

## **SUMMARY LECTURE**

A lecture given on 16 November 1956

[Start of Lecture]

Okay. This is a lecture which is a summary lecture on SLP 8, which is to say on processing culminations, and so forth, of a great deal of research.

This SLP 8 is something that has been gotten together over a considerable period of time. It's been tested and retested and mauled around, and we have some certainty to believe that it is possessed of a certain power of cleavage with regard to cases.

In fact, we would go so far as to say that if you can find a case that doesn't crack under this, we give you a brand-new pair of snow tires and a television set. The snow tires with holes in them, the television set that spits nothing but gamma.

Now, before looking over SLP 8, we have to have a considerable understanding of some very basic types of processes, and we went into that yesterday. And we went into it, looked it over very thoroughly on the subject of Confrontingness, Substitution, Havingness, the places where these belonged, one relationship to the other.

Now then, SLP 8 follows this basic set of rules but is not at this moment in a finalized, exactly placed form. We have a series here of about twenty-seven separate processes, each one of which is very destructive to cases.

And going over these classes again we find that the classes are Havingness, which means he couldn't substitute for it and he couldn't confront it, so he's got it. Got the idea? I mean, he couldn't substitute for it, and he couldn't confront it, so he's got it. We know that Havingness -- it was very incomprehensible for a very long time, by the way, why Havingness did anything for anybody. You know, that's incomprehensible.

A thetan, who is not a mass, does not discover it very easy to confront a mass, do you see? Why should he communicate with a mass? It is a mass and he's not a mass; now, where's the communication? It isn't.

And therefore, why should Havingness, why should getting more of this stuff that won't duplicate him and that he can't duplicate, do anything for him at all? That was the problem, and the answer to that problem was a very simple thing -- very, very simple: All it does is substitute in a total identification which is so identified that it doesn't even have a subject. You follow me? Total identification.

*„Look around this room and tell me something you could have.“*

A fellow says, *„Well,“* he says, *„Let me see. Let me see. I could have that scrap of paper on the floor. Or maybe -- well, at least I could have the dirt on it.“* Something on this order.

Well, he has found the lowest order of substitute for something he knows not wot. And he's very happy thereby.

So you say, *„All right, now look around the room and find something more you could have.“*

And he says, *„Well,“* he says, *„I could have the shadow up there.“*

*„All right,“* you say, *„That's fine.“*

Now, why could he have the shadow? What's this whole thing about? It's the shadow is a substitute for something else, and he finds that he could confront the shadow rather than the other thing.

So that people, when they run Havingness, get a great many cognitions. Their awareness goes up like a shot. Why? Because by (quote) *„substituting“* for things they cannot confront, they come that much closer to confronting them. And the definition of awareness could be said to be simply this: Awareness is a capability of confrontingness. That which one can confront is that of which one can be aware.

And so we get Havingness working. We're taking apart the *“overwhelmptness”* of the case. Now, the word, by the way, *„overwhelm“* is quite interesting if you look at it very carefully. You'll find out there must have been a word called *„whelm.“* And you want your case in a state of being whelmed, not overwhelmed. You understand? Got it? Very, very elementary.

But he's overwhelmed by the room, and then we find that he can find parts of the room and substitute, you know, but he doesn't even know what they're a substitute for. But they're a substitute for something. And he starts walking upstairs, and he gets from overwhelm to whelm, see?

And if you get him up high enough above confrontingness, why, he can do some whelming himself and some overwhelming too, see?

Now, all processes are run on a games condition, which is to say *„no effect on self, total effect on somebody else.“* That is a games condition.

There are many parts to a games condition; don't be confused. Very interesting ramifications in games conditions. Tremendous importance should be attached to all these parts.

Washington Briefing Bulletin of about the 25th of August 1956 contains the list in full. I know of nowhere else that it appears. It's only a partial list in Fundamentals of

Thought. Most important parts of that list -- „*no effect on self, total effect on others*“ and „*enemy and identity*.“ Those are the most important parts of the list from a processing standpoint.

We take for granted the attention and intention and the rest of it up at the top. We take for granted in a game that communication is possible.

Now therefore, the significance that you run with somebody is to say, „*Give me an enemy of comparable magnitude*.“ Well, he found out that he could face his little terrier dog, but he couldn't face that space fleet back in 872 B.C., Galactic Time, see -- G.T. He couldn't face it but he could face a dog. What's the dog got to do with the space fleet? God knows. In fact, I doubt God would know, tell you frankly. Been through his records lately: terrible condition.

Yeah, I was looking around at one file called „*Earth*.“ Boy, is it scrambled.

Now, here we have, then, the lower orders of things in terms of cases, and all this pre-supposes that some awareness can be achieved by the pre-clear of the auditor. Because if no awareness can be achieved of the auditor, why, that's that. No awareness at all existed, why, he's dead as far as you're concerned. Just chalk him off -- chalk him off; run him for president.

You haven't any technique which takes a totally unaware person -- by the way, get that phrasing carefully, totally unaware person - - and puts him into a condition of awareness.

You would have to wait for some impulse of awareness of something and then do something with that. Do you understand that?

Now, it's not true that a person lying in a comatose state is totally unaware. A person who is normally considered unconscious is recording like mad, as we knew from old Dianetic days. And also, weirdly enough, a person who is unconscious or a person who is five hours old alike will understand commands and execute them to the best of their ability.

All right then. SLP 8 with these provisos is, of course, highly usable. It's usable only because it brings a person up in terms of awareness. He becomes aware of the universe; he becomes aware of what he's doing, where he's going, becomes aware of his goals, and so on.

So you might say offhand that your dedication here is to increasing awareness.

A criminal can only be a criminal, by the way, if he's unaware of the pain and misery which he causes. Politician can only yap-yap around about war as long as he's totally unaware of the other nation. It takes a very ignorant, unaware sort of a person to engage in criminal, political-standard type of political operation that you get in the mid-twentieth century. To engage in these activities he has to be very unaware.

Most of these people are in an obsessive game condition -- they're high unknowing games conditions, you see? They don't know what game they're playing but they're certainly working like mad at it. They have no great awareness of the opponent, and

so on. They have no real awareness that they're playing a game. It's quite fascinating, quite fascinating to assess their true state of case. They come as close to being un-processable as anything you ever saw. You'd have to hogtie them, jump up and down in front of them, mimic them in some fashion or another. I don't know, they're probably screamers, most of them. If you started to make very much motion in their vicinity or mimic them, or something of the sort, they'd probably scream or roar with anger or something of the sort.

This is -- I'm not being snide, by the way. I just wish you to have a fairly decent appreciation. What would you think of somebody who would casually contemplate the murder of ten or fifteen million people? This man couldn't possibly be considered sane, and he couldn't possibly be considered aware. He couldn't consider himself at all. Do you see this? It's a problem in unawareness. His ethics, his morality, his capability of good, sound judgment alike depend upon his ability to be aware. Do you see that? Unless he is aware, unless he can achieve an awareness of his environment and so on, he is not able to achieve an ethical standard.

Now, insanity is a highly specialized mechanism. It is not a mechanism which one suddenly descends into. It is an assumed mechanism like death. A very high-toned case can all of a sudden kick off the body. Similarly, a person can kick himself into insanity rather easily.

Insanity says, „*Even death would not avail me, but I am no further responsible and I should not further be punished.*“ It is not a consequence of a great many actions. We can synthesize the feeling of insanity by can't reach-must reach, can't withdraw- must withdraw, and we get that same sensation.

Sensation can turn on almost anywhere. It isn't something that is peculiar, then, to the Tone Scale. It'd actually be incorrect to mark some portion of the Tone Scale „*insane*.“ You see, that is not a good rule of thumb. But it is a good rule of thumb to mark some portion of the Tone Scale with degrees of unawareness, and that is what the Tone Scale is. Follow me?

Now, there are types of awareness which are rather interesting to observe. They're inverted awarenesses. The individual cannot be aware of anything right where he is but can be aware of something at a distance. The reversion of that is he can't be aware of anything at a distance, but he can be aware of something right where he is. „*Point out a place where you are not*“ gives us this at once. We start to run this technique -- just over and over, just old-time technique -- and the individual at first finds stuff way out, another universe and all sorts of things, and then he starts coming in, and eventually he finds something fairly close to him, and then eventually he points [to] stuff that goes way out again, and then it comes in and it goes out and it comes in. It's an interesting progression.

He's walking through various inversions. And so we have awarenesses alternating inside and outside, don't you see? And we have awarenesses also varying on the dynamics, and we have awarenesses varying on the Know to Mystery Scale. We have these things paralleled, why, we can get an awfully good notion of what we are up to with a preclear.

The auditor's awareness in operating with SLP 8 is, however, invited not to some hidden point; it's invited to rather obvious things.

Blindness, by the way, has its total causation in this. If you always depend on that wall to stop your sight, and then you never yourself stop your sight, then the stopping of sight becomes an automaticity. You must always be told at what depth to stop your sight. Do you follow me? Then if there's nothing there to stop your sight, you become discombobulated. And you start looking for hidden influences, which is merely a search for something to stop your sight. Why can't you stop your sight? See, why can't you make your sight rest at any given distance from you?

Well, now, it is a self-determined action, entirely self-determined, stopping your sight on something so that you can see it. And people get into circumstances where they themselves have not stopped their sight, but other things have stopped their sight so often that they no longer know where to stop their sight; they let other things judge it for them.

Thus diagnosis becomes difficult. One doesn't know where to stop his sight. He isn't even trying to stop his sight; he's waiting for something to leap up and stop his sight for him. And of course, the atomic physicist has gone right on down to the atom and the molecule and the electron and other probably nonexistent items in an effort to get something that will stop his sight. And he becomes quite frantic, by the way.

Now, the individual who speaks into nothingness -- he speaks into nothingness and finds himself growing apathetic -- is simply missing the usual backdrop which stops his voice. Do you see that? Now, he should be able to stop his voice.

Give you a demonstration of this. It's actually possible to stop your voice at certain points, at certain distances from yourself.

Phoenix Congress, one time I gave an example of this. It was very peculiar that the magnetic tape recording which was made of that particular thing followed right through with the test. When I was throwing my voice and stopping it in the back of the hall, it wasn't much going into the microphone although I was standing in front of the microphone. Voice was quite loud in the back of the hall and missing on the tape more or less. Just as an example. You stop your voice.

Now, if you depended on the back of the room, or the backdrop of the room, to stop your voice always, then one day you would be called upon to speak in a room that had no back, and you would find yourself very upset.

Now, if you depended always upon some object to stop your sight, then someday there would be no object there to stop your sight and you would start looking for something that would stop your sight. You aren't looking for anything but something which would arrest your vision.

If you see that clearly, you will understand this whole subject of diagnosis.

People become obsessed with looking for hidden influences. They try to look too deep. They look right on by; they look right on through the obvious.

Now, the reason that you are interested in obnosis (observing the obvious) is because it's an exercise in you stopping your sight, and you find it quite novel. You find it quite interesting: You're stopping your sight for a change. You're deciding where your sight is going to halt. It's quite remarkable. You decide that it will halt on a wart, not on a hidden particle which is a distant cousin of strontium 90 and is a cross between an electron and a giraffe. You see?

Well, an SLP is not devoted to diagnosis, beyond this point: You have to be able to observe when a comm lag is flat, when an ability is gained or a cognition has occurred. And if you can observe those three things, you can throw in a bridge and keep going.

But you have to be able to observe the obvious to know when the preclear has a somatic. A preclear always has a somatic visibly. He doesn't have to tell you he has a somatic. If you're looking at the preclear, you know he has a somatic.

I can tell you when a preclear is sitting on grief, when he's sitting in fear, when he's suddenly hit apathy, when he's becoming enthusiastic and so on. Even though he's a rather deadpan preclear, he couldn't hide this. It's written across his brow, but not even as spectacularly as that. He simply is giving the manifestation of that physically, and the physiological manifestation of it may be very minute, but trained observation renders this an elementary observation.

The pc says, „(Sigh!)“ That's a real obvious one, see?

You say, „*What's the matter?*“

He says, „*Nothing. Nothing the matter.*“

„*Well, what did you just hit?*“

„(Sigh!) *Nothing. I didn't hit anything.*“

„*Come on, come on, what did you just think about?*“

„(Sigh!) *Well, I guess it must be my wife. Yes, it's...*“

What am I doing to this guy? What am I doing just pestering him, bothering him, asking him what he did? I'm making him confront something and become aware of it. I'm punching him to pieces, as a matter of fact. I'm saying, „*Come on fellow. You got a sympathetic listener; take a look! You've got an assistant visio here; let's take a look at this thing.*“

He is not even aware of the fact that he is sighing, most ordinarily. Now, that is an obvious manifestation. How about the manifestation of fear which simply is registered in a tiny, tiny rigidity of shoulder. All of a sudden his shoulder becomes just a little more rigid. You wouldn't hardly notice this at all, but it's a difference.

You say, „*What's the matter?*“

„*Oh, nothing the matter. Why?*“

„*Well, what did you just think of just as you answered that question? What did you just think of when you executed that command?*“

„*Oh, nothing. I didn't think of anything as a matter of fact.*“ Shoulder goes more rigid.

*„You didn't think of anything? Well, all right, just what feeling went through you at that time?“*

*„No feeling at all. “*

*„No feeling at all, huh?“*

*„Except, of course... Well, a feeling like... You know, aren't we touching on awfully personal things?“*

In other words, all I'm doing is saying, *„Here you go boy, confront this; confront this now.“* Well, I know there's something there for him to confront, because he has just exhibited it, and I am a better observer than he is. That's all it amounts to.

I am not unaware of what he is unaware of. Part of his inability to observe this is, of course, his unawareness of its substance.

Well, we are really not asking him to look for hidden influences. The influence is just about as hidden as a neon sign in his life. This consistent grief registers and manifests itself in his abandonment of everything he undertakes, and yet he never observes that he's abandoning everything he undertakes, he just thinks life is being mean to him.

If you gave him a ten-dollar gold piece, he'd lay it down on the sidewalk and walk off. And you'd say, *„Why did you do that?“*

*„Oh,“* he said, *„it was taken from me.“* See how he's been living his life? Well, he hasn't observed this point.

Observing the obvious is very elementary, as a matter of fact, but it's knowing where to stop your sight. There's no sense in going on and on and on, and looking deeper and deeper and deeper for the hidden influence and the menace and the invisible particle and the lost universe and all that sort of thing. Why go on looking for this? Because they're not stopping the preclear's sight usually. The things that are stopping the preclear from living are written upon him; they're branded on him, thoroughly. And if you treat any of them, the whole case will fall out in your hands. It's not difficult to do this.

But SLP 8 does not demand such perspicuity of perception. It doesn't demand this exact observation. All it demands from you is that you start your preclear in the lower ranges and when his comm lags are flat, when his ability is regained, when his cognitions are reached, that you throw in a comm bridge and go forward. That's all it really demands.

Now, as I told Dr. Ladas the other day... He wanted to know *„Why an SLP?“* I told him that an SLP was a stopgap. It was a list of things which could be performed by people who could then achieve results without imposing upon them the necessity of being very perspicuous. And it was better to have an SLP than it was to have no results at all.

But the auditor observation -- if he knows his stuff -- the auditor observation is always better than an SLP. Because you demand of an SLP that it embrace all cases. And this is a fantastic request. You could not have an SLP which would operate with-

out an auditor. An SLP is always a servomechanism to an auditor who knows some procedure.

Therefore, an SLP is not anywhere near as vital to somebody who's been through an ACC (a good one) as it is to somebody who has not at all studied the subject close up but just read a book or two on it. He could take an SLP and he could probably get rather fantastic results with it, you see? So an SLP does have value, and having this value, it carries Scientology a lot further.

It's quite interesting that it's much easier to write an SLP -- difficult as it is to write an SLP and embrace all cases with an SLP -- than to try to embrace all auditors with good procedure. But it's much easier to teach an auditor in an ACC good procedure and then trust that his use of the SLPs will be modified by his power to observe.

All right. There are several classes of processing, and all of these classes are included in this SLP. But Confrontingness, you know, only goes up to Axiom 10, and Axiom 10 processes are also included in this SLP. And then higher than that we have the Creative Processes.

You want to be very chary of using Creative Processes just as such on any preclear who comes along, because they're usually entirely over his head, and all you do is scramble the bank. Do you follow me? I mean, it's...

Therefore, these lower ranges, basic Communication, Subjective Havingness, Objective Havingness, Substitution, and Confront are definitely the entering wedges.

And if you, in seventy-five hours, could carry a preclear all the way through those and just get him up within easy reach of an Axiom 10 process, you would have completely changed his life, and you very definitely would have created somebody who is way above the normal, average person.

You see, it's not a small goal you're reaching for just to embrace that; it's a very large one.

Well, it's all right for you to become very ambitious and say „*We're going to reach all the way up through these, the basic Communication Processes, the Subjective, the Objective Havingness Processes, push it up through Substitution, push it up through Confronting so on. Causative methods here. And then we're just going to shoot the moon, and we're going right on up through the remainder of the Axioms.*“ Well, that would be all right. It would be perfectly all right, unless your ambition overreaches the ability of the preclear. Because after that occurs, you give him loses, and having given him loses, why, he is then less able to follow forward than he was before. You see that?

So, you give the preclear wins, keep him in a games condition, life becomes eventually simple enough so that he could confront the basic truths contained between Axioms 1 and 10. All right.

Now, these processes, as I have them here, are not really in a final order. I would say that some of these positions are certain to be changed before the book „*How to Help Individuals*“ is written. It is very well for me to say, „*This is it,*“ and so on - - carry forward that way -- but the truth of the matter is, is we're not interested in my correct-



ness or positiveness. This couldn't have less importance, actually, to me. We're interested in rounding off and squaring up and making functional a subject and a study.

And you see some difference between my methods of proceeding, and the methods of those around me, and methods of proceeding which have been used in earlier times on similar and related subjects. There's quite a difference.

I would not stoop to the wishy-washy, doubtful, I'm-scared-to-be- wrong attitude of the modern scientist. It is too degraded; it just is practically regurgitive in its reaction.

Said to one of them one day -- he was selling me „*Well, according to Professor Wimphwomph, and according to that and that, well, I'm not sure. And daaah-daaah. And one has to maintain -- one has to maintain a scientific objectiveness about the whole thing*“

And I said, „*You sure that you aren't maintaining a political cowardice?*“ Took him a half an hour to understand what I was talking about. He actually, though, didn't take it as an insult; he was too low on the scale to consider it otherwise than a compliment. He thought I had at last perceived that he was being witty, and he perceived that he himself was being very smart. He thought he saw a reason for being very timid about ever declaring anything anything: You could be wrong. You could be fired. You could be kicked out of the university chemistry laboratory, don't you see?

Well, we're not in a position of being kicked out of anywhere. So we don't care whether we're right, whether we're wrong. I've been right many more times than I've been wrong. Any glaring errors on the backtrack are not very glaring.

I've led a few astray. Probably more than anything else, I led people astray who wanted to die by persuading them that through this road, we would eventually survive. I led them astray. They were bound on one path and we were bound on another one, and we dragged them along the survive track a bit far. We got them almost lost. There are some people around who can't even commit suicide now. But that's leading people astray.

But where the accuracy of these predictions is concerned, they have all turned out fairly well. But the more we know about this subject, the less we feel we have to be very didactic about it. The truth of some of these propositions is so sweeping, that if you think you would have to argue anyone into accepting them, it's something like arguing somebody into accepting a sixteen- inch shell. He hasn't got any say about it at all. If he can observe it at all, he will eventually become aware of it and become aware of it as a king block in his own life pattern. And he will say, „*Well now, that's what the universe is made out of*“ -- if he can observe at all.

Your engagement in arguments with the uninformed is the most wasted time that anybody ever possibly could expend, because if they don't click on what you're saying, if there isn't some little responsive spark, their degree of awareness is such that it is not probable that you will have any forward progress, no matter what the argument is, unless, of course, you backed it up with bayonets or something. And we're not in a political conquest here at all. It's a conquest of knowledge.

And somebody sits in the drawing room and says, „*Nyah-nyah*,“ or a couple of high-school kids that came in on Dr. Barrett here one night in the School of Life, and anything he said, why, they chopped him, see, one way or the other. They were being very wise, and they were being smart. And they walked away thinking they'd won. Yes, yes, they'd won a skull and crossbones. They actually sat here listening to Dr. Barrett, who is a very smart man, and these boys didn't know where they were going...

I just give you some blunt examples: They wouldn't know how to please a girl, procure a car -- you know, the elementary things - - work enough or procure some money. They sat there with more problems and more potential unhappiness, you see, than you could have baled up in a month of Sundays, and there they sat chopping somebody.

In other words, they were so unaware, they didn't even know they were in trouble. See, they didn't even know that they were that far gone.

Quite interesting. One looks with some... well, not sympathy certainly, but one looks with a certain degree of sadness, one might say, upon such an activity. And somebody's objections to what we're saying in Scientology is no slightest cue to me to suddenly mount my white charger and couch the lance, you know, and go down the course. No, I pat them on the head and say, „*Poor fellow*.“ A horrible thing to do; much more effective. Wonder when I'll be sending them flowers. What insane asylum will they be inside of as the years go by?

This has become very acutely factual, by the way, in handling the modern scene here. Way it looks to me... I've been looking over some health records here; I told you I was going to get the United States Health Department records.

And I got the retired director and got him on the ball. And boy, I possibly would not say too much, possibly, by saying that we can be certain that a Scientologist will survive this. We can be certain that a Scientologist will survive this, but we can't at all be certain about other people.

We have, through our years of processing and work and understanding, achieved an ability and a stability toward such phenomena which is entirely missing in all other stratas of life. And I would say, we are -- I'm sure, I just know very well that we could get through an atom-saturated Earth. You see, they can only saturate it so long, and then Homo old-style will no longer have the strength to push the bomb into the airplane and go drop it, do you see? So there is a stopping point there, and I'm sure that we can hit that level, and still live with considerable ease.

When I look at these fellows now, I'm like looking at an arena full of gladiators, you know? They are quite interesting. They're going to bat everyone in the head, but they don't know enough to get away with it. Our main line of approach here for years has actually placed us in a superior position with regard to atomic fission and other things. I mean just on a health level. A Scientologist doesn't get as sick as other people, that's all. He has a better health level. If he does get sick he pulls out of it faster, and so on. In other words, we have an edge.

Now, this SLP's value would be mainly found in spreading that edge. And if this SLP could make it easier for more auditors not precisely trained to spread that edge, why, you see, there'd be more of us still alive a few years from now, so it does have that value at this time.

Now, the first level of this is very fundamental. It's as low as we've got. If anybody is at all aware, then we have ways and means of making them aware of us. And if that is the case, communication can begin. Do you see that? Obvious simplicity. So there's where this SLP starts.

Let's take an insane person. We would mimic the insane person until the insane person were aware of us, and then we would use Mimicry Processes and other processes until we had him up to where his awareness of us and his environment was better. Don't you see? Now, you know how to do that, and you have been taught rather thoroughly on that. It would be very difficult to give in writing what you have learned in this ACC -- very, very difficult. All right.

Things like „*Look at me. Who am I?*“ identification types of processes, that sort of thing, all belong in this communication level.

Now, we're establishing the rudiments with communication, and we continue to establish the rudiments. And it could be said, if we continued only to establish the rudiments for the next 189 hours and a half of processing, we would win like mad. Do you see that? Because essentially what is life? There is nothing wrong with the fellow except his awareness of other dynamics; his awareness of these things is withheld, unwilling, devious, too meaningful, too significant. His awareness of other dynamics is in difficulty, so that if we can get him to locate one person and one room and one self, man, what we will have achieved!

So, we cannot minimize „*Look at me. Who am I?*“ „*What are you doing?*“ the old standby for the preclear who can't find out he's being audited. „*What are you doing right now?*“

I have another variation of this that's one step removed and works better: „*What do you want to be audited for?*“ just as though, and asked as though, it's a personal imposition on his part with regard to me. And I make him explain himself, and I make him get reasonable about the whole thing. In that he does not realize he's in session, he comes into a cognition after a while that he is in session -- but that he's been in session for some time with some other „*auditor*,“ which he confuses with an auditor, such as the doctor at birth. You get the idea?

„*Oh, what do you want to be audited for? Go on, explain yourself here.*“

„*Well, you're a good auditor. You're a good auditor, Ron. You get terrific results. I mean, you know, you do things for people. All right.*“

„*Yeah, well, how do you know that?*“

„*Well, I read papers. I listen to people. I read this and that.*“

„*Well, have you ever seen it yourself?*“

*„No, no, no, come to think about it I haven't. But I just sort of know, you see? I just know that you could help me.“*

*„Well, how could I help you? Why could I help you? What do you want to be audited for anyway?“*  
Hitting his level of argumentation and so on.

Now, we take the reverse of this. Quite workable on people who don't want to be audited. All they're aware of is that they don't want to be audited. They don't want to be helped; they don't want to be assisted; they don't want. They know this for sure.

So, I ask them to explain this. And although two-way communication chops up their havingness madly -- remember that; it always does -- nevertheless it's better than sitting in the soup they're sitting in, always better.

*„Well, why don't you want to be audited?“*

*„Well, my brother Bill had a tonsillectomy once and he couldn't talk for a week.“*

*„Well, what's that got to do...? You explain to me the similarity between a tonsillectomy and being audited.“*

*„Well, the same situation. You sit in a room and so on. Well hell, there's no difference. What are you talking about?“*

*„All right, now you tell me why you don't want to be audited.“*

It's quite amazing. You get into amazing, impassioned arguments with these people. You the auditor maintain pleasant ARC throughout, you see? You're auditing them right straight down the line. And then after a while they find it out, and you have established at least that much of the rudiments; a session is in progress.

In other words, this is another method and an undercutting of *„a session is in progress.“* You're trying to get a gradient scale here. A session is not in progress and we gradually gradient- scale it into being in progress by asking the fellow why he wants to be audited, or why he doesn't want to be audited, and we eventually achieve a session in progress on this gradient scale.

In other words, we don't run an unknowing session on him. That's another gag entirely: We're auditing him and he doesn't know it.

I rather frown on that, in spite of the fact that I have done it to U.S. senators and things. I have done it to people; I've done it to people in the British government, so on. They're not sure what it's all about. It leaves them in a spooked condition, but that was my intention.

Now, good auditing is accomplished on a knowingness basis, and the individual when he discovers that a session is in progress is capable, then, of responding to this. He finds out he is doing something. He is engaging in a life activity. And this life activity consists of communicating with another being, and he's participating in a moment of life of such and such a date, such and such an hour, such and such a minute.

You see, he is finding himself in present time. You see, he can identify present time because a session is in progress. So if you only establish these three things with these basic rudiments, you would go a long ways.

But we would take off from there and go into Subjective Havingness. We make sure that a preclear can remedy his havingness subjectively no matter if he's a black case or a pink case before we go any further. Why? Because it's a safety valve. It's a good thing to do; very good thing to do.

And he can't be gotten into trouble thereafter by an auditor. You see that? He can remedy havingness. At the last moment when he's just about to sink out of sight, why, somebody can still remedy his havingness. Do you see that?

Whereas a black case that cannot remedy its havingness is surrounded by black screens, which screens are perpetually absorbing all the havingness he receives from anything, and anything you do with him is an uphill climb.

Blackness and a black field has been solved by putting blackness into the walls. Just that, nothing more. Put blackness into the walls, six walls around. But it's much better to do it by a Subjective Remedy of Havingness: *„Mock up a black object in a black...“* -- in the black field which he has there -- just *„Mock up a black object. Shove it into the body. Mock it up. Shove it in. Mock it up. Shove it in. Mock it up. Shove it in. Mock up a black object. Shove it in.“* That's all it is.

Then *„Mock up a black object and let it remain. Mock up a black object and throw it away.“* In some gradients we can get him to do all three of these actions, we can then get him to get mock-ups rather easily, and he can then see his facsimiles, and he can do all sorts of interesting things.

Now, there is the fellow with the blank field. He is no different from the black field. You have him mock up blank objects, invisible objects, don't you see, and shove them in and remedy havingness with them. Blows a case all over seven states.

He says, *„I'm looking at nothing“*

*„Good. Mock up a good, solid nothing and throw it in.“*

Subjective Remedy of Havingness is number 2 on that list. And then we get the various Control Processes. First is Part A of 8- C: *„Touch the object and let go of it,“* you know, a walk-about.

And then we get Tactile 8-C: *„Look around the room and find something you wouldn't mind having“* (or could have or something of the sort), *„and you walk over to it and feel it.“* Got it? That's a Tactile 8-C. That combines 8-C and a Havingness Process and is one of the most drastically effective things you've ever cared to drill a preclear through. Combines these two things.

Now, the next process on this list is Start-C-S. You don't run him very long on Start or Change or Stop; you just dabble with it. It's the easiest thing anybody ever ran. It really is. It's just Start-C-S. You monkey with it. You monkey with some Start, and you fool around with some Change, and you fool around, but not very thoroughly,

with some Stop. And you monkey with this and that. And you just make sure that he does these things, that's all; and you pat him on the back and yackle-yackle with him and so on. Don't push him; don't crowd him. Because you push somebody on Change and wow! wow! wow! you can get him into more confusion than he's been in, in many a day, see? This is a real beefy process, and when you run it here as Step 5 of SLP 8, why, remember that's just a dabble.

You don't goof as an auditor; see, you don't goof at all. You're very precise with your controls and so on, but you are not at all didactic about how thoroughly he starts or how thoroughly he changes or how thoroughly he stops. You got the idea?

*„Now you just stop when you want to. I'm going to indicate to you some point or another when I want you to stop. And then when you decide that you're going to stop, why, you stop too,“* you know, and he walks on fifteen paces before he can finally find out that he's going to stop. You got the idea? Very imprecise as far as what the preclear does, but extremely precise as far as what the auditor does, see?

Now we have *„Keep it from going away.“* *„Keep it from going away“* is, of course, a very easy thing. We have a routine with two nonsignificant objects. We run two nonsignificant objects, and then we run two significant objects if we want to.

Two nonsignificant objects, we just pick them up, that don't mean anything particular to the preclear; we have him put one on one arm of his chair and one on the other arm of his chair, or on the table in front of him -- you must have some support for these objects -- and we have him now with two nonsignificant objects, one to the right of him, one to left of him. He's sitting down -- preclear is sitting down and the auditor is sitting down too. You see that?

And we give these commands: *„Look at the \_\_\_\_\_“* (well, it's object one, whatever you call it). *„Pick it up. Keep it from going away.“*

Now, *„You keep it from going away“* is the insisting version, see? But *„Look at it. Pick it up. Keep it from going away.“* And *„Put it back exactly in the same place.“*

Now, you have him look at the other one. You say *„Look at it. Pick it up. Keep it from going away. Put it back in exactly the same place.“* That's the simplest version of it, see?

Now we complicate this. We say *„Look at it. Pick it up. Keep it from going away. Put it back in exactly the same place and leave it entirely uncontrolled.“* And then we do that with the two, just repetitively and so on.

It is a version of Op Pro by Dup. That is -- it's a beast; it's a beast! Now, that is a sneaky confront. You noticed we've used here nothing but havingnesses and direction and communication right up to this time, and that's a sneaky confrontingness.

Now, there's a great deal of the *„Keep it from going away.“* *„Keep it from going away on the body“*; *„Keep the hand from going away“* and so on is the quickest relief for chronic somatics for most levels of case if you can really get them to do it.

Very often the case is too apathetic and it really can't do it and will just dog on it for hours. You've overshot the process rather easily.

Number 8 is „*Keep it from going away by sight.*“ In other words, not with the hands but by sight. You've graduated him to the simplicity of keeping something from going away by sight.

Many people would be willing to do this before they would keep it from going away with their hands. You run the hands...

Now there's Connectedness. Very simple: „*Look around and find something you wouldn't mind making connect with you.*“ „*On how many vias could you make it connect?*“ That's the auditing command. „*You make it connect with you.*“

You see now, we've been running Havingness and Communication. This Connectedness is a communication. „*Keep it from going away*“ is „*I can continue to communicate with it,*“ don't you see, and so on.

And now we sneak upstairs into the next level and this is a whole class of processes and these are the Confusion Processes. And here we handle the rest point and the stable datum with substitutions and other „*means*“ here.

The basic one on this is „*This means go to \_\_\_\_\_,*“ having the walls talk to him. It's the most elementary and sweeping one. „*This means go to*“.

„*This means don't go to \_\_\_\_\_.*“ In other words, you're substituting places for where he isn't. Got it? It's a very complicated process, by the way. You go six times around „*This means go to \_\_\_\_\_,*“ six times around „*This means don't go to \_\_\_\_\_.*“ When you've got that pair flat, alternating, then you say six times around, „*This means stay in \_\_\_\_\_,*“ „*This means don't stay in \_\_\_\_\_,*“ and so on. You're getting substitute locations, substitute spots. You'll find it'll give him new rest points and it'll do other interesting things for him. It won't run on a case that can't put a postulate in a wall.

Now, we have all sorts of oddities in here in this same bracket. We have 11, „*Confuse that wall.*“ Lovely process; pretty wild. You're making the wall substitute for all kinds of things all over. You just tell the fellow to confuse the wall.

If he's ever painted, for instance, he's had this flat, dead canvas sitting in front of him; he's trying to make it alive. You know? The sheet music, he was trying to make it alive. The person, he was trying to make it alive. So he's actually wound up in a confusion as a substitute for alive: If you want to make something alive you confuse it. That's about where he is sitting. „*Confuse that wall.*“

Number 12: „*A confusion which you could cause.*“ „*Mock up a confusion.*“ The lightest one is „*A confusion you could cause.*“ „*Just tell me a confusion you could cause right now.*“ That is the lighter one. And then „*Mock up a confusion.*“ This all goes into the thing. Now, you're just substituting confusions. You're giving him enough confusions to substitute for the confusions that he is sitting in, you see? And you run it by substitutes. You see, it's not necessarily true that he doesn't have enough confusions; it is only true that he is fighting back against a confusion he can't have. And you give him substitute confusions he can have, and he eventually can accept the confusion, see? Substitution processes.

Now, we go up the line up here and we get now into the bearcat of substitution. The Substitute Stop, this could be called, and it's called actually Stop-C-S, run in all violence. That's the Substitute Stop. You're substituting this stop for other stops he's stopped. He can tolerate this stop, but he couldn't tolerate the auto-accident stop. So you make him stop, see, and you get substitute stops. And he comes all the way up.

If he can run this it's terrific. Anybody can run this given enough -- a sufficiently violent auditor who's sufficiently precise.

Tolerance of Motion and Stillness is number 14; Tolerance of Motion and Stillness. All kinds of oddities here can be run. Such as you have him go outside and spot something that's moving, spot something standing still. A lot of preclears that are in bad shape spot them in reverse, by the way. See an automobile go down the street and say, „*That's still.*“ You're looking right straight into his case; he's on an inverted situation there.

Now, funny part of it is that all of our Confrontingness Processes, Objective or Subjective Confrontingness Processes, run from there on up -- all the Confrontingness Processes I've been telling you about -- and then above these are the Subjective Confrontingness Processes: „*Mock it up and make it confront.*“ You see?

Now, when I say Confrontingness Process, I don't mean a covert one like 8-C, Part A, I mean an overt one: „*You confront that wall!*“ „*Find a still spot somewhere around here and you make your body confront it!*“ „*Drive that car down the road and make it confront that space!*“ Tears out every auto accident you ever had -- every accident they ever had. Actually that's the way you should drive a car. You should make it confront that road. It shouldn't be making you confront anything.

And we get all of these confrontingnesses, and they go up, then, into the creative levels of processes, which we have not much taken up in this ACC but which we have taken up bounteously in other ACCs. We just were over the head of a lot of pcs.

Now, these areas of confrontingness, all these Confronting Processes, as I say, they're objective and then subjective, but no precise number is assigned to any of these because some people can do them subjective before they can do them objective and vice versa.

Now, Over and Under: „*Confront that bank*“ is all that process should be called. It really is „*Confront that bank.*“ We just run all variations of that. And then we move upstairs and we get to the Not-Know Processes -- well up, the Not-Know Processes -- and above the Not-Know Processes, why, we have straight creation, just straight creation. The auditing command of that is „*Create a Universe. Move in.*“

Thank you very much.

Thank you.

[End of Lecture]