

MECHANICS

A lecture given on 19 October 1956

[Start of Lecture]

I'm going to talk to you right now about mechanics -- just mechanics. Nothing more and nothing less. I'm going to talk to you about a set of mechanics, first, that are very, very obvious and then that are awfully abstruse.

The first obvious mechanics with which you should be acquainted as an auditor consist of the existence of a preclear and the existence of your status as an auditor and the existence of a place in which to audit.

You should recognize that coffee shop auditing fails and upsets people -- although we all do it; so what -- simply because the mechanics of a session are not present. An auditor has suddenly taken off and become an auditor, much to some body else's surprise. The person finds himself a preclear without much consent, and it isn't an auditing environment. That's coffee shop auditing. You all do it; so what? Doesn't matter. It's just not good form.

And because you do coffee shop auditing, and because you do kid around with processes, and because you do occasionally run them on bank managers or other people with malice aforethought, don't for a moment lose sight of the fact that there is, and you can do, a mechanically perfect job of auditing that is not even vaguely mechanical. Don't lose sight of that.

Now, auditing sessions, in the first and finest analysis, consist of the preclear who knows he's a preclear and knows what he's there for, the auditor who knows his business, and an environment in which auditing can be undertaken without serious interruption. Now, that is auditing in its Cadillac level.

Now, just because auditing doesn't always take place under these circumstances, do not forget that these circumstances are the most optimum circumstances and those

where you should do most of your activity and work. Most of your auditing should be undertaken under those optimum circumstances.

You bring people into groups; the people have some knowledge of the subject and then they are audited. They already know what they're there for. They are a pre-clear. You are the auditor. You know what you're doing. You do it well, you do it smoothly. And never let that deteriorate. It's an odd thing that maintaining it is assisted by your occasionally doing very different types of auditing.

Let me give you an idea. Had an auditor, became very ill. Matter of fact he was paralyzed from the middle of his back down. He became extremely ill from a tropical illness -- sudden assault -- in Algeria, which was at war. He lived there.

Algeria was issuing visas to prospective visitors only after four months of waiting, and this case would not admit of this much delay -- four months! In other words, any auditor going to Algeria to audit him would have had to have waited four months before he could get the visa. By that time our boy would have been dead.

Jack Campbell in Paris was witness to an auditing session which, veteran auditor though he is, left him gasping. Jim Skelton was ordered in England to go to Algeria and take care of this case. When he tried to get a visa in London, he was told, „*Comment?*“ When he tried to get a visa in Paris, at first inquiry he was told, „*Mm, no. Four months. Four months from now, after you've waited that long..*“ so on.

Well, Jim thought he was doing very poorly. He thought he was doing very poorly because it took him four days. Jack Campbell took him around to some of the foreign offices at France, and Jim „*talked to*“ (that's in quotes) the various officials. He spoke French, of course.

And Jack Campbell watched these fellows being „*audited*,“ you might say, through a comm lag of no. And Skelton simply took the bit in his teeth and audited them all through their comm lag of no. „*What else would you say no to?*“ He just overtly audited these people across government-clerk desks, and so forth, until they gave him an emergency via [visa] to Algeria -- the only one that has been issued. It had to be certified by the war office, the minister of war, the minister of health, the minister of transportation. Took him four days to go down the list, and he did the whole thing with auditing. He didn't do anything else. He didn't talk to these people; he didn't explain anything to these people. He just went around and ran out their comm lag on no until they obsessively said yes and signed it.

Now, this is no less an auditing session. One day I was sitting up here on Capitol Hill and gave an auditing session which was quite a remarkable auditing session. There was a senator up there that kept being drug off to the hospital because he had heart trouble. And everybody was worried about this senator, and he was really somebody up there.

His campaign manager sat there and, knowing something of what I was up to, gave me a hand simply by following suit a couple of times. We got this senator to remember a severe automobile accident. He never knew he was being audited. He has never been sick since. We just cost him his heart somatic as easy as you please. I just located

where he was stuck on the track by conversation and then ran him straight on through the engram three times. And a few times he was really bogging and at that moment his campaign manager, who has read Dianetics, chipped in and said, „*Oh, come on now, senator, you can remember that.*“ And again, „*How was that exactly?*“ It was an amazing little experience in view of the fact that it took away a chronic somatic which has been of considerable interest to a great many Americans. They've sat around and worried about this senator being in the hospital and so on. Well, that's auditing. Don't think it is less so.

Now there's the matter of you having a slight overdraft. There's the matter of you being given a traffic ticket. We actually move from the end goal of auditing, to improve the preclear, into a field of getting something, getting something done or, actually, committing a communication. That's one of the greater crimes of the universe: „*committing communication.*“

And if we do this smoothly and so on, we do it well. Well, somewhere in there, there is a -- undoubtedly -- point where auditing ceases and simply the accomplishment of communication begins. But I would be very adventurous if I were to pinpoint that point. Be quite an adventurous undertaking to say „*Where, where does auditing cease and mere communication begin?*“

The controlling of people and the not-controlling of people are done very easily by auditing; they're also done by living; they're also done by your changing your mind -- so that sometimes you will think of yourself as auditing when you are not.

You are really not auditing when you are committing communication. You are really not auditing when you are putting a group of people through some type of evolution. When you are stopping somebody from doing something or saying something, you're really not auditing; you are simply using the mechanisms you know about living.

Now, there's some point where you use the knowledge of Scientology just as livingness and where this is changed from your use of Scientology as this specialized thing called auditing.

The odd part of it is, you have to be able to do this special thing called auditing superlatively well before you can use Scientology in its communication brackets. Auditing is the primary skill. Do it well and then you can commit communication with impunity. Do auditing well and you can handle people well.

Auditing is not a particularly artificial method of communication; it is simply a complex, specially goaled method. It is very specially goaled. You are trying to get something done in an auditing session.

Now, the difference between an auditing session and other uses of Scientology is simply this: In an auditing session you are trying to return the self-determinism and the pan-determinism of the preclear to his own control. In other things, you are trying to invite the cooperation of an individual in an activity. It's different. There's such a tiny shadow of difference, however, that it's almost undetectable. And the crudest use of all of this, of course, is just direct, overt control of people come hell or high water, which fortunately can't be done.

If everyone in the world were a stimulus-response machine, the task of controlling human beings would not have to include a knowledge of Scientology. Therefore, phrenology and other modern mental subjects have never dared admit that anyone was anything else but a stimulus-response machine. If they were, they couldn't have handled them; it would simply have been a confession of complete defeat.

As long as they believe people are stimulus-response machines then they themselves believe that with the use of this (quote) „*subject*“ (unquote) called phrenology, as taught in the universities, that they could handle and control people, and that with this knowledge that they have they are safely in control of their environment. As long as people are stimulus-response mechanisms, the phrenologist is in control of his environment.

But the moment this ghastly doubt is entered into the phrenologist's phrenology that perhaps... perhaps they aren't all stimulus-response mice -- you understand, I'm not talking really about phrenology; I'm just not using dirty words -- as soon as this doubt enters, a person whose technology is totally involved with the stimulus-response mechanism goes at once adrift because he's no longer in control of the situation. You move him at once out of the control of the situation.

If he depends utterly upon the premise that all he's got to use is more and better force on human beings to make them obey, stay in line, be obedient and snap and pop in all directions, he ceases to control his environment. If this is the only thing he knows how to do, then of course he is occasionally baffled by failing. But he never looks at the failures; they simply creep up on him as unknowingness and eventually spin him in. He never, never looks at these failures.

The sergeant, the typical sergeant: He says, „*All I've got to do is drill these men enough and get them enough under control and threaten them with enough punishment and damn them hard enough and make them eat enough dirt, and I will then have a good company!*“ And that's not true.

He'll have a better company than if he let it all go to hell, and therefore he has an apparent win. He has regarded these men as stimulus-response mechanisms from beginning to end. And having so regarded them, he is then baffled to discover an occasional failure as he gets on in life.

His disappointments in life consist simply of the sudden recognition that somebody else has an ability to create and control. Up to that time he could be an „*only one*“ and he could mad-dog all he wanted to. You follow me?

Do you see then that if a man blinds himself to any other capability in a human being than stimulus-response, he has a highly unsatisfactory but nevertheless stable basis of operation. But the moment that he begins to perceive that somebody else can think a thought of his own, he comes into possession of an instability as far as he's concerned. We demand of him now new things: We demand of him ability to grant beingness. We demand of him ability to cooperate. We demand of him an ability to persuade. We demand of him sincerity. We also demand of him decency. We also de-

mand of him ethical conduct. And not always is he able to measure up to these demands.

You might say, to coin a cliché, „*A fool's paradise is that paradise in which everybody thinks that everybody else is stimulus-response,*“ and counting on this, carefully omit a notice of the random factors of people suddenly and for no reason at all making up their minds or changing their minds in some other direction.

What a shock it would be to a man who is accustomed to batter and beat his way through life to discover one day something he couldn't batter or beat.

Supposing he meets a puppy. And the puppy is a sort of a happy-minded sort of puppy; not foolish, you know, but you know, he's a happy little puppy, and he's all right. He's a very frail little puppy; not very big or tough. And our fellow who batters his way through life decides he will batter this puppy into some sort of shape. He'll housebreak him. He will teach him to bark. He will teach him to stand out on the front steps and not bay at the moon. And of course, he does this with a little whip.

And he whips the puppy to get the puppy to do this and he whips the puppy to get the puppy to do that. And when the puppy still doesn't do this or do that, he simply whips the puppy harder.

If after a year the puppy was still a happy puppy, but still had a mind of his own and still would make up his own mind when he was to bark and not bark, our boy who depends on force alone would probably quietly go blow his brains out.

If you want to ruin these people just go on being a happy puppy. Don't get grooved on a stimulus-response mechanism.

Now, an auditor who thinks, then, that a preclear is placed under control by force alone probably will have more wins than an auditor who never places anybody under control and thinks it's nasty. An auditor who used force alone would probably do better -- you know, given that he used the force in an orderly pattern -- he'd probably do better than somebody who used no control at all. But an auditor who uses control and no force of course does perfectly. This is the nice little problem you have to unravel in every preclear: How much decision? How much force? How much persuasion? But never, How much lack of control by the auditor?

Because we have this stimulus-response mechanism, theory of, going through the society, well-bought in all directions, we have developed an allergy to control. What sort of control do we have an allergy to? Control by force and bad control. But control by force is bad control.

What other kind of control is there which is bad? Noncontrol is worse than force control. That is quite amazing. No control at all is worse. That is chaos!

Now, if everybody was a brute and everybody could get through life by using his two fists, we wouldn't have any civilization. If the government depended completely upon its bayonets to enforce its laws, there would be no government. They are dealing with a random factor. That factor is willingness.

All an industry can take from its employees is the willingness of the employee to serve. And when that gets dulled down, it's gone. And no matter how much force you use, you're not going to get any work done.

This is something the great empires of Earth... I don't know, they're buried someplace. I notice old, ragged bones showing through the soil every now and then which was some great empire of Earth.

And these great empires of Earth, one after the other, have failed to learn this lesson: Man cannot be controlled by force. Man is controlled only by his own willingness.

It's a fantastic lesson. You'll never get anybody who has the power of hiring Lord-knows-how-many legions convinced that he might have skipped the recruitment in the first place if he wanted a decent state. The legion blunts the willingness.

You can force into position and situation, people, to the degree that they are willing to be forced into position and to cooperate. That willingness is so tremendous that it is only measurable by the will to live itself. That is a tremendous willingness. What it takes to blunt it is fantastic; but the only thing that ever blunts it is force. Force -- application of force to an individual to overcome the self-determinism and power of choice of his own mind. When force is used to overcome the power of choice of an individual, we may have the individual moving along a certain pattern afterwards, but the movement will become devious, interestingly random and will then cease. And so do nations run down; so do they get old.

Now, wherever we look we discover individuals erring. They think if they apply enough threat and enough punishment that they will succeed. However, it isn't true that everyone alive today is a masochist. Now, I have known some people that were very fond of being beaten up. Such people exist. They develop a liking for it. But they didn't „*develop*“ this liking for it; they must have postulated it somewhere along the line; that it was the thing to have done. Maybe they were mad at the body, and maybe they got ways and means of getting the body beaten up. And maybe they're playing some other little odd and interesting and random game. But the funny part of it is, it's not a constant urge in the society; it is not constant in the society.

There is a random factor at all times amongst people, and that random factor is the power of choice of the individual. An individual becomes as well as his power of choice is restored to him.

It's quite an interesting thing to just set out with a process which is determined just to do nothing but restore a person's power of choice. Now, to give you a pat process that would do this would be rather silly. But I can give you a class of processes that would not be silly.

Let's just go on the line of decision. Decision itself is not the topmost bracket of power of choice, because the word „*decision*“ implies that something goes before. He has to decide about something. Therefore this is a very low-level process. Two things must exist, or more, to then demand of the individual a decision amongst them, and so this precludes that we have a primary-cause situation here.

But the power to postulate lies through the power to decide. When an individual cannot decide, it's a certainty he cannot postulate; that's fairly certain.

One of the tests is: Have you ever gone out with somebody and given them a menu, and they sit and look at the menu? And they look at it, and they look at it, and they look at it, and they look at it, and then finally you in disgust, although it's impolite, order something for yourself, and they have the same thing. Why did they put all this study on the menu? They studying the menu? They eating it? Are they mocking up the various dishes and devouring them? What are they doing? They are hung in an inability to decide, and an inability to decide stems from only one thing: that something is dangerous.

There was always a danger on the track where the ability to decide is blunted. The ability to decide is very definitely related to the willingness to live -- willingness to serve, willingness to live, willingness to decide. Power of choice is then a low-echelon manifestation that belongs on the same parallel with decision and is lower than postulating, but is a step on the road to its accomplishment.

You can do more for somebody's mock-ups by restoring his power of choice (or his ability to decide -- same thing) than by some mechanical process which merely builds up his ability to make a mock-up. You see this?

In energy and space, the ability to decide expresses itself in the creation of energy and space. That is in essence the first consideration of a mock-up. A mockup is something which exists in space and is made out of... and it is. But if a person cannot decide, he cannot make a mock-up.

Now, on a lower level, we have the ability to hold position. And that's a lower ability than the ability to decide, but is a very vital one. Hold position. Do you remember anything about the two terminals of the motor, the base of the motor? A motor runs simply because something is holding its two terminals apart. This room is a room because something holds its walls apart, don't you see?

What holds its walls apart? Well, the Earth, of course. Well, what holds Earth apart? Well, we track all this all the way back and we finally find out that it's the ability to position. Now, that is a lower echelon than the ability to decide.

Here's a matter of keeping two terminals posted, rather than which terminal is it. You don't necessarily have to fit these on a scale at all. They're all related.

Exteriorization is simply the ability to hold a position. You know, many a thetan has to hold on to one wall while he pulls the other one down. How about the thetan who sits in empty air and pulls the other one down? Well, he can just hold a position better, can't he? That's all. He doesn't need grapnels. He doesn't need to grab hold of a tree in order to exert a beam.

Ability to decide could be run as a process this way perhaps -- I say perhaps. It very much depends on getting in communication with the preclear, because you're handling a very touchy little item here. You're asking him to do something; you're asking him to decide between something.

But this is attained along something on this line: „*What could you say that anyone would pay any attention to?*“ That's an interesting sort of question, isn't it? That's apparently disrelated at first glance, but if you look at it, it's related well enough. That means „*What decision of yours could stick?*“ See, „*Now, what could you say that anyone would pay any attention to?*“ Another thing is „*What order could you give that would be obeyed?*“ Same sort of a statement.

Now, what -- what would you do with this process? Well, you would just sort of chit-ter-chat around and fish out decisions the fellow could make in order to expand the number of decisions he felt himself capable of making. And we would start out with „*What would people listen to?*“ „*What would people obey?*“ or „*What would things obey?*“ or „*What, if you changed its location, would then stay there?*“

You would say, „*If you had to select that chair or that chair, which chair would you take? Well, could you take the other one?*“ until you loosen up the life-and-death necessity to make the right decision at all times! Because that is what deteriorates it.

It has proven dangerous to make decisions. Decisions are dangerous, that's obvious. Statements are dangerous. Communications are dangerous. Differentiation is dangerous -- very dangerous. Do you know that an electric chair is a chair? Well, that proves that chairs are dangerous, doesn't it?

Well, now it is safer to assume that all chairs have the capability of becoming electric chairs than that there are no electric chairs. So we have at once the clue to the ability to decide, and that clue is courage -- which we can state very processibly in Scientology as „*the ability to confront.*“ Now, you're going to hear a lot more about that, a lot more about that before this course is over, but I just show you where it belongs there.

You're trying to return power of choice. If you're trying to return power of choice, you have to return courage. Mechanically, the return of courage consists of improving the ability to confront.

Now, what have you been doing in this process where you were mimicking things? That's a very low level of confronting them, isn't it? Very, very low level. That's very mild. That's about as tiny as you could get. It's there and you're there. There's no further „*I'm going to surge at it, move toward it or confront it; I'm going to mimic it.*“ You get the notion there. That's a pretty limp one, pretty limp.

But as we go along the line, as we look this thing over, we discover that an old sentence out of an old book, Excalibur, was quite right. „*A man is as sane as he considers himself dangerous to his environment. He's as crazy as he considers his environment dangerous to him.*“ Now, that is really a dramatic sort of statement; it's very dramatic. It's susceptible to a better codification than that, but I don't think the codification would communicate quite as well.

We have this thing called cause, distance and effect. A man is as healthy as he can be at cause, and he's as unhealthy as he has to be at effect. And yet it's not very bad to be at effect, but it doesn't process as fast as other things. But yet it's necessary occasionally to run processes which are effect processes. They are fairly limited most-wise.

But an individual can cognite that something is not an effect upon him; it is not having an effect upon him. He can cognite that this is the case, at which time he would go into a game condition with regard to it.

A game condition is best described as cause-distance-effect -- and here we start getting complicated -- cause-distance-effect with the individual in question at cause.

Well, what the devil happens to the other side of the game? A game condition is tossing a baseball to your fellow player. It's a no-game condition for you to receive the baseball. It's fascinating.

So in a game itself, as far as an auditor is concerned, it goes game condition, no-game condition, game condition, no-game condition, don't you see? Every time you throw the ball to somebody else you're in a game condition; every time you catch it he's in a game condition but you're in a no-game condition. That's just for an auditor; that's just the way an auditor has to learn to look at this.

Therefore, your mimicking objects as a thetan actually increases your tolerance to be an effect point, doesn't it? It's a kind of a no-game-condition process though, isn't it? So is Mimicry then a sort of a no-game-condition process. The odd part of it is that neither of them hurt anybody. That's what's very odd about them. They don't upset anybody. They're not the fastest processes in the world though. That's because they're no-game-condition processes.

Now, I'll tell you a process which would, in essence, work a little faster... would be the consequences of mimicking something. The consequences of mimicking something. You can always run Consequences -- old-time Consequences -- you can always run this thing on a no-game condition and get away with it.

„What are the consequences of being hurt?“ „What is the consequence of you being hurt?“ You can always ask a question like that, but it's a no-game condition.

Now, for your purposes, a game condition runs this way: No effect on self, effect on others. The no-game condition factor is just exactly in reverse to the game condition factor. The no-game condition runs like this: No effect on others, effect on self. That's a no-game condition. It just works out like this, that's all. I know it looks like a game, but after a while you'll find out it isn't. That's what we mean by a game condition: We mean no effect on self, effect on others.

But you're auditing somebody to have him get an effect! Now how do you solve that one? That's an interesting problem, isn't it? It's one of the more interesting problems in Scientology, in faith.

You solve it by saying *„You do it. You do it.“* And, of course, then that becomes a *„You do it to.“* Now, *„You mimic it“* is not as much a game condition as *„You mock up something mimicking it.“* You got this?

Now, there is the subtle, the terrifically subtle difference between a game condition and no-game condition.

Now, I didn't let you do this very long. I did let you do it long enough to raise your tolerance of auditing and to change your perception of the physical universe.

I want to call something to your attention very, very sharply. Now, next week we're going to reverse these processes. That is to say, we're simply going to reverse teams; we're going to run through these same processes. You're going to notice something as you do that. You will notice plenty. I'm not going to tell you what you're going to notice now, but you will see something else is happening.

We must, and I repeat, we must -- we must get this: a game condition and a no-game condition. And let's get it looked at eight ways from the middle, because every time I turn around I've explained this to somebody and they have then been very happy to audit somebody into a no-game condition. And they say, *„But that is a game condition, isn't it?“* It was a game for them as an auditor, but it was no-game for the preclear.

A game is cause-distance-effect, with the participant or team in which you are interested at cause. Got that? A game is not cause-distance-effect, and at that effect point another cause-distance-effect. In other words, two-way communication is a two-way game, but it's two games going on at the same time. That's why nobody ever listens to the other fellow.

Now, here we have cause-distance-effect. Now, we turn it around and we say cause-distance-effect. Well, just skip the second cause-distance-effect and you have a game condition. Take the second one totally and you have a no-game condition. That's all there is to it, you see? The person in whom you are not interested, and that you're not auditing, doing something to the person you're auditing; the person that you're auditing at effect and somebody else at cause. You are not interested in that process. This is known as *„the victim complex“*; person wants to be at the victim point. That's because they've been at too many cause points themselves, so they try to balance it out by now being a victim.

If you were to simply ask somebody -- some guy crawls in to you, and he says, you know, *„What wall? What door? What auditor? What subject?“* And if you just had two minutes to audit him, there'd be only one question that you could ask him, that he could answer then or comm lag on for some days, that would do him any good -- really, that you could expect a slightly spectacular result from. You would ask him this: *„Tell me something you have done to somebody.“* He's coming in, *„They've all wrecked me. They've abused me. They've kicked me down stairs. I'm in terrible shape. I've been mauled. I... took at these bruises. Lo... look at... look at... Missing ear.“*

Now, you'll only have two minutes with this fellow. He's already used up one minute and fifteen seconds telling you that he's a victim. The remaining forty-five seconds, you employ the first fifteen in making him shut up and then in the thirty seconds you fixate him and ask him so that he can't help but receive it one way or the other, *„Tell me something you have done to somebody.“* Then kick him out. He won't answer the question. Let him answer it tomorrow, next month. He'll remember that question. You can tell him even *„When you remember this question, you will feel much better. Write me a letter when you have the answer.“*

There's no reason to keep him in the office, because if he's in terrible condition and interested in being a victim, his comm lag will probably be a week anyway. Do you have that?

„*Tell me something you have done to somebody.*“ This is actually one of the little basic communication processes. There are only two down at that bracket that I have any confidence in at a level of communication itself, and those two are very quickly stated: „*Look at me, who am I?*“ and the other one is „*Tell me something you have done to somebody.*“ The second one is very brief.

„*Look at me, who am I?*“ is a rather easy process that can be run with profit sometimes on a psycho for hours. It's a duplicative- type process. You follow that? It is a duplicative process.

The other one isn't a duplicative process. You'll plow him in quicker than scat if you keep it up too long -- unless you want to run engrams.

But what about all the motivators? What about all the motivators? Let them sit; skip them. See, isn't that interesting? Just leave him sitting there with all of the times he's been shot and hung and banged and thudded with and so forth. That isn't the side that runs or improves; this is what's fascinating. That is not the side of the case that runs.

I'll give you an example of this. You ask somebody who's been on a long boat trip. Have you any idea of steamers, you know, how they roll around and so forth? Well, get the idea of somebody that's been on a long yacht trip that has not rolled along and there's a flip in every roll, and then, of course, a pitch in every flip. And he's been at sea thirty days, let us say. He's been crammed in a small cabin or he's been very restricted on a small deck and so on. You'll find out he walks ashore and all of the scenery rocks. Yeah, oh, it rocks with violence.

There's an interesting auditing question that runs this out at once. Make him sit down and tell you something he could do. Have him look around and find something he could do.

Now, it has to address an object or an item in his immediate vicinity. It's not something he is figuring out subjectively, see? It's something that he is able to see. You have him sit down and you give him this understanding, and you say, „*Now look around and tell me something -- not find something you could do, but tell me something you could do.*“ And you'll be very interested in the resulting chaos.

Every time he says that he could push the pebble over, or something of the sort, all this lurching and so forth turns on again. And you run him right on through it however. He goes through it rather rapidly.

Now, let us take somebody who has taken an ordinary train trip, very short train trip. He's gone on the usual smooth, velvet- railed Pennsylvania and he has arrived in New York after a passage from Philadelphia. And it's not a very long train trip, but it's enough to have impressed him with the fact he was sitting still. And now you ask him to look around and tell you something that he could do. You don't let him go do it, by

the way; he just tells you something there. And he says, „*Oh, I don't know.*“ You'll find at first, boy, is it close to hand and is it limp. „*Oh, I don't know. I could uh... Oh, that cup over there. I could uh... I could notice its shadow.*“

„*All right, That's fine,*“ you say.

„*All right,*“ he'll say, „*now what... what else could I do? And so on and so on and I don't know. I don't know, I just don't seem to notice anything really. Oh, I guess... I guess I could reach over and push that chair a little bit with my foot.*“

Along about this time something strange will happen. The clackity-clack of the rails will turn on. He'll say, „*Well, that... that's fine.*“

„*Now, you look around here now and tell me something else you could do.*“

And he says, „*I... I...*“ (He's wary now.) „*I think I could uh... Oh, I could probably pick up this match. I could probably move it over there.*“ And the rails will go, once more, lurch-lurch. And he'll get body motion. And he'll get all the rocking around that that velvet-smooth Pennsylvania Railroad has given him. And that rocking around will run out rather rapidly. Why?

On the train, in more ways than one, he was in a no-game condition. But technically, as far as we're concerned, he was being an effect of something else that was moving his body and considered himself part of the body, and therefore was moving him. You follow that? He was being the effect of something else for a period of time.

And this we could look at with a great, smooth explanation and say, „*Well, of course, the guy was immobile. He didn't dare get up and play football in the aisles. He didn't dare rush around and get very active and clobber the conductor. He couldn't get out and run along the side of the train. He couldn't do these things. Naturally, a fellow is immobilized and therefore he's on one tremendous, big rest point. And he's stuck on the time track.*“ Well, that is all true, but it's too complicated!

Now, the only other simple explanation that could go along with this has to do with stable data and confusion, but we will take that up in a moment; it belongs in a different sphere of understanding than this.

Let's take cause-distance-effect and recognize it as a game condition that he wasn't doing anything to anything. He wasn't pushing the train; he wasn't holding the seat up; he wasn't doing anything, you see? Wasn't doing any of these things at all. So we ask him what he could do. The second he thinks of what he could do, we disturb his inaction as an effect and we ask him to become cause.

If we ask him this question only for a few minutes, he will be completely refreshed after his voyage -- after his voyage from Philadelphia on the velvety-smooth Pennsylvania. Feel like a kitten but not be asleep. Well, that's the B&O; that's the „*body odor.*“

Now, where -- where do we have an application of this in auditing? Well, it looks like an awful lot of auditors have been sitting still for an awful long time listening to an awful lot of preclears. You ask an auditor what he could do, and professionally what happens? His sitting-stillness starts to run off.

But this gets into another field. Gets into the field of confusion and the stable datum, where he has been sufficiently confused that he has to be the stable datum. And when we get into confusion and the stable datum, we get into an entirely different field of action, which is handled quite differently -- handled with quite different processes. It's a different phenomenon if you can get it.

Now, it's taking place at the same time that cause-distance- effect is taking place. And another phenomenon is taking place at the same time, and that phenomenon is confronting. He's not confronting anything, except, as the train pushes him along it makes him confront -- by forward motion -- God knows what. So confrontingness will run it off, substitution for the stable datum will run it off -- another class of processes; this is a whole class of processes -- and „*Look around and tell me something you could do*“ will run it off.

And the least-sensational process but possibly the most -- well, it's a little more stable than the „*What could you do?*“ process -- would simply be old-time havingness, Trio.

But here we have a class of processes, one of which turns on and runs the motion off; another class of processes which substitutes for him in the train, and therefore gets rid of the confusion by putting new stable data into it; another class of processes known as Confrontingness which make him confront things, and that will also have a tendency to run it off; and then we have another class of processes over here which puts new situations into existence and remedies his havingness of situations. That's... oh, there's dozens of these. There's „*Invent a game.*“ There's all kinds of stuff. „*Invent a game.*“ „*Invent a problem of comparable magnitude.*“ „*Invent an individuality who could have coped with the train.*“ „*Invent an enemy of comparable magnitude to trains.*“ See, now that's another class of processes though.

So actually, you have several different phenomena taking place at the same time. Several phenomena are taking place at once. Now, don't be obscured by your desire to find that the whole universe is holding together on one devil. Don't be blinded by this. There are several phenomena in existence.

Now, there are several things riding on the train: There's a body, there's a mind and a thetan. And you'd have to have three different classes of address here in order to hit three different things, wouldn't you? And you could probably run him on six processes then, rapidly, one after the other, each one belonging to an entirely different class of process, and then dispense with the six different phenomena that you felt should be handled in this case.

There is no one process which immediately runs out all trains everywhere. You got that? For the body, for the mind and for the thetan -- there's no one process.

The body, for instance, tries to process out an unsuccessful life by dying. That process doesn't happen to work on either the mind or the thetan, but it works for the body for a moment. See?

Now, mental processes do not always work for the body, as witness E-Therapy. It has a workability as far as a mind is concerned -- stimulus-response. You know, it was invented from an experiment, an experiment called the God Throgmagog. You could

mock up this Throgmagog God who would stand alongside of you and give you all the hot dope. You put him on full automatic and there he is, except you're doing it. Quite amazing. Think better than you can, too. He isn't aberrated; you didn't mock him up that way.

It's in Evolution of a Science by the way, Dianetics: Evolution of a Science. A chap got a hold of this and refined it out. I'm not trying to put myself at cause point in there. This is what made him mad, is that he had had to find it in Evolution of a Science. He gave me a bad time of it. He had become an effect to this degree and it'd become upsetting to him.

But here's a class of processes for this and a class of processes for that and a class of processes for something else. And if I made you up a great big board and put all classes of processes, and then all processes in each class, why, boy, you'd really have a board. It'd really be a terrific piece of work. And who knows, I might even someday get less lazy than I am and might do something like that.

There's no particular reason to do it though at this time. Until we find some more parts of man, we actually don't need any other classes than we immediately have. Even though we could discover or invent classes of processes, they wouldn't necessarily apply to man, don't you see? And we're doing smoothly on what we have, more or less.

Now, if we look this over carefully, we will discover that beingness is mimicry, that doingness of course is energy, and of course havingness is simply mass and havingness. And we have classes of processes that belong in those three classes. But with a greater generality we can say there's a class of processes known as Confronting Processes. And there's another class of processes which have to do with action, tolerance of. And there's a whole new class of processes that have to do with inaction, tolerance of. There's a whole class of processes that had to do with why the hell he got on the train in the first place, which are simply power-of-choice processes, don't you see? And you look these out, and you're handling the most essential elements.

Now, this is not a lecture devoted to the classification of the various classes of processes I said. And the fact of ever getting all classes of processes together on one board that would do for all universes and all thetans in any bodies at any time is, of course, idiocy, because you're simply undoing things that people invented and added. And they might invent anything and add it to anything, and you'd have a brand-new class that you would have to invent and add, don't you see?

But we can undo most of the things that are done with what we know immediately.

Your Mimicry Processes that you have been running are quite interesting in terms of perception and so forth. We get around by saying „*You do it.*“ Give him a feeling of power of choice, give him power of choice in how he does it, and let him get onto a communication formula and prove to him that being audited will not kill him.

And that's all we've been doing this week, and what we're going to do next week.

Thank you. [End of Lecture]