AUDITING TECHNIQUES: PROCEDURE CCH

A lecture given on 4 February 1957

[Start of Lecture] Thank you.

And this is February 4th, 1957, the twenty-third lecture of the 16th ACC.

I want to talk now concerning the factual -- terribly factual -- end results of all of the technique theory I've been handing you, and so on. We've been talking about techniques, talking about techniques, talking about techniques. Haven't we? And here we give an intensive which is Procedure Control, Communication and Havingness -- Procedure CCH. Control, Communication and Havingness.

I told you a long time ago that these three things did combine. Control, communication and havingness -- they combine.

Now, if you did combine them to an infinite, you would get something on the order of what I have given you here. However, what I have given you here is just about every functional process, in some sort of a scale, that we know anything about. I mean, it's quite interesting. We've just fitted in a great many functional processes that work under communication, control and havingness, and these are worked into a series so you will see where they belong. It's not that you run all these in series; it's more or less where they belong.

But if you were to go from the bottom to the top of this Procedure CCH, you would certainly wind up with quite a preclear, quite a preclear. In other words, we have, you might say, arrived at a point of definiteness in processing which is a great relief, to say the least.

Now, when you run processes, you had better run them under this criteria: Is it a games condition? Very important. Is it a games condition? That's very, very important.

And from that point on, does it improve the preclear's ability to communicate, control, waste, substitute, have, confront, contribute to, and create? -- which is the Scale of Havingness. Does it do all these things for a preclear?

Now, if you do all these things for a preclear, you've done it. What else are you trying to do? Nothing. See? Nothing else to do for a preclear.

You going to change his mind? Phooey! What's the idea of trying to change something's mind that can always change its mind?

The trouble with a thetan is not his ability to get or change ideas. This is what he does most easily and best. So what you working about that for? He does that very easily. What's wrong with him is not this, but that he has become obsessed with various miscommunications, miscontrols and errors on havingness. Do you see this? He'd be most easily possessed, obsessed or upset in these various lines: communication, control and the Havingness Scale. These are where he's upset; he's not upset about ideas.

Now, he could be upset about ideas about these things. But he's upset about the thing, not the idea about it. You got the idea?

Now, you take something like Rising Scale Processing -- yes, yes, highly workable. Problems of Comparable Magnitude -- yes, yes. But you're already into Tolerances.

Rising Scale Processes have a distinct liability, which is a tremendous liability: is you're liable to take out of the confusion the idea which is its stable datum -- on anybody who is upset about havingness. Now, a person has to be pretty upset about havingness to run into the idea of the rest point, stable datum and the confusion. You see that? Rest point, the confusion, stable datum, that sort of thing. He has to be upset about space and terminals and particles and form to have any upset about their significances.

In other words, he doesn't get at all upset about a significance unless he is already upset about the thing which is significant. Got the idea? He cannot be upset about Mother without a terminal called Mother. The way you upset [remedy] all the ideas about Mother is to remedy the upset about the terminal called Mother. Mother talked; Mother slapped; Mother gave things and took them away, see? For any of these things to be upsetting, we first have to have an upset about the terminal. This is what we say, processing the particle. Why do you process a particle? There isn't any sense in it. Never process one.

Mama may have stood over the crib from earliest days right straight on through to high school (still keeping the child in a crib), saying, *„All women are bad. All women are bad. All women are bad. All women are bad. All women are bad. All women are bad.“* You right away are going to say, *„Well gee, I know what's wrong with this case. He's got the idea that all women are bad. Let's take that out of the case.“* No, you're not. You're not going to do it.

„All women are bad“ is probably way back on the track before Mama. Mama probably just keyed it in, anyhow. It's just an idea. Consider that phrase, *„all women are bad,“* as a particle leaking from a terminal. See? So what do you do? You remedy the terminal.

Now, the terminal that you remedy is not women. That isn't the terminal you remedy. You best remedy the terminal from which the particle came. But all of these significances about terminals merely boils down to the fact that somebody was upset about a terminal.

All right, let's go into this now: He had to be upset about space in order to fix on a terminal. Now, he had to be upset about terminals to be upset about the particles which were coming from the terminal. Got it? Hm? Got that clearly? He had to be upset about terminals as a subject before he could be upset about a particular terminal which gave him some ideas about other terminals -- to be upset about Mother, who said, *„All women are bad."*

The shallowest look says just remedy the idea. But that's a very inverted idea. Why does the idea have impressiveness? The idea has impressiveness because the individual is upset about terminals. The terminal is what's impressive, not the idea. The idea is held in force, you might say, by the impress of the terminal. Got that?

The idea doesn't have any force unless it has a terminal, real or fancied, behind it. The only reason a person doesn't change ideas is because he's impressed about masses and spaces.

You can ask a person such a question as this: *„Should ideas be anchored in space or should they just drift in space? Are ideas positioned in space or aren't they?"* Oh, you can throw some figure-figure case on a comm lag like this that just goes on and on and on and on and on. And as a matter of fact, he doesn't have to be a figure-figure case. It's an interesting one.

Well look, space is an idea, so space is secondary to an idea. But now the person has adopted space, and now he's getting ideas subordinate to space. And the ideas which he got subordinate to space were conditional upon the existence of the space for their force or influence upon him.

The distance between here and New York gives us a very, very solid, fixed idea -- do you see that? -- which is held in place by the distance between here and New York. Got that there? Sometimes it's a little bit difficult for somebody to see this.

But you look down the scale, and you find out he could get ideas about anything, he could get considerations about anything, he could consider anything he wanted to, and so on. And he made something, and then after that he had it. So now ideas about it were secondary to having made it. So he starts to change his ideas about it, and he runs into it. So he doesn't want to run into it, so he changes his ideas back. Therefore, he gets fixed ideas.

Now, we can get, amongst us, all the ideas we want to concerning the distance between here and New York. There's nothing to this; it's very easy. We can say, *„Well, it's only 5 miles to New York."* Go ahead, now walk it. But you said it was only 5 miles to New York. No, I'm afraid you'd walk the 197 or 205, or however many miles it is.

You could now get the idea it's 5 miles to New York and start out to walk 5 miles to New York, and boy, would you be wrong. See, you'd walk the 197 miles.

This is what's known as making a liar out of yourself. You take something on which there's a terrifically fixed agreement, then you change your mind about that fixed agreement and then behave accordingly. People'd think you'd become bereft of your senses, to say the least. You start out to walk 197 miles by walking 5 miles, and you find yourself halfway to Hyattsville and you have not yet reached the Pulaski Skyway.

Now, it's all right for you to say the MEST universe is simply an idea. But if it is an idea upon which there is tremendous agreement, which resulted in space and terminals, and you now have a series of significances which apply, and they're very, very definitely below, subordinate to, contingent upon something you already have a big idea about, you're not going to change your mind and get the space between here and New York to collapse.

In order to get the distance between here and New York down to 5 miles, I am afraid that you would have to become totally tolerant of MEST-universe distances and terminals -- which is spaces and terminals. And if you had those well under your control, and you could change those ideas, then you could change the distance between here and New York. So suddenly the realtors at Hyattsville would find out that they were being held by New York State statutes.

But boy, would you have to have graduated upstairs. To what? Well, you'd have to tolerate energy -- particles, you know, that sort of thing. And you would get into the tolerance of that by tolerating terminals. And you'd tolerate the terminals very nicely, and you'd have to tolerate the spaces amongst the terminals, which is space. And if you got all that tolerated, then you could probably tolerate your own ideas. Be the first time. But as long as your ideas are always conditional upon other fixed ideas which you have, you're not going to modify very well.

Now, you can do this sort of thing: You can say *„I'm going to go to New York next time as though it's 5 miles."* Ah, that's all right. Take a tranquilizer or some other *„great medical miracle drug"* -- as advertised in the American Weekly in the comic strips -- and snore your way through to New York on some means of transport. And you could probably flimflam or fool yourself into thinking that it was as if you had only gone 5 miles, see? Look at the methods, methods, methods, conditions, conditions, special considerations, and so forth.

So that you can always change ideas, and fool around with a bunch more methodology when you're already suffering from a lot of methodology. You can always do this. You can get a tremendous idea about building an automobile which has one wheel or something, and cut down the number of moving parts to one wheel, and put the motor in the hubcap. You can always do something like this about distance, as long as you're sold on the distance. So you have to be sold on the prior considerations, and the prior considerations have to be held in place while you are trying to change them, for you to get into trouble.

Trying to hold the idea of MEST-universe space into place while you do something about distance is one of the more interesting things to do. You're laying down this distance, you see, with molten steel, you might say, and you're saying, *„That's the dis-*

tance!" And all the time you're doing that you're saying, *„Well, I'm going to make it shorter than that,"* and so on. All the time you're saying, *„This distance is fixed!"* See?

In other words, you merely have idea-counter-idea. You have a great big, agreed-upon idea, and you're trying to counter this great big, agreed-upon idea with some little, tiny, puny idea that's only you, see? And it isn't an equal struggle. The little old idea you have is overwhelmed rather easily. See that? Hence, the anatomy of fixed ideas.

You have to get a tolerance of fixed ideas before you can fix ideas, which is quite interesting. You have to look at a fixed idea and be able to have that idea and tolerate that idea, and you can undoubtedly then, and only then, really create as fixed an idea as that.

So you go looking at all these significances, and you go handling processes which handle only significances and that change people's minds, and so forth. They've already got the idea they're sitting in an auditing room. They've already got the idea that they're almost a body where they are, and almost a body where the auditor is. And the fixed agreements are this way and that way and the other way on terminals and spaces and locations therein. Then you come along and you're going to run some kind of a significance, idea, are you? Well, you're not going to get very far with it; you're going to have to handle at least some specialized kind of energy. That was Dianetics, see? You're at least going to have to handle energy in some fashion or another, because there's a big fixed agreement and idea.

So we find out rather amazingly that particles evidently are totally contingent upon terminals, and we evidently can skip processing lots of invisible and wiggle-wiggle particles, and so forth.

Now, tolerance of those things, however -- tolerance of these little wiggle-wiggles, the particles -- is very interesting because it depends on an individual's tolerance of the terminal upon which they're impinging. And if you don't like the terminal in which you're sitting, you might even help out some of those invisible wiggle-wiggles, see? If you're all messed up about a terminal, then you can be all messed up about particles, and you can be all messed up.

Now, communication is the idea of an interchange between two terminals across space. That's normally what we consider communication to be. It has a lot of rules and definitions and so on, the way we use it, but that's all in the realm of particles. And we are very fortunate that we have a process which simply takes care of particles all the time you're taking care of everything else, and apparently does so.

An individual who is awfully upset about particles is upset about communication. If you get him over being upset about communication, he gets over being upset about particles. How do you get him over that? Well, solid lines, Contact Hand Mimicry, or something of the sort -- we're off to the races. Follow this?

Now, if you want to do something with terminals in spaces (you see, that's a little different than communication), why, you certainly better have some command of control. You better know what control is all about and be able to effect control.

There's all kinds of methodology mixed up with control. Oh, tremendous methodology. Wow! University of Southern California idea of how to control people: You convince them they're insane and they talk in their sleep. And you tell them that they talk in their sleep, and they've uttered certain utterances that they don't know about and you do know about, and you get them very, very confused. And then you put in certain fixed ideas into this confusion, and you're all set. I mean, this is actually textbook for them. That's a method of controlling people.

I never saw anybody in Southern California ever move anybody ten feet, except to make them run away maybe. See, I just never saw this control result out of this. This is a sort of a 1.1 methodology, got it? And all the way you control a person is to take hold of them and put them someplace else, or keep them from going. Got the idea?

Control is awfully rudimentary. And to somebody who had studied phrenology down in the University, there, of Southern California, it'd just be wild. I mean, he just no more could grasp this -- he couldn't under any circumstances envision that this tremendous subject of putting anybody under control could be classified under Start, Stop and Change. He couldn't see this at all, see? He'd think of stopping thoughts and starting thoughts and changing thoughts or something like this; but as far as actually starting somebody or stopping somebody or putting somebody in some different direction -- wow! See, that looks like big effort.

But now we have a sort of a particle flow joined up to a terminal, and we have our second stage on particles in spaces. See? Communication's your first stage; control is a second stage. You're doing something with the terminal, and you normally are using particles of some sort or another, or lines, in order to accomplish this. And then you graduate up to being able to control things with ideas only. Well, where does that happen? When you have already overcome any intolerances you have about terminals or about spaces. And then you see some old lady start to step down off the curb in front of the oncoming traffic, and you simply step back up on the curb again. As far as she could tell, she changed her mind. As far as you could tell, you merely stepped her back up on the curb. Got this? How do you control somebody? Well, how do you walk?

Now, phrenology (miceology) has us believe that walking is controlled by a bunch of relays in a brain. And I've tried and tried to get my brain to make my body walk, and it won't do it. It just does not do it, that's all. My body walks anyplace, I'm afraid I have to walk it. In other words, I have to walk. It isn't even *„I have to walk my body.“* See, that's too many vias. I have to walk in order to have my body walk.

Now, I can become unaware of the fact that I am making my body walk, and still have my body walk. But am I really in control of it?

Now, a person is really in control of his body to the degree that he is aware of the fact that he is making it do what it does. It's as simple as that. We do these unawareness actions, we are still doing the controlling on a number of vias, so that we are not aware of any of these vias, and we think we're all set.

Actually, an automobile (although they're fun) could be quite aberrative. An automobile is controlling a body -- is starting, changing and stopping a body -- on a number of vias, of which the usual driver is not at all aware. The machinery is doing it. The machinery is actually making these changes occur.

Now, what machinery is it? Well, he's not aware of what machinery it is; it's just „*Something is doing it.*" And you spend some money, and you put it in a gas tank, and you're all set.

Now, because we have automobiles, people get the idea that a body is motivated and powered by fuel. I have had the experience of being warmer on a cold day only after I ate. In other words, I was cold just before I had eaten, I ate something, and I was not that cold. And that's good. I mean, that's fine. That's a great way to figure it all out, and it's okay, except I had already made up my mind that was the case. You see that? I'd already made up my mind that that was the case; and if that was the case, it was the case, and that was the way it was.

Now, I must have made up my mind about a bunch of mechanical rules and laws in order to have an automobile move my body around. I must have forgotten all of them -- become totally unaware of the whole works -- in order to have it be functioning and effective now. You cannot have an effect upon yourself from any source [other] than that upon which you have already agreed. Every effect from which you will ever suffer or react or experience is within the framework of your own initiation. I'm afraid that hangs you.

You had to agree to electronics, mechanics, particles, behaviors, laws of locomotion and assassination, before any of these things could occur to you. It's cause-distance-effect. And unless you have a cause-distance-effect, you aren't, where that is concerned. Now, you can postulate them or agree. You can actively create it or merely agree to the fact that it is created, but you had to do that.

I dare say there is maybe somebody alive in the world today that, when he gets in an automobile, does not get moved from point A to B. He never agreed that a vehicle could move him from point A to B. He has no agreement of any kind on the subject of vehicles. But unfortunately, by taking a body he agrees to all of the conditions of locomotion that the body has agreed to. In other words, he agrees to the agreement. He can therefore agree to the pattern of agreement. He can agree to a whole pattern of agreement, all in one agreement. In other words, his agreements can be multiple. But the funny part of it is, he doesn't blindly agree to any of these things.

It's only what was in the pattern that he himself was aware of and agreed to that can affect or influence him. Now, if a thetan has not agreed to a body, the body might move from point A to B in an automobile, but he undoubtedly would stay where he was. You get the odd conditions which might get laid down here.

All right. On communication and control, we move up into terminals. One of the basic rules of a terminal is that it's a potential communication point. And if you have two terminals, you're not so bad. But if you've got two terminals that are one terminal, this is a mess. So the first step, you might say, of the differentiation of terminals

would be the differentiation of problems. It permits a person to differentiate amongst locations, positions, by permitting him, actually, basically, to go upstairs on just significances at first. You move him up to this.

So you've got problems. You've got terminal-counter-terminal. And that again is communication, that again is control, that is invisible particles; that's all sorts of things. You would never know you were controlling a terminal unless you could see it in action in relationship to another terminal.

If you had one terminal out in unlimited space, you would discover very shortly that no matter where you sent it or from where you brought it back, you would never know. Do you see? Because it does not move in relationship to anything else. Therefore, does it move? (Question mark.)

In order to prove it to yourself and check yourself on this, you have two terminals. And you move one in relationship to the other.

Now, maybe a man is one terminal, Earth is another terminal, and so we walk him to New York, see? And he moves, then, observably, whatever the mileage is -- 197 miles. See? He observably changes position. In relationship to what? In relationship to the terminal called Earth.

Supposing we just had a man in unlimited space, and we moved him 197 miles. I'm afraid there is nothing which would ever demonstrate or conclude the 197 miles except our statement that we simply moved him 197 miles. But we might as well have left him completely still. There was no other point of reference to move him in relationship to. As a result, our basic conclusion about terminals is that there've got to be a couple terminals. So we get up into two data so that we can tell the importance of one datum and another datum.

And we get this interesting circumstance of problems of comparable magnitude. We're running, at once, two data; and we're running, at once, two terminals. Is one datum important, or isn't it? Is one datum a datum? Well, it isn't unless it has an evaluation from another datum.

For instance, God, in the early days of God knows where. Well, let's take the coven, and so forth, in the usual origins of Christianity (which normally go back to the peasant or hunting societies), and we find that the goodness of God comes about only because of the badness of the Evil One, who takes his cue from the tremendous reputation generated by many disrelated evil spirits. And we find out then that the goodness of God is understood by the badness of the Devil. And we can't have a good God without having a bad Devil. As a matter of fact, we can't have a God without having a Devil. Therefore, there is only one God.

I don't know what the Devil is. As a matter of fact, devil means „*little god.*" By the way, the god of any old religion becomes the devil of the new, always. It's one of the working principles of religions: The god of the old religion becomes the devil of the new. Devil merely means „*small god,*" or „*old god,*" or „*then god.*"

But if you wanted God to get real small, you'd then let the Devil get real puny. So you get a decline of people's ideas of God.

This is within the understanding of man and the principles with which man works: That data is understood to the degree that it can be related. And if a datum cannot be related, it then cannot be understood.

So that you have anybody who is a (quote) „*foreigner*" (unquote) arriving singly, as one, we cannot say he has a behavior pattern unless we say he has a behavior pattern in relationship to something that we already understand. We'd have to compare him to an American or we'd have to compare him to an Englishman in order to get any kind of understanding of the fellow at all.

Now, supposing a Martian shows up who isn't built out of flesh, and who doesn't talk with language, and a few other things, and we'd have people standing around trying to understand this. But they would do it by substitutions, and there would be some wild ones. And there would be a long time before anybody got to any agreement on that. But if anybody could relate one Martian to another Martian and relate both Martians to the Martian culture, then we could understand whether these were good or bad Martians, see, and whether or not their behavior pattern was this or was that, and what it meant in relationship to this one.

If we just took one individual Martian and tried to evaluate the culture of Mars, we'd just be guessing. We'd be writing anthropological texts such as those that were authored by the early explorers -- which were quite amusing -- about how you went out to the edge of the world and fell over, and so on.

They had an awfully hard time understanding this particular planet, amongst themselves, until they could put a telescope on another one. Up to that time the Earth was flat; it was flat, and you had all sorts of wild things. It made the wildest panorama of imagination upon which nobody could agree. And therefore, we had no understanding and it didn't communicate, and it didn't do a lot of things, and things were pretty tumultuous. And we had the physical sciences in about the same frame of reference in regard to the material universe as psychiatry is today with regard to the actual human being.

I mean, he hasn't even imagined one (the psychiatrist). He's comparing a human being to textbooks or something of the sort. And you get these wild imaginations going forward. And nobody agrees with anybody. Anything is a schizophrenic. Any time they don't know what to say, they say, „*Well, he's a schizophrenic.*" Paranoia. You don't know what to say -- „*He's paranoid,*" „*He's a psychopathic personality.*" What are these things? You see, they just aren't Evidently, each has never looked at any other. We have no frame of reference, we have no observation of the subject, we have no agreement thereon; therefore, we don't have any luck at it at all.

By the way, the number of years one attends school goes up in direct ratio to the inability of the professor to understand and talk. One goes to school almost in direct ratio to the lack of understanding on the subject in terms of time. In other words, if you had a totally uncomprehended subject, you would probably start in at the year

„one minute" and go on through to seventy without ever having comprehended anything. All data would be disrelated data, see?

The way you do today with the human body: You think you're there to learn, and your school continues from the moment you pick one up to the moment you lay one down. And then you pick up another one, and you lay it down. You don't comprehend it anywhere along the line anyplace; that's because you only get stuck to one body. If you were stuck to two bodies, you'd have some basis of comparison. You'd know whether body A hurt or not in relationship to body B.

You very often find a small child with a violent somatic which has been going on for years, but he thinks this is merely normal. And you suddenly take it away from him with some highly generalized process, and the child will be very upset for a little while. Life is not normal; he is not a normal being. Why isn't he a normal being? Well, his back doesn't hurt. You could look for small children who are quite agitated or upset to be continually suffering from a chronic somatic which they are not capable of evaluating. And they think this is life. See, they haven't learned at all.

Now, a person has even gone beyond comparing the body he has to the last body he had. A person isn't even comparing bodies anymore from one track to another. He doesn't consciously say, *„This body that I have now is completely dissimilar to the body I had then."* That's because they don't exist in the same plane of time.

So we get this whole fixation of singleness. Freud dramatized it. He tries to break out of it by saying *„Sex!"* because he -- I don't know, he must have gotten around. He must have observed that men and women often slept together. You see this idea of singleness. He actually made a breakthrough; he at least said something which did include, in its generality, two terminals. And you'll notice he failed when he came down to one terminal: He was never able to understand or do anything about homosexuality. He failed at once that he had to move into a one-terminal bracket! Quite amusing.

Problems of Comparable Magnitude are run, then, just to coax somebody into the conception that there might be two of something which could be compared to each other. And that does it two ways: You run Problems, which is idea or terminal-counter-idea or - terminal (two things); and then you make him compare a problem of two terminals to a problem of two terminals -- two or more terminals to a problem of two or more terminals. You make him compare problem to problem, but in each problem you have the idea of two. And this is a total double on the thing, which is an effort to coax him into a tolerance of pan-determinism rather than into total mono-determinism. One graduates the zero -- *„I don't even know I am here"* -- to *„I know there is something here, because it compares to," „Yes, there are a couple here," „Yes, there is an auditor and preclear present."*

Probably one of the reasons that self-auditing doesn't work very well is because an individual who is doing self-auditing thinks of himself as the terminal, and has nothing with which to compare this terminal to, and as a result does not get anywhere. And you'll find that self-auditing has only one technique that can be done without much liability. And that is, you can always have somebody (all by himself) mock up a person, mock up another person, mock up another person. Why does it work? It's

because you are getting into the two-terminal category, see? That and probably Problems of Comparable Magnitude are very probably the only two techniques which could work on a self-audited basis.

The success of Self Analysis is totally dependent on this factor. He always had enough other terminals around when he was mocking up something that had terminals in it, and he was in a terminal. And it only worked on those people who already had one terminal. So you can get into a situation where self-auditing is not impossible.

Of course, somebody who is merely going to drain the bank with his mock-ups, of course, is going to wind himself up in the soup in an awful hurry. You just give him the idea of being in one terminal and mocking up another one, and you have a two-terminal situation which poorly approximates an auditor-preclear relationship.

Now, you can do all sorts of things on a self-audited basis, as long as you, of course, are simply auditing a body which is down that-a-way, and you're trying to mock up something in or on the body in relationship to the body, such as a burned hand. You can always get some curative result on some immediate accident -- give yourself an assist, and so on -- mostly because you're handling a part which has relationship to some other body part.

But you start to remedy the base of a spine, for instance, of which you have only one, and you'll find yourself at once in difficulties, then. Then this self-administered assist doesn't seem to be too workable. You haven't got a second terminal.

Well, one of the best ways that you could audit that, if you were going to go out on that basis -- you'd just have to go find other terminals. You could sit down on a porch and make people's spine bases more solid or something, you see, as they went by. You'll graduate up after a while to where you could make two people's spine bases more solid at the same time, and yours would probably cure. You see that? It'd have to be a two-terminal situation.

So all curative measures have a tendency to be double-terminal. Understanding must take place, other things must take place. Well, understanding doesn't take place unless we have another factor to compare with the factor we're trying to understand.

Now, people make this mistake perhaps with Scientology, and they say, „*Well, now Scientology is Scientology, and therefore it has no secondary factor.*" Well, unfortunately it doesn't have. It doesn't have, in factualness, you see, because there's no datum of comparable magnitude. It's not comparable to psychology. Psychology does not have the same goals, the same actions, the same understanding; it isn't in the same framework; it doesn't try to do the same things. I mean, you can just start sorting these out when you really understand the subject of psychology, which can be sorted out against a dozen subjects.

Psychology can be sorted out against almost any ism there is along. It can be sorted out against dialectic materialism; that's something that it is, practically. It can be sorted out against almost any piece of philosophic, physiological stuff that has come along. It could probably be sorted out against hygiene. You could say this is psychology and that's hygiene, or something like that -- you're supposed to wash your brain.

You certainly could sort out psychology against the more rudimentary formulas of the Greeks -- of the more materialistic types of formulas. There are many such psychologies. So you could sort this one out, but to sort out Scientology requires just a little bit more. And it requires a considerably different approach, to say the least.

Now, I've put Scientology in there in comparison to Dianetics, and they become comprehensible subjects. And these subjects are very, very comprehensible, compared to each other. One is a materialistic philosophy and the other is a spiritualistic philosophy, but they are of comparable magnitude because they both attain certain definite ends and goals.

Scientology is liable to be around for a long time, because that really isn't a split terminal. Somebody'd have to dream one up which ran a parallel to get a total throw-out of the subject called Scientology. But then it throws itself out, which is the only thing that makes it safe to have around. Probably the only subject on Earth today which solves itself without liability or continuance of itself, which is quite interesting. It's a safe subject.

Well, we look over this procedure, and we see how these things intertwine. We go up then into havingness; we can contact havingness directly. We've already gotten the person to get the idea of a couple of terminals, and from a couple of terminals he can go on and get the idea of one terminal confronting another terminal. He can go on and get the idea of contributing. He can get the idea of creating. And of course, he can create space or anything else that he runs into.

Now, I'm going to read to you from the Series CCH sheet -- 16th ACC, and that's Series I, Communication.

„Look at me. Who am I?" is A.

B is Hand Contact Mimicry.

C is Hand Mimicry. You know, space enters in.

D is Body Mimicry.

And E is *„Look at me. Who am I?"* all over again. Why? Because it now works. You can take some cases and just start out with *„Look at me. Who am I?"* and get someplace. And then you go the rest of the way with the mimicries. And then you say, *„Look at me. Who am I?"* again; you find out that you've really made the grade. And that's the way you run that.

And then we have Series II, Control. And A is Learning Processes A, B and C as you have been given.

B is Tactile Havingness, which is an 8-C, whereby you have him pick up and find out if he can have the things which he lays hold of. Whether he can pick them up or not is beside the point, but can he have those things? You ask him to look around the room and find out something that he can have. And then you tell him to go over to it and pick it up, or touch it, or handle it. And you'll find out that this enters your control in

there at once. It's an 8-C with a Havingness, and it, of course, becomes a powerful process. It's a killer.

And then you've got just pure control processes of the body in Start-C-S and Stop-C-S, which you should never confuse, one with the other, because they are completely different processes. They're both evidently doing the same thing, but Stop-C-S blows up preclears and practically kills people in their tracks, and Start-C-S simply puts a person under much better control. You don't emphasize start on Start-C-S; it's just S-C-S. You change them, change position, you stop them, you start them. You use these quite loosely and don't concentrate on any one of them. And it puts a person into session quite well. But all it does is really establish the auditor's ability to move his body around.

Stop-C-S -- that's an entirely different one. That's an exteriorization process.

Now, Series III, under Problems, we get:

A. Problems of Incomparable Magnitude to a present-time situation.

And B. Problems of Comparable Magnitude to a present-time problem.

You've got a difference here, and the only reason we're pointing this up from A to B is that any preclear will always win on Problems of an Incomparable Magnitude if you can get the idea across to him with a worded command.

C, we have Problems of Incomparable Magnitude to life situations. And we have to articulate those. It isn't enough really to say *„Give me a problem of incomparable magnitude to your life situation, my dear fellow.“* He's just going to be completely adrift. You have to *„Give me a problem of incomparable magnitude to being married,“ „....a problem of incomparable magnitude to being a schoolboy,“ „....a problem of incomparable magnitude to being a member of the armed services.“* Follow me? To that degree, you have to be specific; you can't get real light.

Why? Because terminals have to be mixed up with it. *„You just take a glance at all the terminals you've ever had anything to do with in this present lifetime. Now give me a problem of incomparable magnitude to it.“* You want to give somebody a nice lose? That's just what you do with that one. All right.

Please note: At this point in the lecture a gap exists in the original master recording. We now return to the class where the recording resumed.

E. Datum of Incomparable Magnitude to Solids and Spaces.

And F. Datum of Comparable Magnitude to Solids and Spaces.

A remark which can be laid in there is, you can take any fixed idea of the physical universe or of Scientology and undo it completely in a fixed condition. This is very well worthwhile knowing. You can take the definition on which we're all hung -- not because we're Scientologists, but because we've had it since Hades unfroze -- and that was that space is a viewpoint of dimension.

Now, you can get other things that would make space, but that is the one that is the fixed idea concerning space. Now, you can find all sorts of ideas. All you need is an entering wedge, you see, to the whole subject of space, and about as close as you can get to an entering wedge is simply space. See, just space. But this is pretty doggone rugged. See? A datum of incomparable magnitude to space, however, can be achieved by a preclear, but he will eventually tell you that space is a viewpoint of dimension.

Now, he'll be all set with that, but we know that's a fixed datum. We know he didn't dream that up. We know he's just talking off the track. So now we'd have to get the datum of incomparable magnitude to *„space is a viewpoint of dimension.“*

It gets pretty involved, doesn't it? Individual finds great difficulty sometimes in comprehending the ideas necessary. Yet if he does comprehend these ideas, you can always get a datum of incomparable magnitude to it and then get a datum of comparable magnitude to it, and get many such.

You can undo every Axiom there is in The Creation of Human Ability. You can always get him to get a brand-new set of axioms. Now, they're allbrand-new, and it wouldn't be safe if you just left him with one brand-new set; you'd have to get dozens. Now, if he could get dozens of sets of axioms, brother, he's out of this universe, and that's for sure.

So it tells you at once that this Problems, E and F on Series III, really doesn't belong where it is, but is included there because that is the series on problems. And it's something that you would do well not to monkey with on a preclear who has any difficulty actually with making space or terminals. You'd get him all the way up the line before you dropped him back again.

All right, now we go into Havingness, Series IV.

And A would be Connectedness.

B would be Subjective Havingness.

C would be *„Keep it from going away.“*

D would be *„Hold it still“* (two objects).

E would be Objective Solids.

F would be Trio.

G would be Trio on Valences (that's *„can't-haves“*).

H would be Then and Now Solids.

I would be Then and Now Spaces -- which I don't recommend your running in this particular intensive. Runs, though. The auditing command varies on that. *„All right. Got a picture of a space? All right, make a little more space,“* or something like that. You'd find out, however, your person would have to be pretty flat up above before he could run this.

And J, Creative Processes, bodies of opposite and same sex, and so forth.

So that we have a couple of exceptions there, which really don't belong in the lineup at those points, which is Series III, E and F, and Series IV, I -- but are there simply because they've got to be put someplace. Otherwise, you're going to lose the processes leading to Operating Thetan if you lose those processes, by the way. But there they are.

Series V is Confrontingness.

Now, you notice, here, that we're still on the Havingness Scale, and we get Confrontingness with:

A. *„Find a spot and consequence of having lighted there.“ „Find a spot where you could light“* is the exact command on that.

And B. *„Mock up enough to confront,“* which is quite interesting as a process.

And Series VI, we get Contribution:

A. *„Mock up something worth contributing to.“*

And Series VII, which is Creation:

A. *„Mock up something that doesn't have to be created.“*

B. *„Mock up a confession -- a confusion.“* (That's pretty good, pretty good -- very good process, I should imagine!)

Series VII, C is *„Create an opponent.“*

Series VII, D. *„Create something.“* Notice we're getting awfully simple.

And Series VII, E is *„Get the idea of the action necessary to create something.“* Now, that kills a low-scale preclear. Those last two just murder him, just like the command *„Look around.“* Auditing command: You just say, *„Look around. Okay. Look around,“* and so on. It'll just murder people in their tracks. Too simple, he isn't doing anything, and so forth.

And Series VIII is A. Rising Scale Processes, which work, and B. Postulate Processes. And then you could add, really, on VIII, a repetition of E of Series III, Datum of Incomparable Magnitude to Solids and Spaces, Datum of Comparable Magnitude to Solids and Spaces, and this additional one up here on Then and Now Spaces (which is Series IV, I) could be added onto the end of that line.

Now, we're not yet through with processes, because actually, there's a little band in here that we haven't paid any attention to which is Series III´ (which belongs between Series III and Series IV) and Series III´´. And there are two sets of processes in there -- but their worthwhileness is established, but not completely in terms of time -- and that's Waste and Substitute Objective, and Waste and Substitute Subjective; because you can always do something specific with the case, and these are more or less specific sorts of processes.

You could get a guy over an allergy of milk, or something of the sort; you can cure him of something rather easily with these Waste and Substitute Processes, but they do

not, of course, hit for a very long goal. They have a tendency to process significances, and they should be in your repertoire. They are very worthwhile processes. You should know about them. They're something that an auditor always turns to if nothing else happens, and it's something that you should use. But they are not in this particular series, because this series is devoted exclusively to bringing a preclear up in communication, and ability to control by remedying his tolerances of games (which is problems, which is terminals) and the Havingness Scale. And you've just improved his tolerances of those things. And you'll find out that you're right in there pitching.

You have a very, very fast series of processes here, right here at Series IV, A, B, C, D and E -- Connectedness, Subjective Havingness, „*Keep It from Going Away,*" „*Hold It Still,*" Objective Solids, and then H, Then and Now Solids. You can actually run Connectedness, „*Keep It from Going Away*" on two objects, „*Hold It Still*" on two objects, and then (giving him an objective solid run) Then and Now Solids, and you'd move right up.

And if he was already in fair communication, if he was already capable of doing some controlling pretty well, you would find he'd practically graduate out the top of the scale -- if you just put him in session and ran Series IV, A, B, C, D, E and H. And that in itself would be a little intensive. You got that? And it would probably make more gain for the preclear than any other single series of gains.

Thank you very much.

Thank you.

[End of Lecture]