QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD:
CCHs, AUDITING

A lecture given on
23 June 1961

Thank you.

Okay. Well, we have arrived at a Friday. And I think the last time I looked it was the 24th, wasn't it? The 23rd. It just shows you: You start looking at the time track, and no telling where you'll land.

All right. Well, here we go. What questions do we have today? Oh boy, I'm happy you really got it taped. Oh man, I'm happy you've got it really taped.

Female voice: I had a question of at what age would one give Joburgs?

At what age can one give Joburgs? Well, I'll tell you, that below thirteen or fourteen, a special Joburg should probably exist, and it should probably go down to the age of about six. And then another one should exist down to the age of about three. And it should be compartmented in that direction. A Joburg would simply stir up a kid under twelve on the whole track. Okay?

Female voice: Yes. Thank you very much.

All right. Any other question? Yes.

Another female voice: Will a properly assessed Havingness command ever cause the needle to tighten, say within the first eight commands, and then loosen?

Well, you're asking would a properly assessed Havingness command first cause the needle to tighten and then loosen? What you are looking at is what will tighten a Havingness needle? And what tightens a Havingness needle is an ARC break. Your Havingness is working on Tuesday just dandy, and on Wednesday it suddenly tightens the needle. Well, it isn't necessarily true that the Havingness Process is now defunct. It is true that the Havingness Process is being run against an ARC break. And your rudiments aren't clean on it, that's all. And it will make the Havingness Process look momentarily invalid.

There is another method by which this happens. A Havingness Process run too long *creates* an ARC break. And you start running a Havingness Process fifteen, twenty, thirty commands. About that time your pc, if he has any inkling that this is wrong, develops an ARC break and the havingness needle tightens at that moment. And the overrunning of a Havingness Process, then, will tighten the needle.

Now, in a case where it tightens and loosens, what you had is a pc with a rudiment out, and the havingness took care of it. And you're looking at this kind of a spooky situation where you didn't really realize what was going on.

You get the idea? A havingness needle, however – your stable datum on this is, the Havingness Process has been running and now suddenly doesn't run; two things are wrong – could be wrong. The first one is the most common, that you have a rudiment out. And you are actually merely distracting somebody's attention madly. And it upsets him.

So, so much for that. You got it? But an ARC break will tighten the havingness needle. The other method by which happens, of course, is the Havingness Process has expired. That's less seldom and in fact it's sufficiently rare that you should always suspect the ARC break. Okay?

Female voice: Is it ever unusual for – as case gets advanced – the exactly right Havingness Process will tend to repair their havingness in just two or three commands?

Oh, yes.

Female voice: And run any longer than that will then suddenly . . .

Well, that's why I've said eight to twelve . . .

Female voice: Yeah.

. . . commands. That is very safe. And their havingness actually repairs with great speed. The havingness will repair on one command.

Female voice: That's what I'm thinking of Yeah. Okay.

I wouldn't trust it. I'd still go on running it five, eight commands.

Female voice: Mm-hm.

Okay?

Female voice: Yeah.

All right.

Okay, any other questions? You know a lot of you people that just arrived, I know there's an awful lot of things you don't know yet and you're sitting there being very, very quiet about it. Is this quietness a symptom of you don't know enough to ask a question here?

All right. It's a case of, I'm afraid, you don't know what you don't know. Yes?

Female voice: I know something that I don't know. On what you talked about yesterday, on running the CCHs 1, 2, 3 and 4, did you say you should run each one twenty minutes and then shift to the next one, and on and on and then, you know? Twenty minutes of 1, twenty minutes of 2, twenty minutes of 3, twenty minutes of 4 and then start over again?

Hmm.

Female voice: And on and on? And then . . .

I say?

Female voice: Well, I'm asking. . .

That's the way it works!

Female voice: I know . . .

That's her job. Go on.

Female voice: I'd like to have it run on me.

Go on.

Female voice: And then you do that for an hour and then you shift to an hour of Joburg and then back again to the Caches for an hour?

Uh-uh. Uh-uh. Uh-uh. *No, no, no! No! No!* No, no, no, no, no, no. This is why they don't ask questions, is because I scold them and chop them up, see?

Female voice: I've seen it recently in auditing. Will you straighten me out?

All right. No, it's one for one, which is if you have run two and a half hours of CCHs or five hours of CCHs, you should do two and a half hours or five hours' worth of the other. But you don't ever expect anything to happen with CCHs running them for a whole auditing period of a whole hour.

CCHs are not an endurance contest. This question has too many ramifications. In the first place, it infers too many things. You have said if you run the CCHs twenty minutes and then twenty minutes and then twenty minutes.. . No, my God. No, no, no, my God, no. No, no, no, no. See? That's what I'm saying no no about. See? Don't run the CCHs twenty minutes apiece. Run a flat CCH only twenty minutes and if it is *flat* . . . Now, get that one right. Because, boy, you can lay an awful egg with the CCHs, see? Got it? Get that one real good. You run a CCH that is flat for only twenty minutes. It's got to be flat for twenty minutes before you leave it.

Now, if CCHs are not biting, then you discover this oddity: that you'll be running a CCH for twenty minutes and the next CCH for twenty minutes. But that's only if they're not biting. You got that?

Female voice: Yes.

Yes?

Female voice: But I don't have it real well.

All right. Now, your CCHs are run only so long as they produce change and no longer. And they are run constantly that they produce change.

Now, your CCH is run as long as it produces change. Now, have you ever had CCHs in the Academy?

Female voice: No.

Ahhhh! Here's what's happening We're going up against a battery of processes which are unknown.

Female voice: I have had CCHs run on me, all of them.

Oh, no, but you've got to be trained in running CCHs. Assign somebody to train her running CCHs. Okay. Because there's a lot more to it than having them run. Yeah.

Now, a CCH must be run as long as it produces change. And you cannot get auditing compartmented into time brackets without observation, which is what I see the tendency is here. And we mustn't do that. We audit a pc. And the only reason we say twenty minutes is because that is the period of observation that is safe. That's a safe period of observation. That's not too long, that's not too short. Got it? All right.

Now, when a period of twenty minutes has elapsed without any change, if we exceed that, the pc feels he is being punished. He's doing the auditing command, and he's apparently being punished for doing the auditing command by the auditing command continuing to be run on him as though, then, he is not doing it right.

The biggest danger in running CCHs is invalidation of the pc. And to run an unflat process flat is not an invalidation. But to run a flat process, consistently and continually, operates as an invalidation. And the only trouble we've ever had with the CCHs is an invalidation of the pc.

Now, the way that CCH 3 and 4 can be run would stand your hair on end. Let's supposing we didn't have that little clause in there of "Did you do that?" on 3 and 4, you see. The idea of asking the pc if the pc has done it. Get the idea? All right.

Now, supposing that we had the auditor – this is what's happened countless times – we've had the auditor deciding whether or not the pc did it. And immediately the CCHs become totally unworkable. As a matter of fact that was the first great invalidation of the CCHs and why we tended to come off of them slightly.

The CCHs were working just wonderfully until all of a sudden a bunch of people got ahold of the CCHs, and they would make a motion with the book which the devil himself couldn't complicate, and which they themselves couldn't have followed immediately afterwards. And they've said to the pc, "Now, you didn't do that," you know, in effects and grabbed the book back and take the thing away into the air and give it to the pc and . . . Pooh, you know? I've watched it

man, I mean, it's *grim!* The auditor takes the book and goes flip-flop and hands it to the pc, and the pc takes the book and goes flip-flop. And the auditor *sighs,* and takes the book back from the pc and does the same flip-flop again. And the pc takes the book and goes flip-flop. And the auditor *sighs* and takes the book. And then I finally would say to the auditor, if I was observing it, *"What the hell is wrong with you? The pc did it!"*

"Oh, yes, but the title is reversed when he does it."

And you say, "Man, just knock off of this auditing and go get audited, will you?"

But it's just using the mechanism of invalidation – mechanism of invalidation. All right.

A pc, if they're invalidated while running the CCHs, tend to go *nnnnn!* And it can be done by an auditor. He can actually invalidate the pc by a misrun of the CCHs. They've got to be pretty flagrant. But we ask the pc then, "Did you do that?" or "Are you satisfied with that?" You've gone flip-flop with the book and the pc scratches the back of his neck with it. And say, "Did you do that?" and the pc looks at you cunningly and says, "Yeah, I did it all right." And you take the book away from him; that's all right. You're through; you've had it. And you do another motion.

It's whether the pc thinks he did it, and you would be absolutely amazed, gazing into the quicksand and morass that some people call a mind, what they think they have done and what they think they have observed. It's marvelous. Do you know that some 20 percent of the people who are walking around in the streets right this minute never see a wall and never see a curb, ceiling or a person. They only see their own facsimiles of the wall, curb and person. They put them up here driving automobiles and give them medals for killing everybody. They can't even *see* the object; they see a facsimile of the object. And you very often will see this cease to exist in the CCHs.

You'll all of a sudden say – the person will say, "This *wall is* terribly *bright.* There doesn't seem to be anything between me and the wall." Well, man, that's right! Hitherto, they've looked at a picture of the wall that was on the wall, and they see the picture and there's the wall.

Now, here's one of the things you can have somebody do. You say – there's a bird going tweet-tweet outside, and you say, "All right now, make a picture of that bird out there. Now bring it in and look at it. What is it?"

They say, "It's a crane."

And they hear an automobile going by in the street, and you say, "Now, put out a picture – you know, make a picture of that automobile. Now bring it in the room and look at it. And what is it?"

And they say, "Steamboat." They say, "What the hell is wrong with me?"

Actually, they will get the facsimile they're stuck in duplicated, if they do that.

Now, that symptom goes forward considerably further. It goes forward to the fact that the person doesn't ever see the wall or the carpet or the ceiling or the floor or anything. He sees a picture that he has made which he has interposed between him and it. You can generally detect this person because their depth perception is fantastic – awful bad. You know? They run into walls and door sides, and so forth, and then they go to the oculist and get fitted with specs, and then they run into more doors and more windows. Of course, the specs don't help you to see facsimiles. They never *see* anything, you see?

All right. Now, you take that person. Now, he's very easily invalidated. Because why is he doing this? He makes a facsimile of the wall and looks at his facsimile of the wall because it is not safe to look at walls. In other words, this fellow is nervous. He is upset. He is – he's quivery, you see? He's real shaky about the physical universe. So this thing's liable to bite him at any minute, you know. And lions and tigers would be quite an – wouldn't be unusual at all to have them just jump out of the fireplace at any minute, you know, or suddenly materialize from nowhere. And this sort of thing's liable to happen.

Now, he starts to get a spark of confidence, you see, in actually having observed you, and then he did it. Now, this tells him he's in communication with you. He must have seen something, otherwise he couldn't duplicate something. So the auditor begins to be real. All right. Now the auditor says, "You didn't do that" in some way. Of course, the auditor ceases to be real at once, because the fellow's whole protective mechanisms go up, and he thereafter makes pictures of the auditors, and he can't do the auditing command and it all goes to pieces, don't you see?

In the first plate, all you're trying to do is convince him the auditor is real. Now, if the auditor becomes part of the dangerous environment by tending to invalidate the pc, by overrunning a process . . . The process is perfectly flat; the pc to the best of his knowledge and belief has done it for a long time all right. Yet the auditor continues to run the process. The auditor is tending to say to the pc it isn't all right. So the pc all of a sudden doesn't know what's all right, and the pc gets nervous and doesn't want to come to the next session and so forth. This is all auditor invalidation of the pc.

All these various mechanisms occur to retard the use and operation of the CCHs. Now, if you know those basic mechanisms, you know why you're running the CCHs which – the basic goal of the CCH is to make the auditor, the physical universe and present time real to the pc, to show him that he can observe the auditor, the auditing room and present time. That's all it's doing. See, it isn't doing anything, really, more significant. It's familiarizing with these things. But it uses these various mechanisms of duplication and so on, on up the line, auditing commands, the control of the auditor, the communication of the auditor. All these various things all add up to additives, so that this reality on the auditor and the auditing room by the CCHs far exceeds anything you would get this way:

"Look at me. Am I here? All right, that's good. Now look at the wall. Is that there? Ah, that's fine." Now we've run a thousand hours of the CCHs, you see? It's just – it wouldn't work, that's all. Because there isn't enough duplication and there isn't enough anything.

Now, let's take this fellow that we're gradually bringing out of his chrysalis. He's getting fairly confident, he's getting downright cocky about it, and he's giving you his hand, and we don't look adequately at what's going on in his mind. Actually, one of the first things he knows very often is that you don't exist or that you are a figment of his imagination, or something of this sort. And all of a sudden he says, "Hey." It begins to be very, very evident to him that there is somebody else alive, and that there is an other determinism somewhere in the universe. And his scarcity on other determinisms is fantastically low. That is the scarcest scarce people get. So they even start mocking up thetan bedbugs to keep him company at night and so forth. And they don't know any other determinism exists anyplace.

But through the process of the CCHs, you get – this condition finally appears that somebody else exists and that a universe is here. And that's the only result you're going to get out of the CCHs.

Now? at any time that you introduce into it this factor, is "I may be real, but boy, you're sure be wishing in a minute you hadn't found it out." "This room may be getting awfully real to you, but we'll just make it as horrible as we can. Because it's really – you're really not doing right, you know; you're doing wrong." Now, this is how you can run the CCHs wrong

Now, any time you settle down to a timed routine that has nothing to do with the pc, you're in instant trouble. Instant and immediate trouble. We know more or less on the average what the safe margins of anything are. But I will tell you that twenty minutes is an awfully long time for a child. It's safe for an adult. But it's quite a long time for a child whose attention span may very well be only ten minutes.

And the child in the course of that twenty minutes may get to feeling terribly invalidated. They're doing their level best to give you their hand and be obliging, and they're liable to feel terribly invalidated. So as you shut down the line in age, when you're running it on a child – well, call it something like seven or eight minutes. And if the child did the process consistently seven or eight minutes – call it 7.5 if you want to be precise – the child won't feel invalidated.

Female voice: I find a big difference in children, timewise.

Hm?

Female voice: I found that there was a tremendous difference in how long was long enough between children. I ran it on two different children age three, "Give me that hand," and one just did real well for about twenty minutes, and the other one, about six minutes was . . .

And then what happened?

Female voice: Well, then he just fell clear, clear, clear apart.

And then what did you do?

Female voice: And then I just kept on and kept on . . .

Yeah.

Female voice: But I only – after that I shortened the length of the sessions. But for the first time, I stayed with it for the time – the whole twenty minutes that I had done with the other child. After that when I arranged the time I made shorter times and he did better after that.

Shorter times for what?

Female voice: Like ten minutes . . .

For the process changing or the process being unchanged?

Female voice: For running the process. I'd say . . .

Oh man, look, look, look, look, look. We're talking – you just better talk this over with Mary Sue, because you got this backwards and inside out. I see that clearly. Because look, you don't run a CCH by the clock. You run it on the pc. It's the pc's change that determines this. Now, you're talking about a ten minute flat area before the process begins to bite. Ixnay. There is no flat area before the process begins to bite.

Female voice: Non that's not what I was talking about.

Huh?

Female voice: I was talking about length of sessions.

Oh, the length of session. That's incredibly short. That's nowhere. If you run the CCHs – if you don't run the CCH that is biting at least an hour, the kid practically spins in.

Female voice: On a three year old?

Huh?

Female voice: On a three year old?

Oh, man! Teach her!

Another voice: Good.

Teach her some fundamentals here. We're discussing them now. Okay. I imagine... Now listen, you'll do better with them if you run them right. Okay? All right. I didn't mean to invalidate you for asking a question, but it makes me nervous sometimes when I see how far *off* these processes can get.

A CCH on a child that is only run for ten minutes, the auditor ought to be shot. If it's biting, you see, and the auditor quits the process at the end of ten minutes – oh, man! He's giving the kid something like a headache for the rest of the day or something like this, or he's driven the

kid into some of a propitiative state. No, a CCH has to be run – that is biting, actually has to be run for about an hour, at least, before anything could be expected to occur. You got it?

Female voice: Okay.

All right. Okay. All right. Any ARC break?

Female voice: No.

All right.

Female voice: That's why I came.

All right. Okay, any other question?

All right. Now, let's take a look at auditing in general, shall we? Auditing in general i8 an activity which is engaged upon by an auditor on a pc, and it is regulated and monitored in its attack and approach by the pc, behavior o£

First thing that establishes what you do as an auditor is the pc's condition. What has just come out in a bulletin is not what establishes what you do with the pc. It's the pc's condition that establishes what you should do with the pc. But in view of the fact that a tremendous width of randomity, activity and upset can occur – tremendous – you have to have a standardization, because you get too many ideas mixed up in what you're doing in the way of auditing, and the clear view of what happens or should happen in auditing tends to go fizzle, and has for about eleven years. Particularly in California. Dear old California.

We just had another blowup today out in California, so you needn't feel bad, Johannesburg.

So anyhow, there are certain things that work, and there are certain things that don't work. Now, when you've had as much work put in on what works, and as much understanding and research background as has been invested in this particular activity, you can't help but come up with some right answers. So there are right things to do with pcs and there are wrong things to do with pcs. And if you don't know the fundamentals, I'll lay you a thousand golden sovereigns to a crooked halfpenny that you won't pull any of the right ones. Because the laws of averages, if they were so rigged that pcs or patients or people would have become Clear or well in the last fifty thousand years on this planet – if the laws of averages would take care of it, it would have happened. And we can show you clearly that it has not happened. So therefore, random running will not get anybody anyplace. That you can make pretty sure of.

Now, we have to know first and foremost how the mind goes together. Man didn't appreciate this before. He was busy trying to save the thing and send it to heaven. Or he was trying to get it nullified or he was trying to get various things, and he was working with the spirit. And from time to time did work with the spirit. And he got no place.

We probably got further in 1952 to '55 on the subject of exteriorization than man had ever gotten before. And we learned quite a bit about it. And one of the things is, is the sudden change

of exteriorization is such a sudden change that it deteriorates rapidly as a condition. Quite remarkable how fast it deteriorates. We can do today all of the things we did then. You can blow people out of their heads and suddenly have them talking when they stuttered before, and have them seeing when they couldn't see before, and all kinds of weird odd phenomena occur. But these things are all unstable phenomena.

I spent some time trying to stabilize these phenomena and make them into something that was highly useful. And then I found out that before a thetan can experience a sudden change – like the total loss of his body – he has to be up to being able to have a body first. Before he can walk out of a body, he's got to be able to have one. And the people who most easily present themselves to be bunged out of their heads are people who wouldn't have anything to do with a body if you paid them. The person who wants nothing to do with the body at all exteriorizes at the drop of a skunk. All you've got to do is say to this person, *"Phhff!"* and there they are, heading past Arcturus.

Now, how the Buddhist, the Lamaist, missed this, I don't know. But he patently knows nothing about it. The mystery of the East has been exploded. Man, anybody who would be stupid enough to sit still for twenty years and regard his navel so as to exteriorize should have his thetan examined. You don't have to sit still for twenty years. Get somebody to say to you something on the order of – the first exteriorization process is "Try not to be three feet back of your head." Whammmm! There they go, you know? Well, Buddhism is accomplished. That was the end of track as far as Buddhism is concerned, and that one little set of English words took care of everything they were trying to hand out. Oh yes, they were also trying to hand out "Peace, peace on you too, brother," and so forth. They were trying to hand out various other principles, which got into other religions, and we had people being quiet. And the whole subject is devoted to how to keep people quiet. It's a police operation, a whole track police operation.

You're always getting space jockeys and space-opera people who are sailing in, saying, "Let's see. How are we going to quiet this down? These people are moving. These people are dangerous. They move. They walk around and they whistle and they sing and they move. And therefore, they're liable to do things. So the thing we'd better do is introduce some peaceful philosophy of some kind or another that'll just stop all this tendency toward motion." That's a fact.

And you get things like Buddhism, Christianity – the quiet philosophies, I call them. And of course, how quiet can you get? Dead. And you might say it's a covert effort to kill everybody off. And it's true that if you get somebody falling totally – well, I can trace the background, in some pcs that have done so, the most amusing concatenation you *ever* had anything to do with. Say, "Well, when did you begin to feel bad?"

And the pc says, "Oh, about 1941. Something like that. I began to feel kind of bad. I was young then, but I began to feel kind of bad and so on ."

"What happened then?"

"Well, uh, nothing much happened. I just felt that I'd – You know, well, it was about that time I felt I'd rather – I'd better take it easy. I might do things, and I might – you know, kind of put myself under restraints a little bit, because something had happened then that was quite dangerous and quite upsetting, and so forth and, yes, I became quieter. I matured."

You'll find these spots of sudden change of pace to be the spots which broke the person's life. Those sudden changes of pace. And what do you find sitting in the midst of them? All kinds of collisions and upsets and accidents, most of which resulted in the advice "Take it easy now and you will be all right." Whether they gave it to themselves or it was given to them exteriorly, they got the idea that if they just took it awful, awful easy, they'd be all right. And from that time on they were all wrong They were *all* wrong, and they could not figure out from there on what was wrong with them.

They were being asked to confront motionlessness. And man has a rather difficult time confronting motionlessness, as any space-opera boy can tell you. All you have to do is persuade somebody to be totally motionless and to take it easy, and he's had it. He gets sick; his life goes wrong; he ceases to be able to communicate; he has an awful time afterwards.

So therefore, these philosophies that wait for a fellow to hit a disaster so they can then tell him to take it easy, are all of them very much in use, and very active use, on the part of people who mean nothing well for man.

Now, amongst those philosophies are included medicine and psychiatry. The reason they give drugs is so that the person will be quiet. The reason they give electric shocks is so the person will be quiet. The reason they do prefrontal lobotomies is so the person will be quiet. A lot of the times the reason they give a medical operation is so the person will be quiet. You never heard of so many reasons why people should be quiet.

Well, unless a person can confront motion, he's had it. He's dead and done for. That is your first condition of life and livingness. If a person cannot confront motion at all, he can't work, and you have the background of a criminal. You've automatically made criminals.

And don't wonder that the whole Roman criminal population joined the church en masse. They did. And don't wonder at all these fellows who have just gotten out of stir and who have suddenly embraced religion. Natural consequence. It's the motionless philosophy adopted by somebody who can't move. I dare say if you held somebody in straps in a chair or up against a wall or in a bed any undetermined length of time, you would eventually find he'd gotten religion or he'd become a Buddhist, or almost anything. And you never would have had to have talked to him about the philosophy at all.

If he'd never heard of it on the whole track, he would probably invent it. You see this? All you'd have to do is introduce the factor of motionlessness into his life, prove to him that movement was bad, and you've had it.

The reason we are having more and more accidents, and the reason I resigned, I think last week, from the Road Safety Committee, in England, was because all propaganda in all teachings will wind up in more accidents. And I can't go along with something that is as stupidly destructive as that. There is no emphasis on deleting the fellow who can't drive before they license him. There is no emphasis on putting on the road cars that can travel on the road. There is no emphasis in trying to take the trucks and passengers and freight off the roads and put them back onto the railways where they belong No part of any of this program makes any sense, because it's deteriorated into "Teach them to be quiet. Don't drive so fast."

I doubt speed has very, very much to do with it. Because you start looking at accident tallies, and you'll find it's mostly the old ladies who were driving safely in the middle of the road at ten miles an hour.

Now, your general situation, then, is that a philosophy of quietness, of motionlessness, has been introduced into this sphere of reducing traffic accidents. And with a great certainty, the more this philosophy is introduced, the more criminal actions will occur on the highway. Driving will get worse and accident statistics will rise. And that's just about all there is to it. There isn't anything further to it than that.

The more you make a populace quiet and nonmotionless, the greater crime rate you will have. The influence of TV, for instance, on the general crime rate around the world has been remarked upon many times. But the program material is what is being blamed, not that the child is being pinned motionless. And that is what's happening. I don't care if you showed them Little Orphan Annie sighing over the dog in just one pose on a nonmoving picture and so forth, with maybe some violin music playing in the background. And if this was all there ever was on TV and the children still sat in front of TV at an active time of life when they should be moving, you'll get a higher crime rate. It's inevitable. See? All you've got to introduce is motionless, you get aberration. Because you're preventing people from taking over the situation.

Now I'll give you something interesting with regard to this, talking about how the mind works. I very busily spent my hobby time, which has now become – my hobby time now has become relegated between 3:00 and 7:00 A.M. – that's the rest of my day, you see – and I've lost any time much to sleep in now. And I'm now trying to find some sleeping time. And I think there's another time track around here someplace so that I'll take care of that. Anyway, last night, up at about three o'clock, four o'clock, I was studying some pictures for a boat, on this theory: That people get seasick because of motion. That was the theory.

And I went along blindly with this, not on inspection or examination at all, because a man who has had a lot of time at sea and so on tends to become rather conservative about the sea. In other words, "It's this way, and that's the way it is," you know, and everybody has said that it is motion which has caused seasickness. So therefore, I thought it'd be an awfully good idea to put, 'tween decks and in people's cabins and in the dining salon and so forth, pictures of very quiet scenes. That that would be the thing, you see. If you put some pictures of very quiet scenes

around – nice, pleasant, quiet, still scenes – a person who feels queasy could look at one and feel better.

So I spent some time looking in some – various publications for – which advertised prints, you see, and old masters and things like this, for some proper pictures, in order to take care of this condition. There are various things. It's like the sweep of light back and forth across the ceiling, reflected from the waves outside, and all of this sort of thing, is what has been blamed for seasickness.

So I went ahead, and I chose all of these pictures which were very silent pictures. They were very motionless pictures. They were very unmoving pictures. And I was sitting there at my table up in my bedroom looking over all these pictures and thinking about all the seasickness this was going to save, you know. And after a little while I started to get a little bit seasick. And I wasn't quite seasick; I felt an odd constriction on the front of my body, and I wondered "What is this all about?"

And along about 3:55 A., I had to revise this whole theory. So the list, although it's been picked up now, and the pictures will probably all get bought – I'll have to give half of them to the medical association. About 3:55, I realized what this was all about: that if you gave people pictures of motion, it would give them a chance to sort of accustom themselves to the idea of motion. But if you gave them a stillness, you gave them a total motion of the ship and sea against the total no-motion of the picture, and they practically would have had it. You've given them a terrific thing. And boy, have you pinned them aboard that ship. If I want to keep a crew, all I've got to do is put up those motionless pictures, because here will be the horizon going up and down like mad, you see, and inside the vessel here will be all these pictures of stern, solid oak trees standing there, you see.

One was called "Dawn." It was an oak tree reflected in the mirrorstillness of a river at dawn. And boy, that picture was really quiet. And when I first picked it out I says, "Well, that's going to take some girl or Scientologist that's aboard at the present moment, and they'll look at that, and they'll say, 'Thank God for the tree,' " you see?

No sir. No. Much kinder to give them a racing sloop throwing spray in all directions, don't you see? Much kinder, because they at least get a chance to look at the motion in pictorial form. And it gives them a gradient. Got the idea?

Yeah, the cure for motion is motion, not stillness. Well, that's quite interesting as an observation. Has nothing much to do with this, or you, but there it is. I got a good reality on the thing. And of course, after I'd looked over several of these pictures of days of adventure – and there's one ship of about 1757 just shooting the living daylights out of another ship, you see, and her sails are all full of holes, and the deck's on fire in a couple of spots and so on, and cannon balls flying all over. It's good enough so as you can practically hear them whistle, you know? And I looked at that after looking at all these still pictures, you know, and I looked at that and I said, "Whooo!" and instantly ceased to feel a little seasick. Got the idea?

So the philosophies of motionlessness are not safe philosophies to imbibe.

Because they lead people toward illness and inability to work, criminality and an inability to control their environments. Philosophies of motion, on the other hand, have not necessarily led to noncriminality. Witness space opera.

Show me an honest rocket jockey who has never bombarded a planet in a loose moment and who has never raped a town, and I'll show you somebody that's never been on the whole track. He's just never been on the whole track.

We don't know where he's been for the last few hundred trillion years, but he's . . .

No, the worship of motion, the worship of speed, and the worship of motion itself is no guarantee. Because there are periods of rest between them.

If you could keep it up at the speed of light from there on out, you'd probably never be affected by motion. But how about going quiet between them? I remember every time a submarine crew used to come in, they used to put them to rest. They used to give them a rest.

And I know my mother used to come up, and typewriter keys and file cabinets and so forth would be flying out of my studio left and right, and some circus music would be playing on the tape recorder, and it would be noisy, you know, and active. And she would come up and she would look at me and she would say, "I really think you ought to take a rest. You are look working much too hard."

And I used to wonder, "Now, I wonder if she's got an operation going here, somehow or another. I wonder if there could possibly be an operation connected with this." And there was. There was. Never affected me very much because she actually never talked to me very much. But I'd notice that people that didn't quite like me quite ordinarily are advising me to get some rest. Check it over. I think you yourself will have a subjective reality on that sort of thing.

Now, as soon as you become incapable of handling the shift and change of things, you become incapable of withstanding the duress of life and begin to experience pain. And the experiencing of pain is – actually comes about after one has lost a tolerance for motion. If you want to know why somebody is hurting as you're running a process, you are running out their intolerance for motion.

Now, you can run motion, or you can run no-motion, or you can run what you please along these various lines. But motion which is predictable motion, of course, is better – that's from the pc's point of view – to unpredictable motion. So unpredictable motion is something that is intolerable. And the person doesn't know what to confront. Something is happening in front of his face and then something happens behind his face. And he doesn't know which of these things to confront and he gets into a fine state of affairs.

But first, he must consider that there is something unconfrontable about it or that it is bad not to be able to confront everything at once. And as soon as he gets the idea that it is bad not to

be able to confront everything at once, he starts to butter all over the universe and stick on the track, and experiences and all this sort of thing begin to occur.

Now, there's another phenomenon which occurs about the mind, is every time a person has been hit hard by life – and he could be hit hard because he has hit others, and he now gets the motivator for his overts and so on – as soon as he's been hit hard, or as soon as he begins, as they did in Arslycus, a program for coercing people into working harder. . . Well, you get how that is. Working harder- that means you produce more or you will be shot. You know, that kind of thing. The Russian philosophy. You get – people will obsessively start producing.

Production follows defeat. Production follows defeat. Germany and Italy have outstripped all other European countries in the production of goods, just in the last few years. That is because they were the defeated countries. And the countries that won the war don't much now look like it. And that's a result of defeat.

This is rather consistent. Any defeated area can be counted on to produce. And any defeated person can be counted upon to be putting up more bank than a person who feels victorious. Bank and reactive mind is the result of failures or defeats.

So you're eradicating mechanically on the one hand a person's intolerance of motion or their intolerance of motionlessness. And on the other side, you're eradicating their failures or defeats. And between the two of these things, the bank disappears. Just that; the bank disappears.

Now, today we don't erase a bank. The bank is not erased. A person is, as we did at the beginning, accustomed into not needing one. Takes over the automaticity of creation, in other words, one way or the other. He takes over the automaticities *of* doingness. And we have beingness – the person *he* should be in order to survive. We have doingness – what he ought to be doing in order to get creation or do creation or something *of* the sort. And we have havingness which is the result of creation.

Havingness is apparently more important because it's harder to arrive at, but you can see from the rationale, is the result of a defeat. That's not a philosophic ambiguity. Most havingness is the result of a defeat of some kind or another. Man couldn't walk on water, so he began to push logs out into the surf, see. And we get the whole cure sequence, so that everything in the universe practically is a cure for past failures. Quite remarkable but very true.

Now, in addition to that, we have another factor which enters into the situation, and that is that every goal is the immediate and direct result of not having done. So we get these various combinations of intolerance for motion, the feelings of defeat. And your next one up the line, of course, is your ability to have without having defeated. And if you can remedy those various things in somebody's mind, you have then produced a completely new being. He is not the same as an old being who has never had the experience. He's not somebody who has been in a plastic container for the last two hundred trillion, you see. He's been over the jumps.

Now, his knowingness, his knowledge of what has happened all the way along the line, doesn't leave him. He still knows. But the consequences of having done, with a renewed ability to do, makes him, of course, not a virgin that has drifted along for a couple of hundred trillion now, and is innocent and steps out of the auditing room as a shy, giggly girl would, or something like this. That is not the condition in which he emerges. He emerges in the rather interesting condition of a totally rehabilitated, hard-barnacled warrior who is a veteran of innumerable campaigns but doesn't show any of the marks of any of them.

And that's an interesting state of beingness. And when we say Clear, we are actually saying about the weakest statement we could make on what we are doing. See? We just – it's a very weak description of what we are really doing. But the other description would be far, far too frightening, I'm sure.

I heard a fellow say one time, "Gee. When I think of my days back there in high school – a coeducational establishment – when I think of all those pretty girls, and if I'd known then what I know now, oh wow, you know. Wow, you know!" Interesting. Interesting point of view. Because you're setting somebody up who theoretically would know then what he knows now. So he knew it now then, but he'd carefully forgotten it all, because he knew what he was liable to do. His best mechanism was to become stupid. That's a fine mechanism, isn't it? That's a very fine mechanism.

You at the same time don't get the tremendously dangerous situation of the fellow who is – has a high level of wisdom messing up an area in which he is in. He doesn't. I tell you, if this fellow, knowing all he knew on the subject of the second dynamic, were to appear in a high school amongst all those girls, they would probably from there on all live better lives. That's probably the net result of the introduction of such a situation, because the fellow doesn't have the covert aspect of criminality hinging on every action, you know?

Oh, he might get in trouble. But nobody would get him in trouble very thoroughly, I guarantee you. First time they came down in the basement and found him giving a lecture to the girls on the second dynamic, they might – the principal might be horrified. But the principal at the same time would probably find himself being run on Routine 1 very shortly. See, all sorts of new complications occur.

Now, that which strips the game from the universe or strips all games from the universe or cancels all games or ends all games, of course, would normally result in motionlessness. But how about ending certain games for somebody who doesn't have the consequence of ending in motionlessness? You've broadened a person's aspect and ability to play a game and recognize what a game is and have some fun out of life.

Now, the second that you have broadened his view with regard to this, you of course have put more games into the universe. Because most of the games they're playing were invented so long ago and are so moth-eaten and so moldy that nobody even knows they're games anymore.

I ran into one the other day which was very interesting Just yesterday I think it was – yesterday morning I was running into some stuff and going over some things, and an old version of "I'm-supposed-to" suddenly turned up. An interesting old version. It's the difference between play and work. And that's an interesting difference. I finally found out what play was. Play is unreal or delusory motion about which you're not supposed to be serious. So you're not supposed to as-is it.

So an individual eventually gets trapped in this thing called play, because everybody tells you, you see, that play is something which is not serious. You see, you're not really playing – you're not really running a train when you're running a toy train. So therefore, the facsimile of the toy train doesn't get as-ised as a train. It doesn't get as-ised as a toy train either, because all the time you're playing with it you're saying it's a real train. Well, as a matter of fact, it is a real train that is a miniature train that you are doing something with, and play is a dishonest doingness. It's a delusory or dishonest doingness.

And work is not a serious activity. Anybody who says *work is* a serious activity is also opening up the bear pit in the middle of the trail. There's no reason why a fellow shouldn't work at a sport. And there's no reason why a fellow shouldn't have fun at his job. But some barrier got added in here, and the operation simply consisted of "play is a delusory activity," so therefore you don't as-is it. And you might say a lot of people walking around in delusions have played too hard. Get the idea?

In other words, they weren't doing what they were doing; they were doing something they were pretending they were doing. So of course then, this really got them – really got them hooked up and short-circuited.

Now, as we move ahead a little bit and look at this as a further consequence, we find out that a fellow who decides that work is hard or that he can't work is getting into the interesting thing of every time he plays, he has to say, "Now I'm supposed to." Every time he works he says, "Now I'm supposed to." "Now I'm supposed to what?" "I'm supposed to be doing something else."

So we get another method of not as-ising anything. Did you ever read a book and have a guilty conscience because you ought to be doing something else? Well, you know, you'll sooner or later hang all such books up on the end of your nose. Because you're not doing what you are doing. You're doing what you are doing when you were – at the same time should be doing something else. And you aren't doing something else; you are doing what you are doing. And probably one of the heaviest marks of a person's disappearance of aberration is on this particular facet of motion. Which is to say that the person does what he does, whether he is supposed to or not supposed to be doing it. And if a person did what he did, and it wasn't work, and it wasn't play, and it wasn't ramification, it wasn't "I'm supposed to," and it wasn't an "I'm supposed to be doing something else" – if he did all of these – paid no attention to those things but just did this

one, he did what he was doing, he would live an entirely different life. What he was doing was what he was doing, you get the idea, without further qualifications.

Now, the morality of existence is once more a test of the play-work thing. Morality is a now-I'm-supposed-to. So that these fellows that run around committing very immoral acts are saying to themselves all the time that they shouldn't be doing them. So they never as-is them, so they continue to do them. Well, I think it's the most – the most weird mechanism anybody ever saw. It's a certainty that one gets a persistence, then, of the things he doesn't want, or gets a tanglement of the things he does want. And eventually, all the things he doesn't want is what he's got, and all the things that he does want are completely confused, delusory and tangled. And then he wonders why he feels odd!

And if you wished to make a clear, clean statement of what auditing was, it is simply straightening somebody out so that he has a tolerance of motion and a tolerance of motionlessness, and so that he can have what he should have or not, as the case may be, as he wishes. Restore his power of choice over this fact.

But to do that, you have to erase the oddities of doingness in order to handle work and play and motion. And motion of course becomes pain, and becomes all these other things. And motionlessness becomes boredom and then apathy and all these other things. You have to take the tremendous significance out of these states so that a person arrives at the situation where when he does something, that is what he is doing. He's not doing something else. Got the idea? And when he's not doing anything, he is simply not doing anything. He's not sitting there not doing anything, while he's supposed to be doing something else.

In other words, he has a clear view of what he's doing or not doing as the case may be. Therefore, he never gets fuddled up with funny circuits telling him he ought to be doing this or saying that or something of the sort. Where do these circuits come from? They just come from the basis of doing things that he shouldn't be doing while he should be doing something else, and not doing things which he should be doing. And of course, these automaticities eventually get set up, and he has avoided them to such a degree that they become solid masses. And he's eventually in a situation where, of course, he's dictated to from every corner of his beingness.

He sits down to read a book and all the time he is reading the book he knows he ought to be doing something else. So he goes over and does something mundane like straighten up the – straighten up all of the ties and shirts and so forth in a desk drawer, and starts putting his room in some kind of order one way or the other, like putting the shoes on the mantleplace. And he wonders, "Now wait a minute. Why did I do that?" It's because all the time he is moving around pretending he should be working, you see. Actually he knows that he would like to be reading a book.

So we get this dualness, half-heartedness, half-mindedness about all actions, which comes down to quarter-mindedness, eighth-mindedness, no-mindedness, and the person becomes simply a dictate of these things because his power of choice can no longer be expressed.

Now, just from that you can see what the Prehav Scale is, very, very cleanly. It's the thing that disentangles all the things from the things. And you'll eventually run into all these things. You'll eventually run into it all, because they're the key and principal doingnesses that a person gets mixed up. Okay?

All right, then in trying to accomplish that, if you yourself, in auditing the pc, make him intolerant of motion, then you reverse the process. That is to say, by your actions and unsmooth auditing and dropping the ashtray and throwing him out the window or something like this, you've fixed him up to a point of where he can no longer tolerate motion. All right, now, at the same time, let's make him sit still when he can't, and give him a bunch of sit-still's when he can't do it at all. And this makes him intolerant of being motionless.

Now let's go further than that and take the next factor of wins and loses, and let's fix him up so that every time he does something right we convince him he has done something wrong, and we add a new lose on top of his bank full of loses. All right, your win-lose factor now is gone because he's getting failures in auditing. We keep handing him failures; he'll go out the bottom.

Now, you're next one up, if you don't duplicate things and don't make them duplicative and don't square him around on the subject of havingness in general, he'll wind up not being able to *have* anything. And you could just reverse the whole process by doing those things, you see, just exactly backwards.

Now, what he should – what you should be doing in auditing is making it possible for an individual to be still or to be in motion, to win on the things that he wants to win on, to accomplish the things that he thinks he ought to accomplish. And one of the things you do this with in Goals Processing is take out of the road all the other things he should really be doing. Goals to a large degree are a do-something-else. You'll find somebody working in an operation, and they're going along and they're doing this job all the time, and all the time they're saying to themselves, "I ought to be a singer. I ought to be a singer. I ought to be out studying singing. I ought to be out studying singing I ought to be out studying singing." You finally get tired of it and you say, "Why don't you go out and study singing?" They sit at their desk and say, "Well I ought to study singing I ought to go out and sing" You get the idea?

Just the fact of sitting at their desk makes them feel they ought to sing. The second you put them out there to sing, as a professional singer, they know what they ought to be doing, they ought to be sitting at their desk.

By straightening out, then, their various goals, they know what they are doing and they don't have these absorbing impulses that take them off of what they are doing. Because anytime a fellow is sitting there with a real hot, desperate goal which is totally unrealized and unrealizable, of course, he doesn't know what he's doing. He can't be doing anything he's doing, because he's got to be doing something else that he can't do.

Now if you upset the environment for the pc one way or the other by running his Havingness in various ways, and running his Havingness backwards, forwards and upside down,

making him allergic to the walls and so forth – you know, run the wrong Havingness Process and so on. "Now, all right. Take a look at this room. Now make sure – doesn't it seem rather small to you? Oh, it doesn't? Well, it seems small to me. Maybe you're just putting up facsimiles and looking at them far out, because the room really is small."

Any kind of a gag of this character, you say, "All right. Now look at that nasty wall over there. Now get the idea that that wall – get the idea that that wall, if you got totally cleared up on the wall, would be a terrible enemy of yours. Supposing you knew all of the secrets of the universe, wouldn't it be terrible if they turned out to be terrible things that would make you unhappy for the rest of your life?"

Isn't that an interesting operation? And yet that interesting operation runs along in the field of philosophy continually, and I have heard it mouthed by high-school girls in this lifetime: "Well, you'd really better not know too much about existence, because what if it turned out too terrible to know about?"

All right. So when you familiarize somebody with it and let him make up his own mind about what it is, he finds out it isn't so bad. He can have the stuff. Therefore, he can do what he is doing, and therefore, he can be what he is being. And when you – when he's in that frame of mind, his mental activities are not so completely absorbed with all of these reactive computations that he cannot decide what he wants to be, do and have. So the individual *can* make up his mind what he wants to be, do and have. But because he doesn't have any particular barriers in it, of course, he can be them and he can do them and he can have them. And then that is a very peculiar state of mind, and everybody will find something wrong with that sooner or later, particularly the Catholic church.

But you have defeated, not the motionless philosophies nor the motion philosophies, nor have you defeated particularly all the working philosophies or nonworking philosophies, or the various doingnesses and moral philosophies and immoral philosophies, or the can't-have-must-have, communist, capitalist, socialist, laborist, Lord-knows-what-ist philosophies – you haven't defeated any of these philosophies. You have picked people up to a point where they can *inspect* them. You're not interested in guiding them away from these horrible evils. The truth of the matter is all they would have to do is inspect them – I don't imagine if it'd take more than twenty or – thirty people to inspect all of one of these philosophies to have it disappear. You know? I mean, really clear-sighted people. I don't think it'd take very much.

Because it's awfully hard to make a lie continue to exist. It takes some real trickery to make a lie persist, although lies apparently persist with the greatest of ease. Look how fast the aberration of a pc folds up when he finds out what is the alter-is that is causing it. As soon as he really finds what that is, it will fold up. If it doesn't fold up and he thinks he's found it out, he hasn't found it out. He's got to look a little further. And then it'll as-is. That's what you're trying to do with auditing.

Now, we lay down rules, we lay down routines, we lay down various things that you can get away with and you can't get away with, and so forth; but actually all those things are supplementing what I've told you in the last half an hour here.

We've gotten a lot of experience on the track now on this subject. And we know certain things you can get away with and certain things you can't get away with. And most of these things are applied to a specialized being known as *Homo sapiens.*

Now, you start auditing grasshoppers, you may find another set of conditions of how you handle grasshoppers to immediately take place. There'll be another set of conditions of auditing, but the principles of auditing will be invariable. You will be trying to do the same thing with a grasshopper you were doing with Homo sap. But I imagine Hand Space Mimicry with a grass-hopper is not quite – not quite as easy as CCH 3. So the processes would be different, the targets of the processes would be the same. The routines and activities that you would go through would be different, but the exact auditing targets would be the same. The conditions would be the same. Do you see how that works out?

Okay. Well, you've got a long weekend ahead of you, and nothing at all to do in it. And so I think I'd like to add a little additional work. A little additional work. And I want you, over this weekend, to review this fact – these facts. Ask yourself this burning question: "Do I know the TRs? Do I know Model Session? Do I know how to administer the CCHs? Do I know the Prehav Scale and how to assess on the Prehav Scale for general levels? Do I know how to security check?" And this brings up burningly, "Do I really know this E-Meter? And do I know how to assess for goals?" Seven things there. Only one has been added which is old, which is the old CCHs. And I want you to ask yourself those questions over the weekend, and come up with the answer, and tear into those things which you feel shaky about on Monday, okay?

All right. Thank you.