

CERTAINTY OF ANCHOR POINTS PROCESSING

A lecture given on 20 October 1953

1st ACC – 29

Transcript of lecture by L. Ron Hubbard AICL-25 (first part), renumbered 13A (first part) and again renumbered 29 for the "Exteriorization and the Phenomena of Space" cassette series. Note that this long lecture was divided into two parts for the clearsound version and the second half will be found in the next transcript in this series.

This is October the 20th and the morning lecture – first morning lecture.

I was just making a comment there just a moment ago on this "ping meter."

I've talked to Volney, long distance, Sunday about this meter and obviously the meter is backwards. The thing should be silent where it's beeping, so on.

There actually ought to be a switch on it and one of the switches should turn it around so it'll register on a live area, or a painful area, and the other one so it ought to register only on anesthised areas. And the only thing you'd have to do to do that, of course, is just throw the speaker onto the opposite side of the circuit.

So you'd go over some preclear and you'd find your anesthised areas, and whenever you found an anesthised area the machine would go yeeep! Well, that would give a person an opportunity to say, "My God! You're dead!" which is approximately the case.

Then – also spoke to him about – he thought he could do that – and I spoke to him about throwing a – just a standard E-Meter needle where he's got that speaker sitting there, you see? That'd make quite a machine. You'd have an E-Meter, which would just be an E-Meter, and then you'd have a ping meter alongside of it. This ping meter would have a switch up there located someplace and on one it would say pain and on the other "anesthesia." And so that it'd register on one or the other and the people could have a lot of fun with it.

But the most remarkable part of this meter, evidently, is it will directly monitor – directly monitor this fact and it will indicate it on a meter. And on this one test of one here – a series of one – I would say that this could go on being done with this machine. I did a little more work with it and it seemed to bear out that conclusion: That he had the probe against his face and it was a null and it just stayed null until I reached over and made the connection, and at which moment – the exact moment I made the connection the machine went "ping." Okay.

This would demonstrate that one human being could monitor another human being's energy and it would also demonstrate that life energy was monitorable or attention units were monitorable by a meter.

Both of these would be extremely important in the field of science, which of course never rises above the level of gadgetry. And you would have it possible then for an individual to observe on a meter that the theta-MEST theory is correct.

And of course, people who have to be told by a meter what is right and what is wrong are people, of course, who have to be told by a meter. And there's nothing much you can do with them. But this validates what they've been trying to do in radiesthesia. Radiesthesia has been getting the "ha-ha" in various circles and being invalidated because it hasn't anything to do with radio waves. It has to do with whether one human being can monitor another human being.

Well, these doctors in radiesthesia will talk to you most learnedly and tremendously with figures and computations and everything, but they do their readings by passing their hands in the vicinity of the people and seeing what change occurs on their hands. And just between thee and me, that has about the same level of validity of knowing whether or not there's pork in Chicago by eating bacon for breakfast.

We have a level of knowingness which is acceptable to the community and the society at large solely on this basis: is can you register it on a meter?

Well, actually we have found that the human mind is liable to a certain number of errors as far as what it thinks is concerned. And that's what I want to hammer on this morning for a moment or two here, a little while, is just that. It comes under the heading of certainty.

Now, people want a meter to tell them what's occurring mostly because the human mind is (quote) liable to error (unquote). That's because one person has some cause for doing something and another person has a cause for doing something and they don't agree on this and their subjective realities are quite distinctly different and then there is no arbitrator.

That's why people go to courts of law: not because judges are clever, not because they're smart, not because they're alive and not because they're human. They want an arbitrator. And the best judge is actually one who sits there and best assumes the characteristic of a meter: impartial. He simply pings on the right evidence, on the rules of evidence, and so forth. Well, what he's pinging on is law as it is writ or wrote. Now that's – he's a meter. So as long as they've got a meter, fine. That's a judge, you see?

So you sit there as the auditor and the preclear sits there as the preclear, and the only reason you've got a meter between you, if you're way up Tone Scale, is so the preclear will agree with you.

Therefore, the theory that says – and to which, by the way, Volney subscribes – the theory which says that you should turn that meter face away from the preclear so that he can't see it – that's wrong. Just don't let the preclear start fighting the meter. The preclear will start changing his mind all the time when he sees there's no reaction on the meter. And he'll start fighting with the meter just like somebody in court fights with the judge. Well, they don't get

anyplace, except maybe contempt of court and ten days in jail. In the same way, they don't get anyplace with that meter.

The entire idea of judgment is an idea which is germane to the MEST universe. This is judgment, that's all. That's just the MEST universe. It has to be impartial, and so on. What it means is the most accumulated force vectors versus the other force vectors. And what you do is take the majority of force vectors and when those majority of force vectors are aligned up, of course, they will go through the lesser force vectors. And then when people no longer are able to face the idea of force, they still take the force and do the same thing with it but say they're doing something else with it.

The majority rule is simply this: If there were twenty-nine men in a room and nine of them disagreed and twenty of them agreed, the reason why they go forward on it is not because it's sensible or just or any other thing, it's just based upon the basis that twenty men can beat up nine men. And if you think democracy has any other basis than that, you're just crawling around in the dark shadows of circuits.

Majority rule is, of course, sensible if force is sensible.

Now, law simply means that the most people are going to survive if these particular force vectors are used or not used, that's all. And then the most people would have a sufficient composite force to enforce their will. Now when that gets artificialized you get a highly, highly aberrated government. When a government sets itself up to be real tough and when it runs itself contrary to the will of the people – but it's real tough – you ordinarily have a fairly good state, so long as the will of the people is just a little bit tougher than the government. But if that government successfully reduces the will or force of the people to a point where it has far more force than the composite mass of people, then, you see, the government is run for the government and it's not run for the people at all, which is bad for the people and good for the government.

Bad, good judgment and so forth works out in the field of force and this is a force universe and again we're into the field of motion.

You notice that communication introduced into police work catches an awful lot of criminals. Good identification into police work catches a lot of criminals. Well, these things are just nothing more nor less than the MEST universe modus operandi at work. It's not necessarily the way – the best way to work things out at all. It just happens to be the way it works.

Now, you're going to find out that in trying to adjudicate a preclear you're going to discover that they have very often abandoned force completely and have certainties on things which aren't so. Which is to say their certainties – they've been convinced that force exists where it doesn't exist. What is not so? They think that force exists where it doesn't exist or that no force exists where it exists. That's aberration.

Working out an optimum solution on the eight dynamics, one would work out what is the greatest survival potential for the majority of the dynamics. That's the best solution: one which enhances with survival the greatest number of the dynamics. Well, that's according to this society at this time, but that's a very – a very workable theory, particularly if you add into

it no balderdash about reason, but just add it in on the basis of force. Which one of these forces applied will most benefit the rest of the dynamics?

Well, your preclear has sunk below this level and he's in a complete labyrinth, a mirror-maze of logic where he can't identify forces or anything else. So he comes up with uncertainties. And we're right back here to radiesthesia. The reason people would give radiesthesia the "ha-ha!" is because somebody standing around somebody else holding his hands out in order to measure the other person's field is very subject and liable to the most gross error. It all depends upon the position on the – the sleeper, there, is the position on the Tone Scale of the measurer.

With a good high Step I, well exteriorized, good visio, good perception exterior, you wouldn't argue about that. He'd not only be able to measure the force on the area, he'd also be able to dissipate it. You see, it'd have to do with case levels. So we – in the absence of a Tone Scale we would have aberrated findings.

Well, what's the difference between this and the mystic idea of, "Well, I know it's true and I won't become the effect of that sort of a thing because I have made up my mind so and I won't become influenced by such factors. Because force is evil and..." Here we go, see? "And the thing to do is to deny everything and run away and be one with nirvana or something," – this whole, whole mess of messy ideas.

And what is it again? Position on the Tone Scale.

The handiest way to establish position on the Tone Scale is communication lag. Communication lag is how fast can the fellow change places. That's all a communication is: particle A to particle – I mean, particle position A to particle position B. How fast can he get from A to B and back to A again and how much certainty has he got on doing it? Because you'll find some fellows are down Tone Scale far enough so they'll say, "Yup-yup-yup-yup-yup-yup-yup-yup." Oh yeah, they're transferring all over the place, but they don't know what they're transferring to. They've forgotten. Well, keep that in mind, too.

Well, your communication lag in ordinary, everyday use would be the amount of communication the thetan has with the body and the amount of force response he could get from the body. And watch a fellow in his operation. You'll see that he will do things that will (quote) "betray him to your penetrating eye or vacuuming ear" without any trouble whatsoever.

Many things are an indication of this. Everything that's on the old Tone Scale is an indication of it, but the best one is communication lag.

Another one – part of that – is impartiality. When he goes onto a complete lag, he's impartial. And here's a very handy one, very handy little one: He won't look at what you're saying, which is a funny, funny statement but you know what I mean by it. He won't look at what you're saying. He won't answer the same question. Now that, in effect, is a communication lag. He may answer you very rapidly but he's not answering what you ask him.

Now, the ability to look at something and the ability to answer what is being asked are blood brothers. The fellow avoids looking so he avoids answering. The degree to which he avoids looking is the degree to which he avoids answering.

There are many ways to choke a communication line. One of those ways is simply to plug it with – just stop it entirely. Another one is simply to flood it; just keep it running at such a rate that nobody ever had any chance to say anything. Every once in a while somebody wonders if I get into that communication line. The only trouble is if they only knew how much I go around and wait for somebody to say something. That's very remarkable. You'll find that'll happen to this guy or that. He'll be so accustomed – he'll have been living amongst the aborigines or something of the sort. That's a fact. He waits for people to say something and they don't say anything. And so he goes along a little bit and again they don't say anything. He's running into a comm lag all the time and he gets so that he'll fill in all the silences himself. Real silly, but this will happen. All right.

Now – I'm not saying I'm living amongst the aborigines here in America. I have lived amongst a lot of aborigines in the world, though. These people aren't aborigines. They get a little bit older and we work on them real hard, they'll get up there though.

Anyway, where we have a comm lag, we have an inability to look at something, and we're getting down into the basic mockery band of the Tone Scale.

Now, it's quite important that you be able to differentiate between the gross pretender who is practically spun in on mysticism and a good high-level Operating Thetan.

Because the fellow who is practically spun in will do a mockery of the ability of the thetan. He will say he's doing these things. They do them in various ways with various communication systems. They all get around and pray for Stalin to die or something of the sort. See?

And you'll occasionally hear a Step I talking, and up, and you'll swear to Christ that this sounded more like mysticism to you than you ever heard of. Oh, this is – this is terrific!

The guy says, "Well, I tell you – I tell you; I went over there, you see, and I looked around and this fellow was thinking about so-and-so and it was very funny. He had this ridge mechanism built up behind his back and so forth, so I just turned it over. And he couldn't think of that anymore because now he was thinking like his mother. It was very amusing." Or, "I sailed around and I landed on this planet, you know? I took a look at this planet and gee, there were all these people and they were having a big fight. And there were all these explosions around in the air and I got caught in one of them and that's why I feel kind of seedy this morning. But I'll get a few minutes of processing myself and I'll feel better." Sounds real weird. This is not in the general understanding of human affairs.

Well, please don't fail to differentiate between this and the person that tells you a flock of spooky ones, like, "Well, I couldn't possibly be an effect of that. No cars could hit my car. What do you mean a car would run into me? A car wouldn't run into me. It just wouldn't dare."

The difference between the two is, the Step I ordinarily goes up along the level and he considers processing, if somebody is going to process him, a slight adventure. I don't

guarantee that he will really be sitting there being processed very well but he's perfectly willing to increase and enhance his potentials. The person at the lower end of the band won't.

The worst off at the lower end of the band will not be processed at all. They will tell you that they are – one of them said the other day, just this, "Why, I am between 10.0 and 15.0 on the Tone Scale." That's why he didn't need any processing – between 10.0 and 15.0 on the Tone Scale. Real spinner! Communication lag: very rapid responses conversationally, but they never made sense. That's what's known as "disassociation." You hear somebody talking in psychiatry about disassociation – psychiatrist doesn't know what he's talking about, but we know – the fellow isn't answering or connecting up anything he's saying or feeling with what is occurring in his vicinity, and that is disassociation.

You'll see somebody who is all the way gone in dementia praecox or some other psychiatric classification, all of which boils down to schizophrenia in one place or manic-depressive in another place, depending on what sanitarium they're in. Anyway, this manifestation is just 100 percent disassociation.

They say, "What beautiful birds there are in the trees – were you in your car this morning as you came down along the line – I have a pencil here, do you?" It has no relation. They're not relating what they're saying to the surroundings. What are they doing? They're not looking. And they've gone below the level of even looking at their own conversational flow. They don't know what they're saying. They're just talking.

Now, this person may have a real snappy answer. Don't ever mix up communication lag with just – just how fast they answer. It's a little neater package than that.

You say to this person, "Well, did you have a good trip?"

"Oh yes, yes indeed. I'll be ready in a moment."

Well, they said something, didn't they? They answered fast.

Well now, on a gradient scale you'll get this sort of thing: This girl came down and delivered Diana to us in Spain. And she was either pretty tired or something of the sort, but every statement addressed to her made her look about 180-degree vector, the opposite direction. She wouldn't look at any of these statements, in other words. It was on the order of "How much – how much did you spend coming down?" "Well, things – things really aren't terribly expensive here in Spain." You see, now that's permissible. That's a permissible offbeat, but believe me it's just an offbeat. She was asked, "How much did you spend?" not how expensive things are. You get that, just that little offbeat? And all conversation with her was that way. You never got any information out of her, no matter how many angles you attacked it from.

Now, I'd say there are three or four people in class who had mothers in that category. They're real weird.

You say, "Mama, can I go to the show?"

"Well, were you a good boy today?" That's, of course, permissible non sequitur, but..

"Mm-hm."

"Well, did you clean up everything in the back yard?" Again, this is still non sequitur; you're still hanging on the ropes and so forth.

"Well, that's fine. Now why don't you clean up the basement."

Well, of course, that's just downright cruelty, you think. But you were many times completely – completely fooled if you had a mama who did this, because she didn't know what you'd said. And if you'd just asked her five or six more times, the way kids learn how to do, why, you eventually would have gotten a specific answer to the question – and very often with considerable anger behind it, but you would've gotten the answer to the question.

You would've said, "Can I have a new pair of skates?" And then you got how Johnny down the street was awfully poor, and so on. You'd go down along this line one after the other, one after the other on questions. Well, if you just keep hammering "Can I have a new pair of skates?" she would eventually answer you bluntly on it. And it would seldom be yes. It would normally be no if you had to ask her that many times.

What are you trying to do? Why do they get mad? Because you're making them look! You're putting them right square into an engram. You're making them look straight through a ridge at exactly that you are there, that you are a being, that you are their child, that you have certain rights with regard to them as a parent. All of these things they have to face up to bluntly, squarely and admit your existence.

They have to look at you. They have to listen to what you're saying. They have to pay attention to your needs in life. And believe me, that is too much strain for a large percentage of the population. It's just – just no – no dice. All right.

When you get a problem, then, in communication, it's a problem of sequitur – connected thought.

Conversation would be "talking with." And there also ought to be another word: "monversation." Philip Wylie, of course, would change that off to "momversation."

But there should be a word there in the English language called "monversation." And when you have – when you have a preclear who is telling you the weirdest and driftiest things in the world, why, you want to cross-check it against his conversation.

Is he in communication? Are you really talking with this person? Is this person really answering? What is this person's communication lag?

"How long does it take to get an answer on the subject which you asked" is the definition of communication lag. See, it wouldn't be how fast do you get a sound back. In this society it would be how long does it take you to get an answer to the question you asked or agreement with the statement you made or disagreement with the statement you made as you made it. That immediately gives you, if you look at it, a different slant on a communication lag, and it tells you that a communication lag very well could be fantastic. It could be years.

I actually have received from a person a communication lag of several years. The longest circuit lag I know of was nine years. A fellow said he was going to do something and wanted an answer to a certain question and nine years later it occurred to him. And he

suddenly remembered when he had asked himself the question. And it was nine years before. It took something nine years to go through that circuit.

Well, don't miss, then, on differentiation between the Step I, simply because he's talking crazy, and the way downscale Step, simply because he sounds occasionally like something the Step I talks about. Because the person who is way downscale is trying like mad to desert that body. He's trying as a last resort to die and beat it, scam, get out, chew the body up, eat it all up and digest it or spit it out or do something with it. He's trying to deny life. He's trying to inhibit action. His whole philosophy will be that if you sit still with your legs crossed in a certain way and concentrate hard enough on your navel, you will have a wonderful result. What wonderful result is he looking for? Well, it'd be the disappearance of his legs, navel and body. That's what he'd like to have happen.

He thinks that if he disciplines himself dietetically or disciplines himself in his daily regimen or if he sacrifices enough, why, he'll be all set.

And you get this – these people with the philosophy of sacrifice; they're what keep the surgeons eating. They want to go down and sacrifice their appendix and the parents want to go down – have the kid go down and sacrifice his tonsils; and it's just – just sacrifice. You've got to give up something, see? In other words, "We'll get you out of a body a little bit," and there's two ways and this brings us immediately to this other point. There are two ways to get out of a body: one by making the body get off you and the other simply by stepping out.

The way you make the body get off you is very difficult sometimes, but I have – I have had this happen: I have told a thetan, "Now, you stay where you are and tell the body to get up out of the chair and walk across the room." And the thetan stayed there – very rare. The guy also could Step I. But this was very interesting. He watched the body walk away. Therefore he got distance between himself and the body.

And the other way is a part of the same class of ways, is to digest the body thetawise. You eat up its nose and you eat up its ears and you eat up its shoulders and its hands and its feet and you just digest it, that's all. The thetan is running Q and A. He's trying to turn the body into a thetan.

Now, you'll see this more times than you can count, on preclears. And they're perfectly willing to run any kind of a technique that'll permit them to turn the body into a thetan – in other words, make a ghost out of it if possible – or just eat it up and make it disappear.

Every once in a while you'll find somebody real mad at a body – you – real mad at it. If he can't exteriorize easily, he'll just start in running concepts which simply strips the energy out from in between the MEST molecules in the body. He'll just take all the energy out of the body. He'll take everything that's trying to hold that body together out of the body. He'll just run a process which eventually will make the body fall to pieces. He'll also submit himself to electric shock and every other doggone thing – anything to get rid of that body; boil it down, melt it away.

But the one which you've got to watch on a preclear – you'll run into this once in a while – is the surreptitious effort to pretend to be processed as the excuse for digesting the body thetawise so that it'll disappear.

And the other one you have to watch for is the person who is trying to turn the body into a thetan. Because both of them are real dogged and both of them are real down Tone Scale, and both of them have something wrong with their communication lags. Now, they're very easy to identify.

This is weird business though, this business of digesting the body, and so on. Again we have the test of this: communication lag.

I'm inviting you to look, in other words, on an upper-scale level, inviting you to take a good solid squint at the operating condition of a preclear and to differentiate between the manifestations of a Step I and the manifestations of somebody who would be a communication level, oh, E or F or G. Because there's a similarity. You'll notice the similarity.

Also, the complete friendliness of an Operating Thetan is mocked low on the Tone Scale with an ARC which is a complete identification.

People will talk down there about "Now, I am your friend." Boy, anymore when anybody says that to me, I kind of jump sideways a little bit and quiver slightly and look for the nearest exit. Because everybody who has cut my throat in Dianetics or Scientology always started it out with that line – always – "I am your friend." People who are my friends have never said so – just their use of the phrase is enough. This is friendship used in business, too, and all of that. That's a low-tone mockery of this thing.

Now, the other point I want to make right on this same groove – the low-tone mockery – there's that little band down there, from 2.0 down to 0.0, actually mocks manifestations which are way high on the scale and which are freely used. The difference between is high on the scale they're used by looking and low on the scale they're used by thinking.

All right, ARC. Now, what is the most complete ARC there can be? The most complete affinity, the most complete agreement and the most complete communication there is would be that ashtray and that ashtray that are both the same ashtray. That would be the most complete ARC there is.

There's nothing wrong with ARC as long as you still can use all sides of the answer. A person who has force and can command force has nothing to fear from ARC. But a person who is trying to get along with no force, can generate no force, collapsed bank, can't work, and so forth – when he starts in using ARC, it just goes all the way down the Tone Scale.

You cannot be right and be human. Remember that. Because your Step I will find it out. Your Operating Thetan will find it out. He can't be right and be human. The whole cult of being human is based on being slightly wrong. It is not polite to be right.

It's just like the – it's just like International Business Machines with their big motto all around the place: Think! You know, it's a wonder to me that organization is still operating. But I asked a salesman in it about it one day and I asked a mechanic shortly afterwards about it, and they both gave me the same answer; it was a very easy answer: "Why, after it was there a couple of days we never noticed it and you called my attention to it now. That sign has been hanging there for two years and I don't think I've seen it the whole time." They just tuned it out.

But you can't be right and be human. T'ain't polite to be right. You come down the street, you say, "How are you?" And the other fellow says, "Uh, I'm all right this morning. Uh ..." Supposing he said – you walk up to some fellow, to some sad apple – some Homo Sapiens down here on the street walks up to the other fellow and says, "How are you?" and the other guy says, "I feel wonderful! I have never felt better for years!" Oh, the other guy goes into apathy. Of course he's about to be et.

You're sitting at a table, you see, and this fellow spills some stuff in his lap or something of the sort and you're supposed to not notice it. You saw it! Well, but you're not supposed to look, you see? Well, it's sure wrong not to look any day of the week when you have to restrain yourself from looking.

Everybody goes around wearing clothes. Now, that's very peculiar. They wear a certain kind of clothes and the clothes are designed to be practical and so on and everybody thinks they need clothes and so forth. And all these reasons – you know darned well after looking at aberration, they're wrong as can be. You can't be right and be human.

So people who go on with communication level at the lower end of the band consistently and continually and so forth, just have to – it isn't that it's bad to do this, you understand. We're up above the level where we have to worry about the contagion of aberration. I'd better tell you that if you haven't thought of it already. We don't have to worry about the contagion of aberration when you can blow up the ridges on which it accumulates. To hell with it.

But remember that you can throw in a circuit that will operate perfectly well. It'll just do a beautiful job. But you don't have to believe the circuit. You could say a man's deterioration begins when he starts believing his own circuits.

Out West they used to say, his deterioration began when he started believing his own lies. Same thing, this man starts believing his own circuits. He sets up a circuit that agrees politely, that doesn't correct the grammar and communication of people he's talking to. He knows that their reasons which they're offering are completely specious; he never says they are. Never follows an overt line. He's just polite, you see? He's just as polite as can be.

You can't be right and be polite. You can't be polite, by the way, and be sane. But you've got to be polite to be human. Manners is the whole system of restraint.

And this business of looking for the center button, center button, the center button, figure-figure-figure-figure- figure-figure-figure is all very well, but the center button is right there in plain sight, is restriction – restriction in perimeter. You want to know all there is to know about aberration in one breath, why, it's just that: restriction in perimeter – limitation of space. And that's all there is to fun, too. Don't overlook that side of the button. People who worry too much about this are apt to look at the other side too much. They say, "Restriction is all bad." No, it's not. There is no fun without restriction.

But politeness is restriction, which could be fun but is generally just completely nauseous because it's trained into you like mad with practically torches and swords when you're a little kid. You're supposed to sit still and listen to the grown-ups talk. I could make

you all very restive by just going on with that theme because that's very centralized as a button. It's restricting the motion of a child. Okay.

When we are operating, then, all of this has to do with – all the way down the line, the top of the scale and the bottom of the scale – has to do with motion. From the scale A level communication: very rapid, sequitur; and G (bottom): slow or never. Between those two you merely have a gradient scale of communication response, communication lag. What is the communication index of the person? It's that scale, and that will tell you his sanity, his ability; tell you all about him.

All right, now let's look again at that scale and see that we have from A to G nothing more nor less than the shift of a particle from one point in space to another point in space and back to the first point in space. That's all you've got, is just the movement of a particle from a point in space to another point in space and back to the first point in space. That's what you've got. That's all you've got. And that is motion.

And the total definition of force is the motion of a particle. And so you can marry together right there communication and force and know why a person who is aberrated can't work. He can't exert or direct effort.

Well, his inability to exert or direct effort is – immediately shows up in his inability to immediately direct communications because they're the same thing. They're particles in motion-direction-direction and motion. You see that?

So in order to bring somebody up the point of the scale, you should be able to increase his communication speed; you should be able to increase his ability to handle force, and both of these things are entirely dependent upon his ability to take from position A in space to position B in space and back to A in space.

The certainty with which he does this is the certainty with which he's moving the particle, which merely means the precision with which he can move the particle – the precision with which he can put it at that spot A and move it to that spot B and back to that spot A, just the precision with which he can do this. And if he can do this precisely, he can communicate and he can exert force. And that's all. There's no other – no other riddle there.

The precision with which he can fix a few anchor points around – you'll have people tell you, "Well, I can't quite get the anchor point into the corner of the room." That's just an index of how well he can fix that point.

You see, in order to move something from point A to point B you have to be able to get to point A. And if he can't quite get to point A, he's really not moving from point A to point B. He's not quite looking, in other words. All right.

Now, there are many variations of this. Let's take the corners of a cube and let's number the corners of the cube; and let's number them, the upper four: one, two, three, four and the lower four: five, six, seven, eight. Then it would be important, if a person were to make space and remake space, for him to move a particle from one to two to three to four to five to six to seven to the eighth, wouldn't it? And if he could move a particle through all those spaces very easily, why, he'd be in pretty good shape, wouldn't he? I mean, he could move it precisely, and he could leave it there as long as he wanted, and it would remain as

bright as he wanted it to remain, so forth, through all these eight spaces. Boy, could he make space.

Well now, the beginning of that drill is you'd use MEST, which is holding out some nice anchor points for you anyhow, and you simply take a particle in – just number the corners of a room, the upper corners of the room: one, two, three, four and the lower corners of the room: five, six, seven, eight. It'd be the ability, first, to move one particle – himself sitting in his body, you see – move one particle through one, two, three, four and then through five, six, seven, eight.

Now, when people are talking about "my thetan is over there," you know, I mean they're sitting in their body and saying, "the thetan is over there," and all that sort of thing, of course, they're not where the thetan is.

What they're doing is moving a form around. Well, that is actually the lowest end of the scale, the mockery band of what a thetan really does, and it's also the highest end of the scale. After a while your thetan isn't going to fly around and you'll actually come up against a bumper plate in processing. If you think your thetan is just going to fly around from place to place and position himself in these places for ever and ever and ever... You've got to get him up to a point where he's got terrifically precise and great speed – precision and speed in fixing points in space and moving from one to the other himself

You start in the process, then, by having him move a point around in a cube of space. And then you would go through – if you weren't too successful with just Change Processing right off the bat, which is your first recourse, always – he would move into this making space by just moving a point around the corners of the room. You just keep moving this point. You'd do that for a little while and then you would go into Change Processing and you would finish up by having him toss viewpoints around with which he could look. His viewpoints, then, get to be very precise. Do you follow this?

Then your optimum process for any case would not be just straight Change Processing, which can be very brutal. It would just be a short, rapid drill on moving things around to the various points of the room. And every time he'd made an excursion of the various corners of the room, or every few times he'd hit them at random one corner to another (he's gone from five back to three), put one on the body and you get your introversion – extroversion on this preclear. See?

And you do so many points of the room, and then do – put one on the body. And then do so many points of the room, and then put one on the body again, and then do many – so many points of the room, and put one on the body again.

Then you start shifting him from the right side of the building to the left side of the building, why, you would get him out into space, so that he's actually moving into one space and then into the other space and into another space. Well, after a while if his uncertainty on that is too great, you'll have to bring him back in and have him find the four corners of the room again with a moving point. So this is an advanced type of processing. All right.

Another part of a variation of this technique would be to set up two chairs, one facing the other, and you have him sitting in a third chair. "Be behind the first chair and then behind the second chair, and behind the first chair and the second chair."

Well, a case that's down the line a bit will set up a circuit to do it for him. So you want to watch that. Don't let him get bored. Because he wants to be sure he's not looking at a facsimile, so he'll set up a circuit that'll just look at the facsimiles and he'll get foggy on you. You won't know quite why he's getting foggy unless you realize that he's got a circuit doing it for him now and he's using facsimiles, not the real thing. But he's not sure, he's not sure that he isn't just doing what he did before, you see? You better change and make new the scenery he's stepping behind.

Well, the best way to do that is just turn the chairs around and drop them over on their sides, see, and push them over on their faces or turn them on their sides. And then after he's done that several times, if you're just being behind one chair and behind the other chair, and behind one chair and behind the other chair, and behind one chair and behind the other chair, then turn them around so when he's behind them, he's being pointed at by their feet. This is a new and novel arrangement, you see. Make new and novel arrangements when you're doing close-up processing of which you want him to be very sure. Every few times, every few shifts, make new and novel arrangements. Okay?

A preclear will set up a circuit which will perform this activity for him after he's been processed for a while because you're dealing with a case which doesn't dare be in places so he's going to use every mechanism in his mind to keep from being in the places you say. If he can make it automatic, he will. So you've got to vary your process enough to do that.

Now, remember to get in your certainty on this. That's quite important. And where he gets confused is he thinks he's only running the time when he did it before or he isn't sure that's today.

Now, you can take a case and run extroversion-introversion on them this way: "Be in the room where you were this morning; Be here in the body. Be in the room; Be in the body. Be in the room; Be in the body. Be in the room; Be in the body. Be in the room; Be in the body. Be in the room; Be in the body."

He'll all of a sudden go kind of pop! pop! about that room, and a lot of things will blow up about that room. See how that would be?

Now, I've run this on a preclear and put him in his car. His car was sitting right outside. But he'd never ridden in the back seat of his car, so I put him in the back seat of his car. He couldn't get that confused. Put him in the back seat of his car and put him back in his body, and back in the back seat of the car and back in the body, in the back seat of the car and back in the body.

And all of a sudden there was a resounding metal clank. He just got through pulling free from, really, hundreds and hundreds of hours of driving in that car. And when he pulled free from it, he pulled free from the first accident he had ever had and it was a resounding clank, believe me. He'd been sitting in a car for years with that accident keyed in, you see? Well, this keyed the whole thing out just as nice as you please.

Now, you see how you'd do that? Make sure he's certain and change it and make it new for him often enough and, of course, as I told you yesterday, try to match up his dynamics. And then remember that he's trying to put a mock-up out; he's trying to put anchor points out.

Now, if you were to send him to eight consecutive places, as pinpointing, you'd be making space. We're going to go into that a little more this afternoon. But remember that if you send him to two places, you're getting no dimension. You're getting just two different places.

But if you're going to make space with this, you have to send him to about four, at least. And he'll get the sensation of space and he'll get more space.

And remember if you're drilling him with chairs in a room, or something like that, to shift them around in position once in a while so that he doesn't get too bored or too tired with it. Of course, it doesn't much matter what you do to him with this process, he'll just keep on getting better.

[End of tape. This topic is continued in the next lecture.]