rationale which permits a contest or game to take place. The right to fight. A contest or a game can take place and a right to fight can exist when a wrongness exists.

How do you win in chess? You win in chess not because you're smarter – chess is a very precision game – but because somebody else made a wrong move. If everybody made a

completely right move in a chess game, it would probably never finish. Fortunately, it's a sufficiently limited game that the mathematics of the game itself put a period to the game after such a long period of time. After you've moved two pieces in exactly counter position, one to the other, fifty times or something like that, well, you call the game off. It's a stalemate. But unless there's been some wrong moves, usually, in chess, nobody wins. And the effort is to get less wrong moves than the other fellow. And so you win.

Well, I know people who play chess that play to lose. But they never tell you about it. They're pretending that they play to win. But they will avoid every coup d'etat that sits on the board and they will make some sloppy move the second they should make the good move. Why are they doing that? They're trying to replenish their wrongnesses.

So you see you could have another kind of a game entirely that would still be a game. See, another type of game which could run sub rosa.

Now, you'd look to this, if somebody has to make a wrong move in order to get a win, you would look for this to invert after a while. "In order to win I've got to lose," sort of a computation. "So that in order to win the game I am playing, I've got to have some wrongnesses; and if I don't have any wrongnesses, then, I can't win the game I am really playing, because it depends on losing. How artistically can I lose?"

And with a whole society ganged up in your teeth, so to speak, to keep you from losing – and lose is impossible, really, to obtain. A thetan cannot lose. He can forget. But he can't lose.

We have the thetan going up against a possible absolute. He sees this possible absolute of an absolute win and he keeps striving in that direction. Most fantastic thing you ever saw in your life.

Now, this is a reactive computation; but what is a life form but a reactive form? That's what it is – it's a reactive form.

Now, there's a little process goes along with this. It actually makes up a big class of processes. There's a big class – there are several classes of processes. One old one, rarely used, still in Route One but less used than formerly, is the "is not" class, that type of question. "Give me some places where your illness is not," and so on. Of course, this is processing toward truth because the illness really doesn't exist anyhow and it'll key out just on that process – the "is not" class.

All right. There is the "Spot Spot" class. You can do all sorts of things with this class of process. You spot a spot where this or that happened; and spot a spot here; and a spot where this or that happened; and a spot here. And so on and so on and so on. You see?

And there is the class of processes which have to do with touching material objects to which belong Opening Procedure 8-C and Opening Procedure by Duplication. But just if we classify this as a class of processes and we say it's a class of processes whereby material objects are contacted by the individual – you make and break communication with material objects – you see how – at a fantastic number of processes we could evolve from this basic process?

All right. There's another class of processes which work directly in the direction of creation, which moves a person earlier on his cycle of action. And that is the class of processes known as "invent." You act – make the preclear create something. Now, all Communication Processes, actually, intimately belong to this class of processes. If you make a spot out there say, "hello," now you're actually running a Spot Process, aren't you? But you are up there in creative spot processing. You see?

Now we could conceive of a process which said, "Make a taboret or make a book or make a bottle. Now pick it up." You see, we could have objects in this if the individual could make them. You see? He'd have to make them.

Now, we have this "Invent something." Now, there is Expanded GITA which is the same breed of cat, Step Four, SOP 8; in earlier GITA, Step Four SOP 5. And we have with this the effort to remedy the scarcity of things. And we do this by mock-ups of wasting – having the preclear waste, in brackets; accept, in brackets; desire, in brackets; enforce things, in brackets – belongs in there too. And we discover that we remedy the scarcity of things with this type of processing.

Well, there is this "invent" class of processing which is just senior to, but infinitely better than, Expanded GITA.

And anything which you can run by Expanded GITA – you look at the enormous lists of Expanded GITA – anything you could run there could be run over as an Invent Process.

Now, Invent Processing can also be run with a bracket: Have somebody else invent for somebody else; have somebody invent something for you; you invent something for somebody; or you just invent something. But, actually, it balls up into just this one process, which the master command of it would be simply, "Invent (blank blank)." See?

Now, a very blunt statement of it, run by Expanded GITA, would be "Invent some money." You get the idea? So that it doesn't quite dovetail and it's nowhere near so specific. But where it works it works out the rest of the Expanded GITA lists. "Invent a game" is the master of these processes. That is the key process. Now that stands, really, right up there above SOP 8; is the Step Four of today, you might say. It would be the total of Step Four. All of the tremendous significances which were formerly in SOP 5 and SOP 8 under GITA and Expanded GITA are all covered today under "Invent a game." See? We just – this is the process, we just keep on running this and running it and running it. It's just a discovery that this makes the individual get in there and pitch and recognize finally, that he can remedy any scarcity he has simply by the process of invention. This is true.

He's the only one that's ever going to remedy any scarcity he has. If he depends on other characters or factors to remedy his scarcities for him they won't be remedied. So, therefore, somebody gives him a brand-new watch or something like that and his scarcity of watches really isn't well remedied at all. You see? But you'll find this kind of thing happening. Somebody gives him a watch. For days he looks at this watch as a strange thing that he really doesn't recognize, you know? And he'll kind of be careful of it because it's new and all that sort of thing. And gradually as he wears the thing he'll gradually accept it and he'll kind of forget where it came from and he'll sort of get the idea that it's his watch. Well, he gets along with that he probably created it too. He now owns this watch so it does, to some degree,

remedy his scarcity. Now, when it disappears he will have that scarcity – the scarcity of a watch which has been given him.

But that watch can be taken away because that watch was given him. Something which he created could never be taken away simply because he could merely create another one. That would be the simplest thing under the sun. Couldn't possibly be taken away because, you see, he could always replace it. You could always say it was the original item, too.

You could only lose those things which you acquire from elsewhere. And you really don't own them so it makes a silly look here. All right. Let's be very, very specific, intensely factual about a process here. And we discover that if you want to solve games on a person who's having a very rough time with games, you've got to solve a different kind of game. And that game is the game to lose. And if a preclear is hanging up in any way, shape or form, you must assume immediately and instantly – now get this carefully – if a preclear is hanging up in any way at all on processing, you must assume that this preclear is playing a different kind of game. He's playing the game “To lose.” That's your immediate assumption. I have never had evidence of any kind to demonstrate otherwise to me. No evidence I have ever run across demonstrates otherwise than that this preclear is playing to lose.

So you ask him to invent some games – now get how tricky this is – you – as it says in *Dianetics 1955!* you get him to invent some games (which shortly will be *Scientology 1955*) you ask him to invent some games. And this individual cannot tell you what he is doing. He knows you wouldn't accept it because the greatest pattern of life that he has is nonacceptance of his losing game. They won't accept it, they won't let him lose, nobody lets him lose. So he goes on and tells you games that could be won and it doesn't remedy his scarcity of games. You get this little bug that gets into “Invent some games,” then, see?

Now, possibly sooner or later, this would occur to him and work out – possibly. But I have already run too many cases long enough on, “Invent some games,” to know that it takes them an awful long time to get there. And that's a waste of time in processing.

So the way we shorten this up and the way we shorten up any case would be “Invent some wrongnesses.” It's just that auditing command, no other. No bracket, nothing. Just “Invent some wrongnesses.”

And all of a sudden this individual will come into complete subjective reality on the fact that if he doesn't have a wrongness anyplace, he has no right to fight. And it is the lack of wrongnesses which keeps him from fighting and which suppresses him below fighting and thus away from pan-determinism. And it comes in immediately to a scarcity of fighting because there's a scarcity of wrongnesses.

You realize that these traffic cops out here were actually a bunch of bums if they murdered babies and so forth, you would be perfectly licensed to carry a gun in your car and shoot them down wherever seen. You realize this. Why? It's because they have a wrongness, see, so that makes it possible to fight them.

But supposing these cops are paragons of virtue who never do anything wrong. And they gave you a ticket, you've got to take it. You are not justified, in other words, for an action or a fight. You see that?

So that people have to invent things wrong with you as an auditor and tell you and other people about them in order to give them any right to fight you at all. They have to go around inventing horrible things wrong with you. Otherwise they would have to agree with you utterly. They'd be yours. And the only thing they can possibly do to keep from becoming utterly owned, they feel – this is not the case – is just invent enough wrong things about this auditor and then they don't have to do exactly as he says. So they sit up and tell you that you have broken the Auditor's Code with them. They tell you all sorts of weird and incredible things. But they invent some wrongnesses for you.

And that is the only bar there is to auditing. And that is the only thing which creates war. And that is the only thing, actually, which sits there and keeps a fight in action.

So let's look at it as a process, recognize that any case that is hanging up is playing a different kind of a game – the game of being wrong and of losing. And if the preclear is playing this game of lose because he can't play a game of win – he can only play it satisfactorily if he has a lot of wrongnesses himself; which is just your inversion. The way you get him out of this rat race and this spinbin sort of a computation is ask him, “Invent some wrongnesses,” and keep on asking him to invent some wrongnesses and invent some more and invent some more. He'll learn more about himself and his own reactions in a half an hour of auditing than he's ever known before, because every wrongness he invents will be an actuality for a long time. He'll struggle and struggle to be original and actually invent one.

Okay. That's the process. And that's also the basic thing you have to know about Scientology and auditing.

Thank you.

(End of lecture)