

4TH LONDON
ADVANCED CLINICAL COURSE
NATIVE STATE & POSTULATES



L. RON HUBBARD

LECTURES 30 - 40

4TH LONDON

ADVANCED CLINICAL COURSE
NATIVE STATE & POSTULATES

TRANSCRIPTS, GLOSSARY & INDEX



L. RON HUBBARD

VOLUME THREE • LECTURES 30-40

LONDON, ENGLAND • OCTOBER - NOVEMBER 1955



GOLDEN ERA PRODUCTIONS®
A HUBBARD® PUBLICATION

GOLDEN ERA PRODUCTIONS
6331 Hollywood Boulevard, Suite 1305
Los Angeles, California 90028-6313

© 1978, 2008 L. Ron Hubbard Library.
All Rights Reserved.

Any unauthorized translation, duplication, importation or distribution, in whole or in part, by any means, including electronic copying, storage or transmission is a violation of applicable laws. These transcripts have been prepared from the recorded lectures and written materials of L. Ron Hubbard in accordance with his specific directions for the publication of his recorded lecture materials.

Dianetics, Dianetics Symbol, Scientology, Scientology Symbol, L. Ron Hubbard, L. Ron Hubbard Signature, Scientology Cross, Golden Era Productions, Golden Era Productions Symbol and the other trademarks and service marks depicted in this presentation are owned by Religious Technology Center and are used with its permission.

Scientologist is a collective membership mark designating members of the affiliated churches and missions of Scientology.

Any queries regarding these transcripts should be sent to:

LRH BOOK COMPILATIONS
Tape Transcripts Editor
6331 Hollywood Boulevard, Suite 1006
Los Angeles, California 90028-6313

Printed in the United States of America

IMPORTANT NOTE

In studying these lectures, be very certain you never go past a word you do not fully understand. The only reason a person gives up a study or becomes confused or unable to learn is because he or she has gone past a word that was not understood.

The confusion or inability to grasp or learn comes AFTER a word the person did not have defined and understood. It may not only be the new and unusual words you have to look up. Some commonly used words can often be misdefined and so cause confusion.

This datum about not going past an undefined word is the most important fact in the whole subject of study. Every subject you have taken up and abandoned had its words which you failed to get defined.

Therefore, in studying these lectures be very, very certain you never go past a word you do not fully understand. If the material becomes confusing or you can't seem to grasp it, there will be a word just earlier that you have not understood. Don't go any further, but go back to BEFORE you got into trouble, find the misunderstood word and get it defined.

GLOSSARY

To aid comprehension, a glossary has been provided containing definitions of terms and phrases. Words sometimes have several meanings and the glossary only contains definitions of words as they are used in the lectures. Other definitions can be found in standard language or Dianetics and Scientology dictionaries.

If you find any other words you do not know, look them up in a good dictionary.

CONTENTS

LECTURES 30-40

LECTURE 30 21 OCTOBER 1955 NATIVE STATE AND COMMUNICATION	1
<hr/>	
LECTURE 31 24 OCTOBER 1955 RÉSUMÉ OF CREATIVE PROCESSING, PART I	25
<hr/>	
LECTURE 32 24 OCTOBER 1955 RÉSUMÉ OF CREATIVE PROCESSING, PART II	49
<hr/>	
LECTURE 33 25 OCTOBER 1955 ENGRAMS - DISSEMINATION OF MATERIAL	77
<hr/>	

LECTURE 34		
25 OCTOBER 1955		
THE HANDLING OF CONFUSION IN THE PRECLEAR OR ON ANY DYNAMIC		103
<hr/>		
LECTURE 35		
26 OCTOBER 1955		
STABLE DATUM AND THE STUDY OF SCIENCE		129
<hr/>		
LECTURE 36		
26 OCTOBER 1955		
SOLVING ENGRAMS WITH STABLE DATUM, COMMUNICATION TERMINALS		153
<hr/>		
LECTURE 37		
27 OCTOBER 1955		
THE ROLE OF A SCIENTOLOGIST		179
<hr/>		

LECTURE 38 28 OCTOBER 1955 THE ANATOMY OF TERMINALS	203
LECTURE 39 28 OCTOBER 1955 SIX BASIC LEVELS OF PROCESSES	225
LECTURE 40 28 OCTOBER 1955 INTOLERANCE	251
GLOSSARY	277
INDEX	309

NOTE:

An index and glossary of terms are provided at the back of this transcript volume.

The numbers in the margins of the transcripts represent track numbers on the CD, allowing you to rapidly find your place when resuming study.

NATIVE STATE AND COMMUNICATION

LECTURE 30

A LECTURE GIVEN ON 21 OCTOBER 1955

60 MINUTES

I'd like to talk to you now on this second lecture of October the 21st, 1955 on the subject of the modus operandi back of processing itself. 2

Now, we know that the ability to create a not-know, places an individual in command of the subject of not-know. We know that. So let us examine, then, not only why an individual creates not-knows but what pursues from that point.

Now, we have native state: some level of rather wide, able knowingness, you see? We won't say it's an absolute because we find these absolutes are practically unobtainable. We've known that for a long time. But certainly the native state of a thetan is a potentiality, at least, of great knowingness or it is a knowingness of anything and everything. Now, we won't say, then, that it's an absolute, but we will say that it certainly seems to approach that point.

In order to have a game, the thetan postulates a not-know. Why does he postulate a not-know? Well, evidently, a not-know is intimately related to the creation of time. If a person had a total knowingness, he would have, then, a totality of understanding this subject of time, too, and he wouldn't have any time, evidently. So he postulates a

not-knowingness in agreement, one way or another, with other thetans and we have a not-knowingness of certain time periods such as future and, in moderation, past. And we close out future entirely and close it out more and more, we of course are more and more closely situated to base time and thus everything and everybody can go off, tickety-tick, very nicely.

- 3 Now, we look at the past and we discover that not-knowingness about the past throws out of existence any and all (he would like to believe) solid forms concerning the past. But when an individual's not-knowingness goes over *totally* on an automatic principle, he then has a condition whereby his not-knowingness begins to swamp him. Past, then, does begin to regain some of the mass it has already had. And we discover that his pictures of the past can appear in the present with the greatest of ease.

And we have many systems by which pictures of the past can be handled. But these pictures of the past, remember, are backed by a not-knowingness—ability to not-know the past. And this ability to not-know, or this not-knowingness, degenerates on an automaticity. The individual goes out of control of it, you might say, possibly because he wants to, and then we get him pulling in facsimiles.

Now, by its very term and word, *facsimile* means picture of or in lieu of; it means something instead of. And instead of the past, he pulls in a picture of the past. And these pictures—as he has gone across the past track already on this fanciful system of not-knowingness called “time”—opening up a pinpoint of the present consistently and continually—he then gets a condition there by which he's saying he *knows* parts of the past.

Now, know—Axiom 36 is, of course, a second postulate. And being a second postulate, it has the force behind it of not-know. Now, it's a lower harmonic of a total know, but it is knowing *something*. And knowing this something, an individual is then in the interesting position of holding back the confusion of his own and others' creation—this not-knowingness (which is—that and confusion, for our purposes, is the same thing)—and he holds this back

by knowing *something*. He doesn't alter the not-knowingness ordinarily. He never touches this but it has the dynamic thrust, you might say. The power of specific knowledge or data or items as an effect is derived from the postulate, not-know. The second postulate derives its strength from the first postulate.

So we have the thetan moving from native state of Cause over to second postulate, knowingness, which is an effect. And as you look at a wall, you say, "I know that wall is a wall" and you have actually pulled in upon yourself something. Get the idea? Knowingness about something is an *effect* operation. So the second postulate is an effect postulate.

And now if we not-is it and say, "I know something. Now I'm going to forget it. Now I've forgotten what I knew," we've moved on the track and we've not-ised this *effect* knowingness (second postulate is *effect* knowingness) and we've not-ised *effect* knowingness. And we start to gather up some of the darnedest systems and thingamabobs and so forth, forgetter mechanisms of one kind or another. And we start to get the phenomenon of solidity in the reactive bank. We've not-ised, see? This thing was knowingness and maybe we even put it into picture form.

You see, this *effect* knowingness tends to be solid and as we get into the picture aspect of it, we then go so far sometimes as to forget the pictures by not-ising them. We press the energy of these pictures out of existence by saying "It does not exist at this moment." And of course, that is a lie, too—third postulate. But it's less of a lie than to say, then, that another system is going to permit you to remember this.

You see, now you've altered the Not-iness and this becomes remembering. Now what are you doing? You're recalling something that you have forgotten, which you once knew, which you postulated that you didn't know, which you knew anyway. You follow this sequence, now, as we move from the fourth postulate back to the native state?

Female voice: Yes.

And now we wonder why somebody starts to have trouble with his bank and it all starts to get solid. There's a line in Shakespeare about, "'Tis sport to see the engineer hoist by his own petard." And I suppose that it's an enjoyable thing to see somebody blown up by the fuse he lit, but this is certainly what a thetan is doing. And the fuse in this instance is, of course, not-know.

- 4 And as we light the fuse of not-know, we say, "Well, I'm not going to know about that now. I'm not going to know about that. I'm going to be real cute here and I'm going to say I'm not going to know about *all* of that. Now I'm real smart. Now I'm going to know about that."

Now, we're on the time stream on this subject and this subject is going to flow along at a uniform rate and here we go—here we go.

"Now I'm going to know about that. And now I'm going to forget that I know about that. And now I'm a real smart boy and I'm going to convince myself time really exists by saying, 'Well, now, I remember when I was a boy,'" see?

And we've got an idiocy going, which was what? Started by the thetan himself and when he gets into a jammed bank, is almost total effect and obsessively starts to remember things which then occlude along about the fifth postulate, you see. "I'm occluded" is the fifth postulate. He gets himself into the remarkable state of being hoist by his own petard. Only trouble is there's no explosion. It's usually just a dull crunch.

Now he says, "How am I going to get out of this mess?"

And there hasn't been any real method for a long time except maybe death or something. But death didn't get one out of this. So actually, one could say, for—as far as we know and as far as we have any record—there hasn't been any method of getting out of all this for 76 trillion years. See how we'd do this?

You know that a boy, actually, when he starts to study geometry has to postulate that he doesn't know anything about geometry to become the effect of knowingness about geometry. And yet, you take some savage in the Gullaby Isles and you start to show him these patterns and how the angles compare, he'll say, "I know about that. That's silly."

And you say, "No, no, you really don't. This is a very specific subject, see—very, very specific subject. The actuality is that there are theorems and so forth" and so we get a specialization of this subject of geometry.

Now, it really isn't safe to do that with any subject if you lose entirely your command of the ability to create not-knowingness.

We get back to the fact that Scientology is a safe subject to study if you study it. It's a safe subject to use if you use it. And it is oddly enough and remarkably enough, probably—and only one—the only safe subject that Man has ever had that was completely without real liability in the aggregate. **5**

But of course, we could partly know it and we could only halfway use it and we might as well be holding a pistol that bears Spanish proof marks and fire it. Of course, it rather blows up and maybe takes one's hand and half of his face with it.

Now, why would it be necessary for anybody to study not-knowingness? Well, I suppose you're at the ten-to-the-eight-hundred-millionth-power postulate. I suppose that's about where we are, more or less—in other words, a ways down the track. And we've just kept reversing this idiocy and oddity of not-know it, know it, forget it, remember it, occlude it system, system, system, system.

Now, when we start to not-know something—without a rather specialized activity, the bank is liable to swamp us. There's just so darn much of it. And an individual says, "Well, I can't tolerate that much confusion, that's all."

Well now, he's quite honest and sincere in this. Although he was hoist by his own petard, he nevertheless is being hoist. All right.

It's all very well to say it's all in the fellow's mind. But what I generally say if asked, in reply to that remark is, "Well, it's all right. You are, too. So is your shirt." They don't quite get this.

Well, all right. If this is the case, then, we must examine a little bit further why a thetan is doing this, anyhow. Well, we have said many times—and so far have not run across anything to controvert this—that the thetan is playing a game. He must be playing a game of some sort which has become a bit too grim for him when he feels very bad about this game. Because the game, obviously, does have a liability of one kind or another. A thetan, by his own considerations, tailors up a sufficiency of liability and mass to pack him in and do interesting things to him. But they get too interesting after a while. As matter of fact, they get fixative.

And so the reason he not-knows something is sort of—play a game—be able to look at things and be able to participate with his fellows and so forth. It's an activity, then, which is apparently superior to this business of being in a native state. See? We can talk all we want to about "Let's all go back to the swamps of Nirvana," pardon me, "the pool of theta" or something—"the dismal swamp." But you know, it doesn't have any appeal until people are just so apathetic that it's enough to half kill them, just the thought of living another instant.

Therefore, this native state is apparently not a totally desirable mechanism. Otherwise, some thetan long before he was hoist by his own petard would have said, "To hell with this game." And while he still knew how to do it, not-knewed himself into an ability to not-know and would have again been in his native state. It's as simple as that, you see.

6 So we are faced with the possibility that—we can't say that everyone has just been trapped against his will. It sounds rather odd because it leaves no villain anyplace. And that

is the great oddity in studying people. We don't find any villain anyplace. We find that bad intentions come about by individuals assigning bad intentions to others and then swapping valence and getting out of their own beingness into the racked-up, postulated badness of the situation, you see? And we find no badness—really, this is true—we find no badness anywhere unless it has been mocked-up for somebody and then he skidded into it. So badness is a consideration.

And as far as goodness is concerned, we could say, “Well, goodness, then, wouldn't have any reality unless you understand it against badness. And if badness is a consideration about or against somebody else, then naturally goodness would be, too.” And that's not the truth. That doesn't happen to follow, because they're a first and second postulate manifestation—badness and goodness are first and second postulate.

Now, we've got native state and then we've got—so forth. And once we get down the line a ways we can still say, “Native state, first postulate, second postulate, third postulate, fourth postulate,” anywhere we want to on the concatenation of life. And say, “This, so far as we know, is his native state with relationship to geometry. And then this was his first postulate saying he did not know geometry. And this is his second postulate, now, saying that he is now going to learn geometry.” See? This could have occurred anywhere along the line with regard to some specific subjects.

And so it can occur below the level of knowingness, certainly, but very, very close to it, on this subject of badness and goodness, you see? And the way an individual gets to be bad is a first and second postulate manifestation. So his first postulate is rather uniformly, “I'll do all the good I can, you know. I'll improve all this and make a universe and we'll make it all decent and swell.” And then his second postulate is rather uniformly—and this is odd, you see, it may be some kind of a survival mechanism at work here, but it is nevertheless odd—that the badness comes in as a second postulate. This is a curiosity, see? He says, “It's now bad,” or “I'm bad,” or “There is something bad about it,” mostly

because he's made a postulate which was quite native to him. There was something good about it, so maybe it's "all bad," you see? But nevertheless, the postulate that's alive is "all good."

Maybe there is nothing to know, see, and maybe all knowingness is just made up. This could be, too, you see? So native state could be dull stupidity. Only it doesn't demonstrate itself to be dull stupidity at all. As we boost the fellow up the line and he gets closer and closer to native state—and that is what he's getting closer and closer to—why, we find he gets brighter and brighter. So we must assume that the don't-know is an artificiality stated by himself. And so it is.

Well now, it isn't necessarily true that all goodness is something stated by himself—not necessarily true, but it just happens to work out that way in practice. So an individual, evidently, had as his first postulate about his intentions—good intentions—and then this got stopped with a badness, see? And we get this badness as an artificiality. It's a second postulate and it's a lie, because it works that way. We can't locate, really, any badness that isn't powered by goodness. And if we don't look at this principle, we just don't understand what people are all about. The badness is powered by goodness.

And we see this curious mechanism: We see somebody starts out to heal somebody. And he works him over and—nice to him and tries to help him out and, doggone, this person won't get well. You know? He finally starts getting mad at him. He finally says, "Well, the dickens with him." Then he says, "He's a fake. He's no good, you know? And he's a villain. He's wicked."

And we hear somebody damning and raving about somebody in particular, we can be absolutely sure that on the backtrack this individual started to help somebody or something and this person refused or this thing refused to be helped. And then we get a bad opinion of this, you see?

Although one never should speak on the First Dynamic at all, let's take the cracks I make about psychiatry, see? Well, it must follow that I tried to help psychiatry at one time or another. And really, the only reason I'm mad at them is because they refused to be helped and they're still in their swamp.

Now, let's go further. Psychiatry in its bad actions—and many of its actions, today, can be considered from our viewpoint (now that we know a little bit more about it) to be rather thoroughly bad, see—I mean, because they do not produce a cure. Psychiatry runs around telling everybody how they cure everybody.

It even became part of a bill of the United States House of Representatives that 75 percent of the people going into the better institutions were cured. I mean, this is a stated law of the United States now. I mean, what a lie! See? I mean, this is for the sea gulls. That's a fact. They couldn't demonstrate this. But they should never use a word like *cure*, anyhow, and yet there it is. And that bill was drafted by psychiatrists and passed by the US House of Representatives and by the United States Senate by consent. It also provides millions of dollars worth of research funds which shall only be handed around and passed into guys' hands by the APA. You talk about favored legislation! But it contains this lie right in the middle of it—just an outright, baldfaced lie and it's unsupportable.

We had a chap who was a chemical engineer statistician. And this man researched all the records of psychiatry to discover what psychiatry was really doing. And he found an awful lot of words, but he could find no evidence of anybody having been materially assisted by psychiatry. He did find people being sent home and psychiatry writing in their books, see—psychiatry writes in its books, "Oh, this person is cured," or something. And then we find a readmission of the person after three weeks. And then—darnedest entries, you know?

And we look in this and their remissions or successes from a prefrontal lobotomy and electric shock are all almost the same—they release them—he was *released*, you see?

And we then say, "Well, something must have been done for him." And then we find that the fellow either went home and murdered his wife or burned the house down or did something wild like this and was readmitted—or got killed or got picked up and thrown in some other institution or bumped himself off or simply went into a complete spin. And this is the track of this. And yet we find this as law of the land.

Now, how the devil this could be? How could anybody be standing around and even believing it in all the popular magazines that this brutality and savagery of (quote) "treatment" (unquote) would be helping anybody? Somebody must be operating here at a real nutty level. Well, how did they get into that nutty level? They must have started to assist their fellow man and then they must have failed and now they've gone nuts, see? You get the idea?

Their fellow man must have said, "Because you are operating with bad people in the insane, you must be bad." And their fellow man refused to be assisted. And so somebody spun. Because you see, it's gone again over on another harmonic. We're down into the third postulate, which is the only reason I'm describing this at all, see? We're down into the third postulate on this subject—which is to say, what we are doing is good.

And the fourth postulate is, of course, we're re-calling ourselves, only "bad." See, once more you've got this imbalance. Do you follow me?

- 8 Now let's take survive and succumb and let's find that survive is native state. And there's a little bit of wonder about this of exactly how this fits. And I'm not giving this to you as a precise datum, but there is no such thing as a continued survival for a thetan in a native state because there's no time through which to survive. But his first statement is that he's going to survive and his second statement is that he's going to succumb—and his second postulate is succumb. And the unreal postulate there is succumb, although it's evidently some kind of a harmonic on the native state, just as knowingness is a harmonic on the native state, just as badness is a harmonic on the native state.

So there's just no telling exactly what a fellow would wind up in if he said, "I am totally and only native state." And then we start to classify exactly what is native state on the time track and in terms of our own values. See, we'd go out of communication because these conditions are the product of first postulate, second postulate, third postulate, fourth postulate, don't you see? These are our evaluations.

So what is native state? Well, this person certainly would be aware of being alive. We can certainly agree on that. But he also, at the same time, he wouldn't be aware of anything. You get it? It must be something like that.

Now, I'm saying it must be something like that because although somebody might have had a preclear assume it sooner or later, you of course never talked to him afterwards. For somebody to assume total native state would be for somebody to back totally out of the game. And we get right down with that to: What is the game, then? How does one know one is playing a game? And what is the principal game an individual is playing?

He's playing a game called communication and that is the game he's playing. And then, in order to have communication, he has reasons why. And that is the significance of the game. But the game is really communication.

The pay of the game is communication. Just as the winning team always gets all the applause and the losing team doesn't, so the winning team wins. Wins what? Then you could say, "Well, a bit of ribbon, a little pigskin to hang on the dean's or the coach's wall or something,"—certainly nothing very finite. But when we reduce it all down, we find that there was a reality there. The reality was communication. Their play was communicated to the spectators who are observing it and to the other team—more intimately to the other team and then to the spectators. I imagine games, after a while, began to tolerate spectators and then eventually began to tolerate people talking about spectators. I think that's the end product. You no longer talk about the game, you talk about the spectators.

The columnists for fashions in the United States are about as far south as you can go. They don't talk about the marriage, they talk about what everybody wore who was looking at the marriage, you know? They don't even recite what the bride wore anymore, you see—talking about the spectators. And Prince Charming was there and so forth, you know? You get the idea?

As we drift away from the game, we really aren't drifting away from the game if we consider the game just in our own terms of two sides to a football match. See, we're not really, then—we're really not, then, detouring away from this game. Because the game, at no time, is anything but communication. And as long as somebody talks about something somewhere, a game is in progress. Got it? And the way you know a game is in progress—if somebody is talking to somebody somewhere, see? See that? And if people are doing something or talking back or communicating in reverse, we know a game is in progress of some kind or another.

Now, completely aside from the motives of this game and the reasons of this game, there's only one real worry about the game—and this is a real worry—that the game will cease. And that is a worry. People worry about that.

And then, what would be the cessation of the game? Well, the cessation of any given game would be the end of communication with or about that game. That would be the end of game—would be an end of communication about (blank), you know, about anything—that would be an end of game. Nobody talks about it anymore, so that's the end of game. You know, then, when you've reached the end of game at any given moment, because nobody is talking about it anymore.

9 As long as people are talking about it, however, a game is in progress. And as long as anybody is talking anywhere with others—and they're talking to—boy, you got a game in progress.

Now, as we look this over, we discover then how we can tell when a game is ending. People are stopping talking; they're not talking as much. The level of communication at any given moment in any society is a direct index in ratio to the amount of communication that has been in that society to the vitality still extant in the society, see? We can measure the vitality of a society at once and instantly by measuring the amount of "talk about" that is in the society. That is the criteria—quite important. And if a society stops talking to a society, the game is going by the boards. The vitality in the society, the interest in the game must be waning very markedly.

The value of a game is, really, not dependent upon the velocity of particles. Some people make this mistake. They feel the velocity of the particles in the game measure the game. This is not right. It is the amount of communication which the game will support which measures the value of the game. You got it? The amount of communication that game will support.

All right. Now, knowing this, we can look at a couple other of the factors which are very important and that is that talk is pay—communication is pay. What pay is there? Communication—that's the pay. One draws his salary in order to further communicate, see? Doesn't matter how the pay is handed over or in what form it is in. Actually, it is as good as a salary as it will buy the opportunity to communicate one way or the other, see—the opportunity for communication.

It's, for instance, doubtful if anybody ever goes to a show to watch or enjoy the show. That's interesting, isn't it? But one goes to the show to a large degree to—sometimes to complete the other side of the cycle. He also has been in shows way back when and so on and he's balancing out things, you could say, to be entertained, to have interest and so forth—but he goes to the show to have communication.

And a more valuable part of the communication is this interesting thing: He's got a show now as a subject for more communication. And he paid in his—oh, I don't know, what is

one of the lower-class seats in a theater today? Eighteen pounds, isn't it something like that? In the United States they're getting up toward the optimum of five or six hundred dollars a theater seat—they're going in that direction. It sounds wild. But whenever a decent show is filmed today, you go down to go into it and you look up there and it says, "This is a road-show edition of this particular film and your admission—general admission: two dollars and fifty cents." It's getting there. It's getting there. Used to be a dollar and a quarter for a road show. In other words, this subject matter is becoming dearer and dearer for some reason or other, because it's becoming more and more important.

But after you've been to the show—you see, you've gone in, you've paid this sum of money, whether it's a sixpence or sixty pounds, you go to the show—then you've got something to talk about both to people who went to the show and to people who didn't go to the show. It's a double bonus. And there are people around who won't let you tell them the plots of the motion pictures you've just seen—these are killjoys. There are people around who will say, "Oh, that's nothing. I saw an act like the one you're talking about several months ago and a much better act." But of course, that's still communication if somebody is talking, you see? So we could see a little bit more about this.

- 10 We're very often astonished to find in the theater this oddity: that an individual has been talked about in a very gentle way—not too much discussion about them one way or the other—and then they pull a horrible boo-boo in private life and everybody goes gab-gab walla-walla. And the stupid producers always say, "Well, this person has done something terrible, let's just pull her off," so on.

Well now, actually, once in a while, a person can do enough so that there's a fast gab-gab walla-walla and then the public stays away in droves from their pictures. But only if the person is represented as being a very good and saintly person on the screen. Happened to an actress, Ingrid Bergman, who played, unfortunately, Joan of Arc just before she had an illegitimate baby. And while she was busy having the baby, the world premiere

of this very expensive picture was released on Broadway to an empty theater. See, that's an oddity. There was too much gab.

There's too much departure here. People could not artfully talk about this subject. She wasn't smart enough to make it discussable, see? If she'd been a little bit smoother about the whole thing, why, she could have had some talk going and the baby, too. See, and everybody would have filled up the picture house and away we go. But she evidently stopped communication by the character of her act being different from the character being portrayed. So she, of course, was what? You had an unreality set in so great that she didn't exist so, of course, you couldn't talk about her—Joan of Arc does not have illegitimate children. So therefore, the picture and she did not exist. Got it?

A man is much safer in life to play the villain in the show. He's always much safer because, then, no matter what anybody says about him, he, of course, still has reality on which we can get an agreement. And many people, recognizing this, specialize in villainy for no other reason. They know it's the safe role; you never lose your popularity. Get the idea? Not because people talk about bad things, but just because people ordinarily in discussing and making nothing out of things try to downgrade things. The fellow is already sufficiently downgraded—a little bit below optimum or something like that—people will talk about him.

Now, the communication is an interesting fact in that it does this strange thing: it as-ises the things about which one is talking. Communication as-ises mass.

Now you, as an auditor, better never take your finger off that. Communication as-ises mass. You're going to knock somebody's havingness to ribbons.

Very probably the only reason bodies age is because they talk. New thought? You thought the only reason bodies were in good shape was because they talk. Remember, it as-ises mass. You got it? Hm?

Well now, an individual should then be capable, practically, of putting up a new mock-up every time he wants to draw his pay and draws it too thoroughly. The only pay is communication. There's his body; he's making it talk. Very good. The body is talking. Fine. Some of it's going to as-is, one way or the other. I mean, in terms of mass now. Some of it's going to as-is. Well, a good, able thetan simply keeps moving a new body in the place of it. You know, he keeps building it up again. It as-ises out the bottom, he says, "Well, bang-bang, bang-bang, patch-patch, bing."

Only, sooner or later he gets tired of patch-patching every time he has a conversation, so he does this one: He sets it up on automatic—got little machines. And he says, "Each one of these machines which I don't know I am running are now going to feed masses at the body and when I gab-gab walla-walla too much, why, then of course, these machines are always there. And, therefore, if I talk about cowboys and Indians, I'll get a picture of cowboys and Indians and that will remedy the mass of cowboys and Indians." And it's so-ooo logical. Isn't that gorgeously logical? Let's just set it up on automatic and then we *never* have to worry about this, not even vaguely. Oh, no?

Now he's into a new problem. And the problem is he's lost not only his power to not-know, but he has delegated his ability to mock-up to a bunch of machines. And so he loses the ability to mock-up.

- 11 Now if we center and exactly represent and articulate the reason why he has all of this machinery feeding masses to him and his pictures and masses and so forth, then we have solved the problem of what he is doing. And having solved it, we can then repair it.

You cannot repair a radio set if you do not know its purpose is to receive radio signals. You take a radio set down to the wisest man in Egypt four thousand years ago and he would probably have made ornaments out of its tubes and copper wire. One, he could never have found out what it was for because there were no receiving stations around and two, nobody ever time-machined him any wiring diagrams. He wouldn't know what

the radio set was for. And that would be a terrific mystery. And that radio set might sit around as being the most mysterious thing. And somebody would say, "Well, probably, probably, that is the product of the Crown of Isis, all those glittery things on the front of it there." Very possibly this had a deep significance and there's a small devil that is in the box. Or maybe, not talking, the machine would have had no significance at all.

Now, a little bit better than that—he would never have repaired the set, never would have repaired the set. But supposing we had sent a wind-up phonograph back to Egypt that had some actual records and we had shown somebody how to play the records, you know? And this wind-up phonograph appeared four thousand years ago amongst the pyramids and pharaohs and mummies. He could have wound it up and played it and wound it up and played it. Remember, it's now amongst the pyramids and mummies and there are no spare platters to spin. There are no spare needles. It's a rugged piece of construction, but there are no replacement parts. And after a relatively short time, a finite period of time, you would have had these records played completely smooth so it would have just sat there and scratched. In addition to that, the needles would have been worn out—as always occurs in any communication mechanism. It wears out.

Only a mechanism that does not communicate is practically always there. A rock stays there for a very long time—I call to your attention—a rock mountain will stay there a very long time, except for one type of communication it would stay there forever. And this rock mountain, this rock mountain, of course, goes by the boards under the communication of wind and sand, the communication of heat and cold, and the communication of natural catastrophes. It goes. If it were not touched, if nothing ever flowed, no life approached it, it would be there forever.

These asteroids that go spinning round and round are kind of out of communication. They are very hardy in the first place, they do not chew up easily at all and they are rather out of communication. The only thing that is touching them are a few cosmic rays

and a few sunbeams and these are not very erosive. They do have a stress on them—the communication of the relative gravity of the planets through which influence they travel. Now, these asteroids, however, are not in very close communication with anything and they just go round and round the Sun, on and on. Follow me?

12 If this preclear of yours never talked, he would always have something to talk with. You follow me? If he never talked, he would always have something to talk with. He would always have a terminal.

Now that terminal, however, has probably been removed a considerable distance in not-knowingness—which we might as well say, time—been removed a considerable distance. It's been moved back into the pyramids of Egypt as far as know-how on setting it up is concerned. Only it's been removed in the opposite direction. And the know-how of what it's all about has declined.

The actuality is that it's very hard to spot who actually built bodies. And a thetan will seldom own up, even under good processing of passed caliber, to the ownership or construction of one of his machines. But they're sure fancy machines. They make a phonograph look silly. They are complicated. They've got wheels and gears and every other darn thing. You know, some people think we're just being loose, you know, when we say "thetan machinery." Well, we'd also be loose if we said the machinery of the Jaguar machine works. You know, that's a loose statement—same order of magnitude.

A thetan does have machinery. It is machinery and it does some of the darnedest things. He powers it on an indirect circuit which sometimes gets cut and it turns out for him energy masses and new mock-ups and replacements about the things he's talking about. So he thinks about a cow, he gets a mechanism—a picture of a cow to as-is as he's talking about the cow. And this gives him a little more body to make a little less body on. You see that? See this as an interesting mechanism?

Well, it's an unfortunate thing that communication as-ises things. But communication adjusts one on the Tone Scale. And as one goes without communication, he sinks down and gathers more mass and then, as he gets communication, he rises upscale but loses the mass—unless he himself goes upscale and then puts the mass back without going downscale on the mechanism of communication.

Now, there's a way to beat this racket, see? All you have to do is put an individual into a position or capability where he can restore the masses which are as-ised and you will, at once, have whipped the corrosions of time, which are the corrosions of communication.

Now, mummies—now, I'll go over this again—mummies stay around for a long time, don't they? Hm? Stay around for a long time. And let me call to your attention that they don't talk. This sounds very far-fetched. But mummies which have been found and are talked about start to disintegrate. Interesting, isn't it? Hm? So the solution is, to have a mummy, you had better have one that isn't going to be found.

Now, if you have a machine that is supposed to repair all of your havingness then you, too, had better not know about it. If this machine is supposed to sit there and automatically repair all of your havingness, then the first thing you would do after you got the machine all knocked together would be to forget you had it—not-is it to that degree, throw a not-knowingness on it and, for heaven's sake, stop talking about it, because the darn thing is going to cave in.

But there is this state—there is a time, I assure you, to locate this machine, and that is when one of two conditions pursue and obtain: One, when the machine is giving you pictures about other subjects than you're talking about. These don't as-is. And that just is a cumulative machine and it simply starts packing in the energy. And then you don't know what the machine is giving you pictures of and you don't know you have the machine, so you don't know, really, what you're as-ising and you don't know how this relates to anything else and you have a thing called hallucination.

- 13 And the only reason hallucination worries anybody is he knows he's never really going to talk about the pictures the machine is giving him, because he starts to talk about those pictures, he'll talk about other pictures—I mean, he talks about the pictures he's got, then other pictures will appear and he doesn't know what they will be. And they are, none of them, in agreement with anything he wants to talk about. In other words, the machine is not assisting his communication, it's impeding it because he knows better in this society than to talk about hallucinations, see? You just don't go around talking to all your friends about your hallucinations—not unless you're a writer. [laughs]

Of course, a hallucination is a self-created—a story on paper could be said to be hallucination, except for this one thing: you know who wrote it. A hallucination only gets real maddening when you're getting the wrong picture at the wrong time and you don't know who or what made it. And then, that gets pretty daffy. Then you don't as-is anything. Everybody sooner or later has had a machine go haywire.

Well, that's certainly a time to tear up the machine and find out about it. Hm? That's no time to sit there and let this machine go *blong, blong*.

And the other one—the other time when you want to find out about this machine, no matter how thoroughly you've not-knowned it, is when it is no longer in operation. It's a mass sitting someplace. It's now a communication stopper. But in view of the fact that you're not talking with attention directed through it, it doesn't as-is.

And after a few busted machines have clapped on some preclear's head or after a few machines have started to produce blackness—because he's started to talk about too much blackness and then got worried he didn't know what the heck the machine was doing and it kept feeding him blackness every time he thought of blackness and he was getting more blackness than he could talk about and so he didn't talk about blackness anymore. You get the idea? But that belongs in the first category, that's a misproducing machine. When he starts to talk about lightness, it goes on producing blackness, you see? You get

a fixed machine. Well, these are two conditions under which you would like to know about the machine.

But there's another echelon that is higher and more important than this—even more important than this. And that is, those things which fail to assist the individual to receive pay—communication—are, of course, a liability to the individual. Those things which assist him in communicating, of course, are valuable to the individual and are helpful and assistive to him, no matter if they're horrible. Anything which assists him to communicate he then considers good—assists him to communicate. And anything which retards him in communicating is then, from our standpoint, to be considered bad.

So we get the finite limits of processing very easily. Processing should regulate itself, no matter what scheme or system is used, to enhance and increase the abundance of all of the points in the Communication Formula. And you could say, "What should processing do?"

What should it do? It should improve communication. Now, of course, communication is going to disappear entirely if you flip the thetan into a native state, see? You understand that. So that doesn't improve communication. He doesn't get paid at all. He won't like it, either.

And the other fact is to increase the abundance of communication in all of its parts. If you increase the abundance of communication in all of its parts, you, of course, are not going to as-is everything in sight because you're also going to have to supply terminals which *will* as-is.

Now, the dream of a thetan is to have an entirely indestructible communication terminal which is yet mobile. Sounds peculiar. He actually wants something that he can't as-is. By what? Communication. **14**

So we get individuals tailoring themselves up in the most remarkable things. We have knights dashing up and down wearing tin suits, which were hot, and when they got fleas in them, were maddening.

Now, when we have a process which increases the abundance of communication in any of its parts, we have a good process so long as it doesn't, at the same time, inhibit communication in too many other parts. So we could increase somebody's intentions in such a way as to as-is all of his terminals. Got that? We could increase his intentions with a process which as-ised all of his terminals. We could increase his number of things to talk to at the expense of his space, which is necessary to communication. We could get all kinds of things to talk to and more and more things to talk to and he wouldn't, eventually, have any space left, see? And thus we get the actual limits, if they could be called such, of Scientology processing, the goal of which is to assist the preclear in getting paid in the game called communication.

Now, that this pay is very worthwhile is a thing you should never for a moment doubt. An individual will stop communicating when he can no longer afford to as-is. See, he just has got—his mechanisms and so forth are so thoroughly unbalanced that he can no longer really afford to as-is anything. And he stops creating terminals at a moment when he cannot utilize them in communication or he tries to stop creating terminals at a moment when he has terminals which don't communicate or he can't communicate about, see? He tries to keep this adjusted. And he goes out of adjustment on this formula and no longer gets paid.

- 15 Now, is communication pay valuable? Is the pay called communication valuable? Does communication actually have any slightest inherent goodness that is rewardful?

I want to call to your attention that the entirety of sexual sensation in the whole Second Dynamic is communication. Well, that's a very interesting thing. It's communication—a very close proximity toward a certain definite goal and purpose, it's very much in a game, you see—it's a very pat game all by itself, it's a type of communication. And any sensation involved therein, must be communication sensation. There's no other way to do it.

All right. Now, let's take up something a little closer than that: eating. Did food ever taste good? Did food ever taste good to you at all? Well, if food or drink ever tasted good to you, even vaguely, that must then be capable of being experienced through communication, because it in itself is a very close-proximity communication. Well now, do all communications to feel good and to taste good, be of this close proximity? Hm? The proximity of closing the terminal with your terminal, you see, is not really necessary—it's not really necessary for the sensation.

Now, it's a quite—quite odd thing that communication itself just as communication and an interchange of thoughts and ideas can rise as a sensation to—and taste and flavor, you might say—to a greater height than sex or food. Gives you something to think about, doesn't it?

So an individual is out of communication to the degree that he is no longer willing or able to as-is things by communication. And thus he's being very, very sparing of his communication and thus communication no longer really feels good to him. So there is a level of the Tone Scale where he has to preserve himself so that he can still communicate, but communication is to him not very flavorful. You know, it's sort of like you have to keep on eating soup, but there's nothing in the soup to taste. Or there is maybe some seasoning but no meat or vegetables in the soup and the seasoning might not be pleasant in that state at all. So a fellow could get it to an ebb where he couldn't be paid. The game—the pay.

The game is communication. The pay is more communication.

So all you're trying to do is put your preclear into a position where he can be paid for living. If he doesn't enjoy living, he simply does not have any pleasant sensation connected with communication. That's all. But he has hopes. And he hopes someday that he might have.

And these beautiful sensations and beautiful periods that people have had and experienced are big communication wins. And they try to keep these things in the bank. They're being paid. That is pay—these ecstatic excitements and so forth. He just momentarily permitted somebody to communicate *really, full-out* and he communicated *really, full-out* and *slurp*, it was delicious. But he didn't have much mock-up left.

Thank you.



RÉSUMÉ OF CREATIVE PROCESSING, PART I

LECTURE 31

A LECTURE GIVEN ON 24 OCTOBER 1955

59 MINUTES

All right. I want to talk to you now, this morning of the 24th of October 1955, for the 4th London ACC, concerning the uses of processes which you already know about, tremendous number of processes which have been put out in the last five years. 2

First and foremost of these processes today is Creative Processing. It's an interesting one. It has been done and has achieved successful results on very many people, has changed many, many cases and actually is the subject of a book called *Self Analysis*, which has done very well for the last three years since it was put out in that form.

And the fate of Creative Processing is to be revived at Level Three of Six Levels of Processing. That's its fate.

Now, usually we pick up a process and then throw it away, you see, and pick it up a little bit tardily again, you know, a little later and then we throw it away and so on.

Well really, Creative Processing has not altered very much. We said a long time ago that if you would work with this book, *Self Analysis*, for quite a while, you eventually would exteriorize somebody.

See, I just happen to know that and it's very odd that I happen to know that and not know exactly why. And now all of a sudden we know why and the why of this is fabulously interesting. It's that in Creative Processing we were actively creating and remedying scarcity of terminals. We created terminals and we rendered their scarcity null and void.

3 Now, we discover that two-way communication as-ises. If you were to simply keep on talking on good two-way communication basis, you would eventually discover that you didn't have any mass to talk with. Two-way communication as-ises. And the reason it as-ises is quite interesting.

Now, you can think of all the mechanics you want to and you can dream up all of the rationale you want to back of this and you can give it all the significances you want to, but there's an oddity here that two-way communication would as-is anything, because it doesn't happen to matter what postulate the mass was put up with. We put up this mass with some sort of basic postulate or another and then we run Two-way Communication with or through this mass and discover that it is diminishing.

It's one of the more fabulous things, see. I mean, it didn't matter what reason you mocked it up or what postulates or considerations got it there, the end product was that two-way communication would as-is it.

This should be very significant to you—matter of fact, it is. It's fascinating. It means that two-way communication must rank with postulates, it just means that that must be the case.

And it must be that either you make a postulate or you two-way communicate, see? And if you've made a postulate, then two-way communication will as-is the postulate. This is quite fantastic, you see. Because there isn't any mass about which I know anything that will not at least thin on two-way communication and if you kept it up, would vanish and disappear, no mass anywhere—one of these interesting factors.

Now, therefore, we must have a considerable vested interest in two-way communication. If we have such a vested interest in it, it must be awfully important. And if it as-ises masses put up by anyone (and we get to the other point), it certainly is doubly important because here is the other oddity: Two-way communication as-ises a mass whether it is put up by Joe or Bill, and whether run by Joe or Bill or Tom and Susie. See? It just doesn't matter who runs the Two-way Communication or who put up the mass.

So we are at once—and I've just gotten this sorted out neatly—we're at once above the level of ownerships, so then we're above the level of causation. We must be above the level of "*Who* made it?" And the question, "*Who* made it?" is also solved by two-way communication. We don't even have to hit "Who made it?" to get it going by the boards.

So we have two systems at work here. And one of the systems requires great precision, such as perfect duplication, assignment of the exact ownership, the mocking-up or unmocking of masses by postulate. Here's this hugely complicated system, see? That all goes under the heading of postulates, mock-ups and all that, you know?

And here's another independent system—and it's an independent system. Don't try to interrelate these two things. You can, of course, put them on the scale of seniority or parallel or anything you want, but they really are not related systems. Two-way communication—two-way communication.

Now, there's a great deal of liabilities to the use of communication which create circumstances not necessarily the same circumstances as the first class. Now, in the first class of which we speak is this ramification of postulates, mock-ups, misowning—all kinds of oddities like this, you see? Now, there's that class.

And now, we have another way of making masses—is start knocking off parts of the Two-way Communication Formula. And that's the second class.

Now, these two classes, then—either one makes or unmakes masses, postulates, creativeness, perfect duplicates, ownership, discovery of exact causation, you understand? These make and unmake spaces and masses and also time. That's one class.

Now, the other class (just make sure you get this real good), the other class is two-way communication as-ises, and failures on the two-way communication system—in other words, only part of the formula in use—creates masses and spaces too.

So you can create masses and spaces with use of, or neglect of, some part of the Two-way Communication Formula. You can create masses and spaces weirdly enough over here in this first class, you see.

In other words, we have two independent systems at work. And the two systems monitor each other and modify each other, see? That is the way it is.

Now, when you look at somebody's bank you realize, then, two things could be wrong with this bank—two things, see? It's there by misownership and it's all gummed up, because of misownerships of confusions and shame, blame and regret, you know, and kicking it back and forth and failure to locate the exact causes of things and failure to exactly remember things—get that in there. Although that really isn't germane to that (I'm going to talk about that in a moment), we have all of these things that could accumulate and disrupt the bank—in other words, postulates; misownerships; active, forthright creation and uncreation of masses and spaces.

And then, we've got this other system here that a fellow starts to engage in two-way communication, and spaces and masses result or get as-ised depending on whether or not you used full two-way communication or partial two-way communication. Now, you see that? See, there's another system by which we get masses. Isn't it fascinating that there are two systems?

Well, there aren't just two systems—there's three. There's a third system which is independent of the other two systems which monitor and modify both of them. And that is the first postulate system, Axiom 36. This is another independent system. We can tell lies on the first, second postulate basis and we will then create and uncreate, in various ways, spaces and masses and also, of course, for all of these, time.

Now, in other words, here's native state and the fellow kicks out one of his abilities with the first postulate and then he makes a second postulate as to the specification, classification, the ability. And we get as a result of this activity—we get masses resulting, you see? We get resultant mass and resultant space and resultant time.

Here's another way of making time and mass which is not necessarily dependent at all on the first two classes. So class three is all there by itself—very nicely, very neatly. It'd probably keep on that way forever, you see. You could know and not-know various things and you would get a resultant series of interesting factors involved.

Now, you understand what I mean—I mean you'd get a mass. Any time you say, "Well, I don't know," you know, "I don't know about women." "Well, I know women are pretty doggone nice." Got to have a mock-up.

Here's a mechanical system, see that? He gets a mass or a space or both with his second postulate. Quite cute. Now, he can forget and remember the resulting mass and he gets this curiosity of another way to create a universe, see? We've got, now, three ways to do this same thing. All right.

The odd part of it is that any one of these systems—any *one* of these systems monitors the other two.

Now, those are the three principal systems. There may be other systems; I haven't taken time to look around and classify them at this juncture. There may be other systems.

But the great oddity is that none of these systems need to be resorted to if you're going to take them apart.

Postulates and considerations take apart the third class. You can add to or unmock the masses resulting from the lie just by consideration change, see? This first and second postulate system, in other words, can be monitored by that.

The first and second postulate system can be monitored by two-way communication. It'll add to or subtract from masses resulting because of Axiom 36—the first, second postulate system. Quite curious, quite curious.

So if there are these three classes, then we had better look at which classes are worthwhile and useful in processing. And we find out all three classes are.

But we find out this terrific oddity: unless we rehabilitate the ability in class one, we get no resurgence on the part of the preclear—*awfully* important for an auditor to know.

In other words, although considerations are not absolutely necessary, evidently, for two-way communication and so forth, there's some sign that these classes two and three—and that's why they're listed as classes two and three—are resultant from and dependent upon considerations themselves (postulates and considerations). You see that? Because of these three classes, although they're very neat and although they're very nice and although they handle masses and although they get things out of the road which the preclear can put out of the road and lay aside, you see, although they create and uncreate masses, spaces, time, keep a universe going or knock one out and so on, they nevertheless are evidently—*evidently* dependent on the ability to *consider* in class one. See, they're evidently dependent upon that factor.

Now, where do we get the most gain in a preclear? It should strike you as odd that we can change his intelligence or change his personality, either-or. And when I found out, originally, that we could change his intelligence or change his personality at will—either one—I

became very curious and I wondered what changed his personality and what changed his intelligence. See that?

Now, wherever and however we work this system of processing, we should know whether we're changing personality or improving intelligence. Now, the odd part of it is that all three of these things, in the regain of their abilities, have a tendency to alter both the personality and the intelligence. See, all three classes have an effect on doing this.

Now, wherever we have a system, we, of course, have something junior to a consideration. Now, that's the way it is and we're stuck with it. See that? All right.

It must follow, then, that these systems are the result of considerations. You mock-up something because you consider that it is there. You unmock it because you consider that it is unmocked, see?

And now, in classes two and three, which is why they have junior numbers (that is to say, they're two and three, not class one), we find that within the bounds of existing agreements, you see—within the bounds of existing agreements, a past series of agreements are at work.

Out of class one, then, we get a certain pattern of agreements which bring us up to and straighten out difficulties or, actually, create more difficulties in classes two and three.

Now, we have, then, a series of thoughts—a series of thoughts which have to do with class one and are intimately—and are derived from class one. Do you see?

We obtain, then, workable systems. And we could say that Scientology as class four is such a workable system. See this? We've done a fantastic thing here, see?

Actually, within the realm and framework of universes, we have actually created another system which, by certain practices, agreements and considerations can make and unmake space, make and unmake mass and make and unmake time.

If you don't believe this, you ought to see how much junk you can make a fellow accumulate by bad auditing, see, you actually create new masses. You give him stops

and changes at the wrong parts of a session, you fail to engage in enough two-way communication and so on. And this fourth class is certainly older—I mean, pardon me, it's newer, you might say, it's more years deep from year zero—than classes two and three.

Now, it's very, very strange that this class four would handle classes one, two and three, and yet obviously, cannot be senior to classes one, two and three because class four simply uses and handles the existing sets of agreements and abilities.

Now, then we're up against a very great curiosity. Class four is able to control and monitor classes one, two and three. And class four is Scientology.

Now, there may be some other systems that we wot not of or that are peculiar or germane to some other universe, see? There may be other systems. This may be.

So we should, of course, allow ample space in there. So we should just say the *n*th class is Scientology, and we shouldn't call it class four, see, or the "xth" class. Maybe that's better. It's the *x*th class, see? Almost impossible to say, therefore, you'll remember it.

Well, let's just name it there and let's put it as one of these classes. And the reason we're going to put it as one of these classes is we actually can create and uncreate spaces, masses and time with this stuff. You can create an independent Scientological time track for an individual just between auditor and preclear if you don't follow the better practices of auditing. You can create an individual time track. To that degree, you're creating a universe.

You can throw enough Auditor Code breaks into the situation to create artificial masses which actually don't come under the heading of two and three intimately because they're under the headings of one, two and three all at once. And, therefore, we get this *x*th class. So there may be other systems and classes, so we just better leave a space in there and we say to date, "We know of these classes."

- 8 Class one: By postulates and considerations, the making and unmaking of spaces, masses, time, associations, agreements and so on.

Class two: The making and unmaking of spaces and classes by use of or neglect of two-way communication. That's an easy one to remember where it is because it's class two, two-way communication.

And class three—and class three is the native state—first postulate, second postulate system.

And class xth is anything you've learned since 1950. Curiosity, that's all—that we would actually be dealing with something which is best used as a standard class. It is best used as it, because it's another breed of cat. We have done the unthinkably, incredibly impossible thing of standing up above class one—the use of postulates and considerations in order to create and uncreate spaces, masses and time and universes. See that?

If we can handle class one with Scientology, then Scientology at least belongs in the same class of classes—at least belongs in that same class. It's another system of agreements though.

And the simplicity of it all is that the preclear changes most and changes best when you win in class one. Got that?

When you win in class two, you have caused energy to get him to change his mind in the bank. Well, you still win, but you're winning subordinate to a set of agreements derived from class one.

And now native state, first postulate, second postulate systems and so on, of course—don't underestimate these, they do change the preclear, see?

These states of change are subordinate to, actually, the two-way communication state because they have to be done with a two-way communication basis. And, actually, the xth class may or may not be senior to or junior to the other three classes for the good reason that it uses the other three classes—and only works because of class one, but would work even if you didn't have class two and class three. If we didn't know class two and class three, we'd still get some workability—and *have*, see?

I'm perfectly prepared to find eighty-nine classes stretching out—all of them, however, subordinate to, if you please, class one. Even class xth is subordinate to one. Because if we neglect cognition, for instance (that's where that belongs, class one), if we neglect cognition on the part of the preclear; if we neglect his increase of understanding as represented by his increase of ARC, you see (which is again merely a new postulate on his part or a new created state as far as he's concerned); if we neglect the ability to mock-up or unmock at will by postulate alone—we have a limited win.

The only way to get an unlimited win would be by class one and class xth, with class one eventually as-ising class xth. Got that? And unless class one as-ises class xth eventually—the fellow comes to the cognition, “Well, I don't need any more auditing. I'm in beautiful condition. Things are going along fine.” Unless he makes such a consideration and says, “Well, I don't need any more,” we haven't won totally. We have won subordinate to class xth.

9 Let me call to your attention that psycho-*anal*-ism never, at any time, got any higher . . . [laughter] What's the matter? Isn't that the subject of their activity? I thought it was. Excuse me if I'm wrong. I'm just being scientifically factual. I don't see why you're laughing.

They never became higher than the subject itself, you see? Everyone had to be continued in a psychoanalysis. Got the idea? In order to get along, he had to be psychoanalyzed forever.

All right. We don't want to fall into this trap in Scientology. We can, of course, actually live rather well as far as making masses and spaces and so forth and time tracks and everything else subordinate to class xth. See, we actually can do all right with getting an occasional patch-up of auditing.

All right. Now, we have to ask this question then, “Is there a make-and-break point or have we created a new Frankenstein?”

Now, the Frankenstein-monster effect is just that and is—this is an old term, by the way—is quite important. It is that thing which dissuades people from doing further creation. It is the effect which damps out creativeness—the Frankenstein-monster effect.

By the way, you know, the monster was never named Frankenstein. Frankenstein was the name of the builder of the monster—the creator of the monster. And Frankenstein's monster was built lock, stock and barrel by this gent Frankenstein out of old body parts that had been kicking around in deep freeze or something.

And wired up, why, the Frankenstein monster of course, as you all know, went romping and enjoying nothing, but went romping across the land stripping the limbs from little children as though he were taking petals from flowers and doing other thoughtless things, and nobody could stop him.

There was no way you could kill the Frankenstein's monster—not being alive it couldn't be made dead. See that? And the monster, therefore, became a terror to all beholders and so on. It was an indestructible thing and it had no soul, no mores, no ethics and so forth—a general or something like that, see? [laughter]

You think I'm being too hard on generals, I know, but then you probably haven't known any personally—I have.

The general that is too busy to look over his morning mail and so a young fellow gets shot. The first man to be shot for desertion in the United States Army since about 1862, something like that, is shot because a general is too busy with his golf clubs or something or whatever he was doing on the Western front, to look over what he's signing. So a young fellow, who is quite neurotic and who simply didn't know which way he was going, gets shot, you know?

A general who says, "Bomb that town. Bomb it to smithereens," because undoubtedly there are lots of enemy hulking in the rubble and so forth and you get into the town and find out that it was occupied by one school full of school children, most of whom are now dead and the rest wounded. And who says, "Well, tactical blunder. Go on, boys. Let's get on with the war—*pfst!*" You know—inhumanity incarnate and a Frankensteinian monster.

This, by the way, is not germane to one general. This is the characteristic of a man who will actually consent to continuing a destruction as the head of what is laughingly called a set of troops, see, and have a lot of reasons why all this has to take place and sincerely dedicate himself to destruction, *totally*, without consulting the self-determinism or decency of the race. And I think that man is a pariah. I think that man must be utterly craven and depraved; I don't care what army he is in or in what age he lived.

That's my idea and that's why you all of a sudden hear me coming down once in a while with a boot heel on generals. They don't make a good game, they simply end them. Their motto is the same motto an engram bank has: "We must overcome self-determinism by force. And if we sufficiently overcome everybody's self-determinism by force, we will then have a . . .", and they've never asked themselves what.

- 10 Now, we train these boys and turn them loose and then the next thing you know, they're *yappity-yapping* back and forth and the next thing you know, the private citizen has a war on his hands in which he isn't interested. We've actually, to that degree, created a Frankenstein's monster. We've created a man who knows nothing of diplomacy, knows nothing of life and we have put into his hands a great many young men who have been lied to and trained in one way or another and they go out and kill a lot of other young men and a lot of civilians, too. And if this is a way of life, I have never noticed any life in it—only death.

Yet the world having created this particular type of monster is faced today with the problem of how do you uncreate this monster? How do you uncreate this general whose totality of existence depends upon threat and continuance of war? See? How do we uncreate this character? How do we uncreate this whole philosophy of war?

Now, we could say there's a philosophy of war and the philosophy of war has created the general and we would be right. A sort of a group postulate has come up here, and the mass and space and time which it created is the general and his army.

Now, the only way the race is trying to as-is this thing is to create other generals and other armies and have them try to obliterate the existing generals and armies who came about because of this postulate. You get the idea now, hm?

Now, this is not a political speech I am making—probably be hanged for it in about twenty countries on Earth, to say the least. But if they did hang me, they'd certainly get a lot of publicity—ha-ha. [laughter] Probably the only reason I'm alive today. Anyhow, "It'd make more noise to hang him than let him talk."

Now, I want to give you this as an example, not out of the depth of bitterness of my soul, but out of the depth of bitterness of your bank, because you felt far worse than that from time to time about a Frankenstein's monster.

You made it and *it* kept on going and you couldn't do anything to knock it off. You get the idea?

Audience: Yes.

You were party to some act or creation which then could not be made to stop, just like Frankenstein, you see. You made this mock-up in this space and time and so on. And you said, "That's cute. Now it's walking fine." And you said, "Now stop walking," you said. And it kept on walking and you said, "Cease! Vanish!" and it didn't cease and it didn't vanish. And a situation more or less of your own creation became more and more arduous and persisted further and further and it seemed that your very efforts to unmock it, to crush it, to wipe it out, made it more awesome and more terrible—just like the effort to crush generals and armies today.

And the force of arms of various nations is becoming more awesome and more terrible (you see that?), till a man trying to suppress the survival of one of these Frankenstein monsters *then* gets into this fantastic consideration that he *must* suppress and *must*, himself, kill in some fashion. And if he cannot do it in any other fashion, he will do it with force.

- 11 A man who has, through his connection with a woman, brought her to a level of activity and pain and hurt of which he is fully ashamed, finds he cannot uncreate this monstrous situation. He has put the devil of pain, you might say, inside of her to such a degree—he's disarranged her, he's given her some sort of an off-balance insanity and he would do anything to uncreate this and he cannot. And therefore, out of franticness, like the "Ballad of Reading Gaol," he may shoot her or stab her. You understand?

You see the excess of passion to which an individual may come in an effort to knock out a Frankenstein monster. He himself has created the monster. He knows that it may have had other basis, there may have been other provocations, but at the same time, he *did* create it.

The American people today are shuddering with shame over Hiroshima. They've stopped talking about it, but they haven't stopped feeling about it.

It's a fantastic thing. This bomb was turned loose against something and they have created it. And now, they're trying to settle this problem and it doesn't settle, it doesn't resolve, because the only thing that will resolve it is something of equal magnitude, they say, which is other bombs.

And out of this spark alone we may have a national suicide complex, because the country we bombed had a national suicide complex. You follow me?

Audience: Yes. Mm-hm.

So Lord knows what would happen to an individual who started out at all costs to knock out a Frankenstein monster—a war that he has, through his own stupidity, nursed and nurtured into full, red blossom, you see? And he wants to do something about it and he just makes more war. A reactive bank which has more or less been created and you want to do something about it and all you do is make more reactive bank. Get the idea?

You decide to dramatize these engrams and maybe they'll go away that way. "And if I just let myself go and let myself rage the way I seem to feel that I have to do, from something

inside me, maybe it'll all go away." And you haven't—it hasn't all gone away, you've just got another lock on the same engram, see?

Dramatization actually is a mechanism by which the individual seeks to wipe out his reactive bank. If we put a person into a position where he can, by an old psychotherapeutic term, *abreact* his hostilities, we feel that he will be better off, then he doesn't get better off. He may have little pressure on him as a result for quite a while, but the next thing you know, why, the bank caves in on him just the same.

In other words, here we have the anatomy of the decay of an individual or of any dynamic or Man himself or this universe. It's the creating of something. Now, be very sharp on this—not all the histrionics in the world could put this across—it's just the creating of something which then becomes uncreatable. You get the idea? It cannot be *discreated*. It's the creating of something which you cannot then discreate, if you will take an invented term.

Somehow or another it started up and somehow or another you want to stop it or control it further or unmock it and you fail all the way along the line. And the failures, as they pile up, simply bring about a conviction on the part of the individual, not that he *cannot* create and that would be the wrong computation to use if you were treating a young writer or painter, or a musician who no longer—who no longer wrote or painted or composed. It's not that he *cannot* create, it's that he *dare not* create. You got it? He dare not create!

The rehabilitation of the ability to create is the only thing which can bring an individual out of the shambles. And he dare not create because those things he creates he feels he cannot uncreate. You follow me? **12**

And under this entire stress walks Man. If anyone wanted to make a summation that had nothing to do with our technical terms or anything, you could say he must not create since he knows that that which he creates will become a monster to everyone.

Actually, you really have no problems of your own. They are all other peoples' problems, see? They really are all other peoples' problems.

Death will come and you will be 180 yards back of your head as it lies there bloody and battered and you will say, "Well, I'll not know that whole works." And that's that. Maybe it will take you a few years of sitting on a piece of space dust to not know it all, you know? But eventually you will say, "Oh well, what the dickens," and pick up another mock-up or get back in the game again one way or the other. But usually diffidently, since you know too well that if you now create anything, it will become a monster.

It's almost as if you cannot suffer but insist you can by being the other thing which you believe is suffering. You follow that? But the creation of the monster is an unsolved problem because the creation of anything may become an unsolved problem if it cannot be discreated.

We desire an illness to stay home from school and then one fine day we realize we're really sick—and the body is really sick, you see? And you wanted it to be sick once, but now it's really sick. And you say, "Well now, sickness, discreate at once!" The body goes right on coughing. And you say, "Well, I didn't make that sickness originally." Ah-ah-ah-ah, see?

As a matter of fact, you have disobeyed the third class at once, you see? You've gone into the soup. You have said, "Heh-heh, first postulate." And then you've given it the real why. This is the most tangled postulate system you can get into: Native state, first postulate, second postulate directly controverting the first postulate. Native state—well; first postulate—sick; second postulate—not sick. Get the idea? But it's made as a second postulate because it's directed at a particular illness. Therefore, when you process significances—and you might pick this up this morning real quick—when you process significances you are laying in second postulates on sickness. You see? You follow that?

You're being very specific. You say, "Oh, that first postulate there. Not so." And the fellow goes on being sicker, you see? So you just really shouldn't process the area of

sicknesses—some specific sickness. Process, if you please, the subject of sickness, if you wish, but even then you may have a hard time. Process, if you wish, the mechanics of how sickness comes about. But even then you may have a hard time, because remember that you're processing each time against a specific first postulate, see? First postulate said, "I am sick." It also said, "Sickness is possible." And now you, on second postulate, you're trying to say, "That sickness is curable," you see? So it's a lie, because the first postulate was that it existed. You get it?

Now, on first and second postulate systems you could handle sickness if you simply looked over this and you realized that the fellow was not-ising health. Get the idea? He's first-postulating against health. That's what he's first-postulating, see? So to run out the first postulate, you'd have to rehabilitate his ability to say, "I am sick, I am sick, I am sick," see. "That sick, that sick, that sick, that sick, that sick." See, it isn't the contrary or upsetting contradictory here, it's the fact that if you say—he says, "Now I am well. I no longer have jaundice. I no longer have another dreadful disease this society has—I no longer have jurisprudence. And I no longer have the . . ." See, it'll become a lie, and lies become solid. And you get a solidity out of the first and second postulate system. See that?

So, you'd either have to rehabilitate his first or second postulate or, if you please, you would have to create by mock-up, certainly, sick terminals and get him to end them until he regained his confidence concerning the Frankenstein-monster effect. "You create a sickness and uncreate it." "Create it and uncreate it." "Create it and uncreate it"—in mock-up form, see? "Create it and uncreate it." And all of a sudden he'd say, "[panting] [sigh]." Ahhhh, somebody dare mention the fact that one is sick, because that postulate could be uncreated. See, he'll eventually heave a real sigh of relief on this basis.

And if you wanted to be a great healer and only a great healer, you possibly could follow this system exclusively with no other system beyond possibly some sort of two-way communication or sympathetic attitude—wouldn't matter much. Say we wanted to be a

great healer, you would simply, in mock-up form, get the guy to end what he made—in creative form, you see—until he overcame the Frankenstein-monster effect. You see that?

We find before us the whole world engaged in trying to end war with war. We find in every preclear—actually, in a sick preclear—the whole preclear practically, dedicated to trying to end aberration or malfunction, with aberration and malfunction, see? And he doesn't think he can stop it, therefore, he has to use force against it. You follow me now?

All you'd have to do would be to remedy this individual's discreteness to return to him his creativeness. Now, remember that as long as we say this individual cannot create mock-ups, things, stuff, you know—"all the fellows, by the way, who cannot create mock-ups," that's for the birds, he *can* create mock-ups—all of these people, you see, come into this group. And if this individual is treated from this basis—that he *cannot* create mock-ups—you will fail. You will fail inevitably because you're using the wrong postulate. Use this one and you'll win: He *dare not* create mock-ups. You got it? He dare not. And the reason why he dare not is the Frankenstein-monster effect. If he creates something, he knows he can't stop it.

This individual also has the feeling that if his right hand started shaking, he would not be able to stop, fix or try to hold it still. You got the idea? And you got Saint Vitus' dance and such an ill, see—right hand, got it? So he daren't start acting in an aberrated fashion because he knows if he did, he would not be able to stop it. You got it? So he has to walk with careful sanity through all of his days. See, he cannot create a condition and then discreate it, so he has to be very careful what situations he creates. All right. Now, we got that? You got that?

Then, the remedy of mock-ups, the remedy of the ability to create, the remedy of the ability to create universes and, therefore, the remedy of complete dependency and parasitic existence alongside of and upon everything else which already exists—you see that—would come to an end.

Now, there are many people so parasitic as to drive you half out of your mind. Do you know that they will come in and use your toothbrush? They *have* to use your toothbrush. They can't use theirs, see that? They *must* be parasitic. They *have* twenty pounds in their pocket, you see, but they cannot at any moment spend any part of it. They have to borrow five, ten, fifteen, twenty pounds from *you*, see, to spend it. You get the idea? This is very curious.

Now, having done that, they cannot pay it back. Why can't they pay it back? Because it would unparasitize them. You see this? So they become more and more dependent upon already created things. And what things are going forward in this universe? What things can be depended upon absolutely and completely to be there and to continue in operation? The Frankenstein monsters. The thing which can continue in operation then is, therefore, that thing which nobody has been able to discreate. And the things which they're unable to discreate are for the most part Frankenstein monsters. Got it?

Audience: Yep. Mm-hm.

So it could become a very horrible universe. It could have a dwindling spiral, you see? It doesn't have to have, however. It doesn't have to go on that spiral at all and people do not have to become parasitic, you see?

An individual, a thetan, who believes that his total force and energy must come from the Sun or from an electric power line is nuts! But he dare not create any energy and he dare not do anything *but* take it off the power line because if he did, he, himself, would have created a Frankenstein's monster.

If we evaluate this from the standard world belief that people hurt people and that people intend to hurt people, we will miss to some degree even so in these computations, because we'll believe that pain is intentionally—always intentionally—delivered.

Do you know what life really thinks of pain? It thinks when somebody hurts a mock-up of one kind or another, that it must have been a mistake, see? Nobody could have had

that intention and therefore, it must have been a mistake. And that is the first thought that a child has, for instance. You step on a child, a child immediately assumes it must have been a mistake on your part. He protests, but he protests to tell you that you've made a mistake. You got her? And out of this comes the Frankenstein-monster idea.

You made this mock-up. You didn't make it for any particular evil purpose. You might have just made it for somebody's amusement, you see? And then it runs into somebody and they know very well what your intention was and yet they're afraid it'll mess up their mock-ups, see. So they, then, say, "Yi-yi-yi-yi," and give the complete illusion of pain and damage. And they're telling you, you made a mistake making that thing. And you say, because you can't experience this subjectively at once, you say, "I must be hurting them in some fashion or another."

- 15 One of the most alarming things which you can do to a child or a dog is, when they come around to rub up against you or swat you or anything else in play, you see, is to suddenly start howling or crying, "Stop! Stop! Ow! Ow! Ow!" You know? Of course, they'll recognize this as a game very shortly, but they're quite upset for a moment. They look you over and say, "What did I do?" And now, you don't keep on and convincing them, you kind of grin at them through the "ow, ow, ows." And they say, "Ah, this is a gag. I recognize this gag from a looong time ago," see? But if you were to, actually, pretend that you were horribly wronged and upset, whether you were or not, the child would become upset and would become less active.

Now, sometimes a child is very hard to convince on this basis. And they pound you around mercilessly before they finally get the conviction that they actually are hurting you. They don't believe it at first. But when they find out they really are hurting you, they quit. The day that some activity becomes totally convinced that people can be hurt—some activity that hurts people—that people can be hurt, they will stop it, see? So therefore, people work hard at convincing people they can be hurt. And this is the betrayal effect.

People are going around saying, “Betrayed, betrayed, betrayed. It is possible to betray people. It is possible to hurt people,” you see? “It is possible,” and they’re saying, “Ow, ow, ow, ow, ow.” You get the idea? And if they say, “Ow, ow, ow, ow, ow,” enough, then people won’t let Frankenstein monsters loose on them, because they are already aware of the fact that things cannot be discreated which are harmful. So they’re keeping everyone posted that they’d better not create any Frankenstein monsters that simply go around chewing people up.

Out of all of these involved considerations, by the way, comes the subject of pain itself. Pain is a conviction. It’s a great oddity, but pain is a conviction. I know it does nobody any good to hear this if he’s lying there screaming. He hurts, see? He hurts and it’s really painful, he can feel it. And you say, “Well, if you walk over to it . . .” You’re from some church or something of the sort—and you say, “Well, pain is just all—all an idea.”

It happens to be that that’s true, you see—pain is all an idea. But they don’t add this: pain is all an idea which has become agreed upon to such an extent, back down the track, that it is as real as walls. Get the idea? They leave the bridge out and, therefore, the explanation sounds silly. All right.

People tell people, “Ow, ow, ow,” in an effort to get people off of them and keep them from turning loose these monsters. And so people become convinced that more monsters can be turned loose than are turned loose. And so they again impede their own creativeness, see? They hear this, “Ow, ow, ow,” they read the newspapers which are saying, “Ow, ow, ow,” see? And they read this—and whether pain was or was not there or any truth was or was not there, they get the idea, you see, that more pain exists than does exist. And they get this terrific conviction restimulated over and over and over that Frankenstein monsters can be turned loose. And they themselves have been surprised many times in mocking something up which they couldn’t unmock. And so therefore, in the receipt of all this bad news—all of which, by the way, is hearsay . . .

16 Somebody said that—I've forgotten the exact words, but to the effect that all the criticism or all the comments, the bad statements that people made, always come second-hand. You never hear them from the person himself. That's always, you know, good roads and good weather, but any comments you hear about him, he got second-hand, see?

You know, there's a distinct possibility that there are practically no first-hand comments. Get the idea? And then comes the possibility that there are very few second-hand comments, but they get manufactured en route. You get the idea? So that you'd have a terrific additive stack of "ow, ow, ow" in the world, you see, all out of proportion to what was going on in the world.

See, it could be real bad. This is undoubtedly true, you see, that it is bad enough, but bad enough could be added up into, "Oh, gee whiz, so unbearably bad, you know," on and on and on, in an effort to reach this point of convincing somebody that it is possible to hurt somebody else. And thus we get a self-protective mechanism going through the society and we get nearly all of it third-hand—second-hand, third-hand, fourth-hand, fifth-hand, a hundred-fifty-fifth-hand, to name the newspapers, see?

The newspapers take somebody who can't report and they put him to chasing down rumors of people who can't talk and you eventually get the big scandal on the front page having been passed through the Linotype operator who can't type. And of course, it goes through the rewrite man who can't duplicate either. It's hard to tell whether a hurricane or a blonde hit Poughkeepsie. [laughter]

So we get this conviction that mock-ups can be created which are bad which cannot then be uncreated by anybody, see? And we get the postulate on the part of people, you see, that they dare not create a mock-up. You got that?

And Creative Processing itself can—used with these understandings—can then rehabilitate the ability of the individual to create. And when it does, it renders him less dependent,

less parasitic, more independent and freer and certainly rids him of a terrific number of guilt complexes.

And so we have Creative Processing working and today being the first level approached or attacked on Level Three of the steps we are teaching in this 4th London Unit.

Thank you.



RÉSUMÉ OF CREATIVE PROCESSING, PART II

LECTURE 32

A LECTURE GIVEN ON 24 OCTOBER 1955

60 MINUTES

All right. I want to talk to you some more now, this morning of the 24th of October 1955, on Creative Processes as they are used today at Level Three of the Six Levels of Processing. 2

Obviously something is wrong if an individual has to have a great deal of mass—obviously something is wrong. In the first place, a thetan actually does not require mass.

Now, what first and foremost is wrong? We discover the Frankenstein effect to be present to some degree since the individual feels that he needs this mass from which he can take energy. He feels that he himself does not dare create energy. Do you follow me?

So not feeling that he can create energy, he feels he must have the energy, then, from an exterior source.

The entirety of shame, blame, regret, guilt, inactivity, apathy, various suppressions, an unwillingness to coordinate or accomplish anything to finish the cycle—do this, that, the other thing—all these things stem, really, from the computation, “dare not create.” And if an individual dare not create, then we can assume at once that the individual is

facing the necessity of having energy masses from which he can draw energy to run his various machinery. Do you follow me?

He dare not create. If he creates, he will accomplish the horrible thing of being the author of something which is undiscreatable. He cannot discreate it or uncreate it. He cannot then destroy it.

- 3 Now, I use the word *discreate*, although it is not entirely proper, because the word *destroy* has too many connotations. The word *destroy* contains in it an enormous number of systems, so that if the cycle-of-action were to be stated create-change-destroy then it would seem that the cycle-of-action would contain a great many complexities.

In other words, create would be very simple and then destroy would be enormously complex. Do you see, then, that we wouldn't have really a single line of create-change-destroy? We would have a multiple line. The line would go from the single source—create—and would then branch out and become gradually thousands of other lines, so that we would have maybe billions of points at the point "destroy," if we worked it the way it is normally worked in the physical universe.

Destruction becomes a very complex thing. How do you go about destroying something? That's a terrifically interesting effect. How do you go about destroying a letter? Well, you get a match and you take the letter and you hold it in a place where it won't burn anything else and where preferably you can't be seen. And you strike the match against the side of the box and you hold the match underneath the corner of the letter, holding the letter in such a way that the finger won't be destroyed along with the letter, too. And then we let the letter burn. And the carbon-oxygen manifestation takes place and the combustion then consumes the paper and the writing and the ashes fall away and we drop that final corner and let it burn up.

Now, that's a *simple* destruction. You got it? That's a *simple* destruction compared to the destruction, let us say, involved in how do you raze a building.

Well, you raze the building in a very simple way. You go and get somebody to raze it. But this somebody, to raze it, must have an exchange of money in which the materials he's going to salvage from the building must be counterbalanced with, maybe, additional payments, since it isn't entirely remunerative to do so. And then he has to go and get dynamite and bulldozers and shovels and picks and crews, all of which have to, then, have income certificates with the government so that he can pay the government the amount of percentage that it requires in order to hire the person to shovel the stuff to put it in a truck.

Oh, no! I mean, we just go out into such complexities on razing a building that we could sit here the rest of this week listing all of the facts and items of disposition. And the funny part of it is, is when we burned the letter, we still had ash and we still had smoke and when we razed the building, we still had rubble.

Now, maybe we can do something with that rubble. But we have done a lying thing. We have said, "destroy" and we have meant, "alter." You see that? So the word *destroy* in common parlance does not reach end of cycle. It is an unfinished cycle-of-action. It is create, change. That's all! We put the word *destroy* on there as a statement of a type of change and that's all. It's a statement of change; it is not an end of cycle. Now do you see how somebody could get trapped in this universe? Hm? And do you see how people could fail to show up for appointments? And do you see how people could go on waiting and waiting and waiting and waiting compulsively?

Well, they've taken a (quote) "physical universe" (unquote) end of cycle. See, it's not an end of cycle at all. By the way, those quotes should be "physical universe end of cycle" (end quote), see? It's not an end of cycle. No destruction has taken place. So the word *destroy*, in the way we use it, is *not* an end of cycle.

It means that we have destroyed its activity or its function or its form. But we have not destroyed the memory of it; we have not destroyed the dust or the ashes or the smoke

as a result thereof; we have not carted the bodies off the battlefield although the army is destroyed. You see?

There's always a residue—always a residue. So much so that the physical scientist, finally in apathy, has stated that there was such a thing as a conservation of energy. And he has hung himself with that stable datum. There are two stable data on which the physical science operates, neither of which is true: “conservation of energy” is one of them and “the constancy of the speed of light” is the other one. And he believes implicitly in these two things. And as long as he believes implicitly in these two things, a great oddity is going to occur: He will never get off to the stars. He has pinned himself with his system to the surface of Earth.

- 4 He has several other laws which are not true, which have only relative truth, and one of these is Newton's law of interaction: that every action has an equal and contrary reaction. This only becomes a vague approximation of truth when we add what he understands to be in it—so long as you have actions and reactions of *comparable magnitude*. See, every action has an equal and contrary reaction of *comparable magnitude if wavelengths and particles are of similar magnitude*.

The moment we unsettle this law and we take a small hammer and start to rap rhythmically inside a ship's hull—the ship starts going forward. Oh, no! You see, this is not possible—the laws of inertia and so forth. Actually, we've got a little hammer and we just go up to bows of this ship, you see, or back to a bulkhead. And the ship is lying in the water and we take this hammer and at exactly the right rhythm, we go tap, tap, tap, tap, tap, tap, tap, tap and the ship starts through the water. For every action there's an equal and contrary reaction? Well, then, why would the ship move?

And yet, this does observably move. You can build test models which will do this—which, with all the working parts and motive power contained in themselves, and Newton's law of reaction not revoked by Congress or anybody—this model will nevertheless progress

forward although we've got just a tap, tap, tap, tap, tap going on inside the model against it itself. This is a fantastic thing because, of course, it mustn't do that.

The old comic strip cartoon idea of the fellow sitting in the stern of the boat with a pair of blowers and blowing against the sails, you know? And the physicist is always saying, "Ha-ha-ha-ha-ha-ha," you know? "This fool. I mean, he, you know, equal and contrary reaction. He read it, Newton said it, it must be true."

But the funny part of it is, I did it once and it works. If you blow at just exactly, with a pair of blowers, against a small boat's sails while you're sitting in the stern of this little boat, it will go forward.

What is it? It's the inertia of the particles hitting the sail, that's all. It's as simple as this. But you have to do it at exactly the right rhythm, with exactly the right push-right force—in order to cause it to act. And if you did it with the wrong rhythm and the wrong force, your boat would just sit still.

And that, by the way, is how flying saucers fly. They have an eccentric that flies round and round and round and it is imparting an inertia to the hull. But the funny part of the flying saucer is, the odd part of it is, that it is *not* obeying Newton's law of interaction.

You see, if every action had an equal and contrary reaction, the flying saucer would simply sit still. But this is not so. The moment we unbalance the law of inertia by really stating the law: comparable wavelength and rhythm, you see—we have to have comparable wavelength and rhythm in order to make Newton's law work—as soon as we come off of that and we get tinier rhythms or huger rhythms, we get an imbalance of the law itself. It's as simple as that, you see?

In other words, the physical scientist has all these understandings. And he's trying to work in the physical universe with all these understandings and these are just assumptions. They are assumptions—correct and true within the province of *his* work only. And they're not even true for thee and me in handling cars and grand pianos and so forth, you see?

The fact that a fire in a house threatens the grand piano and that a couple of fellows (or even one) suddenly picks up the grand piano and moves it out in the street—which happens every now and then. Somebody says, “How on Earth did anybody ever get that grand piano out of the house?” Look, there it sits not broken up, probably its legs won’t go through the door or anything, you know? And there it sits, unscratched. And they get ahold of five men and they laboriously, for the next two hours, move the grand piano back into the house, you see? We get these oddities—these oddities.

And the physical scientist looks at them and he says, “Well, well. *Tkhh!* Well, we just throw that data aside because it’s a wild variable and we shouldn’t have any business with these wild variables.”

Well, that’s the only thing a scientist really should examine. See, here’s this system and where are the wild variables? If he takes up and classifies and categorizes the wild variables, then he will find probably a new stability. And the new stability which we find by classifying some of these wild variables is that the physical science has yet to reach an end of cycle with anything. And so he is doomed to any action he undertakes to an eternity in that action. Get it?

Get that nice and sharp now. *Any* action that the physical scientist undertakes dooms him to an eternity in that action since it never completes. There’s no end of cycle. So there is not a create, change, destroy in the fullest sense of the word. By “destroy” he means a disassembly of its parts and, in some fashion, a neglect of the disposition of the final part. He does not, when he razes a building, dispose of the dust which rises because of the dynamite blast. He does not, when he burns a letter or when you burn a letter, dispose of the smoke—but you might dispose of most of the ash. But you don’t dispose of that little bit of ash that blew away and floated on down the street. You don’t dispose of that ash. You see this?

There's no end of cycle in the physical universe. It's horrible to conceive. Therefore, the duration of the physical universe is eternity. It has infinite duration because it never ends itself. And people who protest against the physical universe are protesting against the Frankenstein-monster effect—if they're protesting. It might be a very handy and a very good thing to have a playing field that never entirely unmocks. This might be a good thing, see. But it would be a bad thing to believe that it couldn't be unmocked—that it was an impossibility.

At first, I imagine, we simply refrained from unmocking it. And then after a while somebody got the idea that, "Let's solve everybody's worry about this playing field—solve *everybody's* worry about it. And let's say that it cannot be unmocked, by inventing an agreement called 'the conservation of energy'—that no energy is ever destroyed."

And upon this reef is hung every case that is hung. See, it's hung right on that reef. It says, "I *must* continue to have mass. I must continue to have massy terminals in order to have communication for the excellent reason that communication will reduce my masses. And I must get these things from elsewhere—these masses—since I dare not myself create them because, if I create them, I'll have another Frankenstein's monster. It'll just go on and on and on. It'll never finish an end of cycle. I cannot destroy the thing."

One of the nastiest cases you ever want to confront is the case of the physical scientist. He's hung with the stable datum that energy is indestructible. And he sees energy in his bank and he says, "Therefore, it's indestructible. It cannot at any time disappear."

Well, it's an interesting thing that you can not only make energy disappear—not only make it disappear in its parts and strew its parts around—you can also make the parts disappear if you want to. You can make the whole thing go in its entirety. All you have to do is start making perfect duplicates and you'll get a disappearance.

But where an individual is unwilling to have a disappearance of energy—follow this now—he's unwilling to have a disappearance of energy, which is to say, he is unwilling—he

is unwilling to create. You get the idea? He's unwilling to have a disappearance because he doesn't know when he's going to get another piece of energy and so he doesn't talk. So he can't engage in two-way communication. So, therefore, unwanted masses stick around as well as wanted ones, you see? You follow me?

You know how this works: He isn't going to create anymore. He knows he better not—he dare not create anymore.

If he dare not create any more in himself, he doesn't dare talk. Because if he talks, he's going to miss some of his mass. He actually cannot go into communication unless he has an expendability of mass and he won't have an expendability of mass as long as he believes that he dare not create any more mass.

7 And, of course, the scarcity of mass comes about because the individual believes, as he sits there, that all the mass he's going to get, he's going to get from somewhere else. And if he's going to get this mass from somewhere else, he'll have it.

Now, of course, Ownership Processing gives us the clue as to one of the reasons he does this. The mass stays there if he misowns it. Then we get a continuance of mass, you see? He mocks it up and says Joe did it. And he gets a continuance of mass.

But there's no reason why he can't do this. He doesn't have to go on to the rest of the idiocies. You see? He doesn't have to go on to a total parasitic existence on masses that exist. He hasn't got to grab masses all over the place and stack them up one way or the other. He just dare not create. He dare not create because of the Frankenstein effect.

Now, oddly enough, we have joined hands at this juncture with the physical sciences to such a degree that we can explain the existence of the physical sciences and why they are this way. We know the basic agreements on which they are made. And the basic agreements are made this way: If we never finish an end of cycle, we will still have a playing field, see? But if we never finish an end of cycle (any of us), if we always come

down to destroy, which means cut his head off or stab him, you know—that's not destroy in its final sense—we will wind up with tremendous quantities of residue.

And we'll eventually begin to object to this residue and we will call them engrams and we will call them masses and ridges and we will call them screens and materials to obstruct one's sight and we'll call them overweight and we will call them all kinds of things, you see? And we will say, "I don't want all this excess material. Then what am I going to do with it?"

Well, our answer is get another mock-up. Knock it off, see? Leave it there, bury it in the ground and go get another mock-up. See that? But the society doesn't permit you to kill this mock-up, so you find yourself killing one by inches and saying all the time, "I didn't do it."

Now, here is morality. Here is where morality, guilt and suchlike join hands between thought and the physical universe. An individual has said, "Ow, ow, ow," when you made a mock-up.

And you have said, "Now I will uncreate the mock-up which is making him say, 'Ow, ow, ow,'" and you didn't do it. And the mock-up kept on going.

Now, we could envision a neat number of tricks that could have been played on you or you could have played on somebody to bring this about, see?

The fellow mocked-up a cat of huge proportions and then the cat started swatting around somebody else's mock-ups and somebody else said, "Ow, ow, ow, ow, ow." And the fellow said, "Well, all right. It's hurting somebody. I mean, it's really serious now and it stopped being a game, therefore, we will simply say, 'No cat.'" See? "No cat." *Dzzzt!* The cat went right on. And the fellow says, "No cat! Cat, discreate! I created you, I can certainly discreate you."

The cat goes right on knocking apart the mock-ups and getting bigger and fatter and so on. Well, you can imagine all kinds of tricks by which this could have been done. The fellow could have said, "Cat. All right. Now, cat attack mock-ups." You see?

And at the moment he said, "Cat," you could have taken *bis* cat and put *your* cat there (get the idea?) so quick that he wouldn't have noticed the reappearance of another cat. So now he says, "My cat, unmock." And, of course, it won't unmock because it's your cat. Get the idea?

Now, somebody could have done this with a picture. See, somebody could have said, "Say, that's certainly a beautiful picture you've got there." And it wasn't your picture, see? You swiped it. "Beautiful picture you made there."

And you say, "Oh-ho-ho, yes. That certainly is. I certainly did a good job on this picture." And you say, "I never saw such a pretty picture."

Now, let's take a look at another one. And you then say, "Picture, move." *Daaaab-unb!* "Picture, move." *Daaaab!* And you said, "Hm, it's not going to move. It's not going to obey me, therefore I will destroy it." And you said, "My picture, unmock." And it stayed right there and got heavier. Why? It wasn't your picture!

But because you didn't want to be so—you know, his admiration was fine and you wanted to be in communication, you see. You didn't want to say—he's just said, "That's a beautiful picture you made. And you say, "I certainly did make a beautiful picture there." And now he wants to see another picture, so we're going to move this picture and you didn't say, "Joe's picture, disappear." Would've disappeared, see?

Instead of that you keep up the pretense that it was your picture and then try to handle it. You've miscalculated the ownership. In other words, there are numerous ways and numerous tricks, tremendous numbers of combinations by which you could have gotten in to a non-end of cycle on something.

So you finally took this picture and you went crunch, crunch, crunch, see? And you say, "Well, I have some use for this. I've got some use for this. I've shown it that I can change it. So, if I can change it, I can change its position. So therefore, I will now take and shift its position. I'll put it over here and pretend I have some use for that little ball of energy. [sigh]" Get the idea?

So a person starts to get these little balls of energy around one way or the other. First, he kind of sticks them in his pockets and he puts them over in some other universe and he does this with them and that with them—all of them based on a lie of one kind or another. Basic lie is ownership and authorship. And—see?

And he gets more and more of these things. And one day he makes a black picture and he says, "This will really discombobulate these boys, you know. Heh!"

And so here's a bunch of guys standing there and all of a sudden he makes up this black picture and it starts down on them. They've all agreed to see each others' pictures, you see—solid agreement. And the thing comes down on them and he says, "Good heavens! Look at that horrible black thing coming down on all of us!"

And the other fellows say, "Gee, wonder where that came from."

And he says, "I don't know. Wonder who made an awful thing like that."

A couple of them said, "Oh, a fellow who would do this would be pretty bad."

This guy says, "I don't know. Maybe Jinks did it. Maybe he did it."

Heh! The only one that gets blacked by the picture is the guy who made it and said somebody else did. Get the idea?

The rest of them don't know who made it. They say, "It's other-ownership" and just that statement all by itself will relieve them of responsibility for the picture.

But supposing they had all made it and they said, "Well, somebody else made this picture." They'd all get it. See this?

Now, you're running a preclear one day and you go down through the bank and all of a sudden everything turns black. *Brrrrrr*. And you say, "Well, all right. Let's just handle this." Now, you said, "Just handle this." Huh?

Well, this was a bad thing to do to somebody at one time or another. It was a very bad thing to do to somebody on the whole track, somewhere back when.

And the fellow says, "Well, all right. I'll handle this. Unmock." He's already been through this once. A long time ago he said to this mass, "Unmock." And then he had it, at that time, put over here in a corner where nobody would notice, you see? And it doesn't unmock. It does not disappear. You see this? There it is. And he said, "Good heavens! What do I do?"

Now, we run some Ownership Processing on this and some interesting things happen. We find out all kinds of things. It was possibly the body's blackness that it mocked-up, it was possibly the thetan's blackness. But most often you'll find out it was created by the individual himself and thins out and goes away when he owns it thoroughly enough, run thoroughly by an auditor. Or it goes away by two-way communication which again disposes of it. You follow me?

Now, that isn't necessarily all the ways there are.

If blackness is this hard to get rid of and if one gets into this much trouble by creating blackness, then please—please look this over. An individual after a while is going to stop creating it. And when he stops creating it, he says, "I have no further control over it."

- 9 Control comes in when communication goes out and belongs in class two. Controlling of things belongs in class two when you are actively controlling them. Now, that sounds very strange but it does—you have to address the postulate to *it* as part of communication in order to get the thing to control.

And supposing the basis of this thing was no communication. Therefore, it'd become uncontrollable. You'll find this time after time when you cut a person down on

communication terminals and he dare not create. This proviso, you see, goes along with all of these difficulties with masses and spaces. The proviso is “he dare not create.” Then he will do this oddity. He will do this oddity. He will flick out of two-way communication into an effort to control. See this? He’ll hit that borderline, he’ll cross it. And after that he gets control-happy. He’s control-happy because he’s out of communication. You see this?

Now, he’s still fixated on the idea of trying to make a postulate work, but he’s doing it by communication in some fashion or another. Now actually, you don’t have to address a postulate or consideration *to* anything to have the postulate become effective on it. You don’t have to address it *to* anything so, therefore, making considerations is not necessarily a Communication Process. But controlling things certainly is. You have to communicate with things that you wish to control as we understand control, you see?

Again this is the way we use the word *control*. We move things around. We station them, you see. We regulate their shape and size, we change them in one fashion or another or we create them. But if we can’t uncreate, we don’t create. Follow me?

If you want to see a preclear’s bank stand still—just stand still—just have him start mocking-up mock-ups that can create. Bank stands still. It’s quite amusing. Time hangs in suspense—an odd phenomenon. We have him mock-up mock-ups that can create. You got the idea? We have him make bodies that can make things and you will see at once, at least to some slight degree, time stand still for him. Why?

He creates things, then, that can create and time stands still. He just slams into the second postulate, that’s all—that he must not create. And if you mustn’t create, you don’t have any time either. The time you have depends, to whatever degree, on the time you create. So therefore, a fellow who is stuck on the track has stopped creating. To some degree, time must be in your hands or you won’t have any.

This, by the way, is an observable phenomenon. It’s quite, quite cute as a phenomenon. The fellow feels sort of *duub*, you know, frozen in space—stopped. All you did was ask

him to create something that can create. You don't ask him to create something or you won't get the phenomenon, because, usually, the individual this is most pronounced on cannot or will not create anything. But he will create things that can create by putting at a second stage, because then he can blame it all on that, see? So you can make the little subjective test in this line.

Time depends on creativeness, mass depends on creativeness, accumulated mass depends on creativeness, space depends on creativeness. So therefore, lookingness depends upon creativeness, too.

And where an individual is preserving mass, two conditions must ensue: he either must have it in order to continue his communications (since from somewhere he must get some energy) or it was created as something he did not want and he doesn't want it now. You get the idea? So he resists it and holds it in place.

- 10 One of the more fabulous manifestations of all of this is, however, the fact that he has simply made up his mind not to create; just as in class two he makes up his mind not to communicate; just as in class three he makes up his mind never to make a first and second postulate setup again. He says, "I will never lie again. I will only tell the truth." Naw. Tell me this is nonsense.

You can sit down and make a preclear lie to you. Say, "Tell me a lie." And a case that's having an awful hard time won't go into creativeness to that degree. A lie to him is pretty bad. You say, "Tell me something that isn't true." And he'll stagger and gag and fumble and so forth when you start to process somebody who can't create and he starts to drain the physical universe of its various manifestations for his answers.

See why he does this? A fellow drains the bank. He doesn't create a new truth—not because he *cannot* create. See, that is the oddity that has been a stable datum with us for some time and I'm stressing it now. It is an oddity. It's been a stable datum with us.

And he'd eventually slide out of this when he found none of them bit. But every once in a while, he'd find that he couldn't control one or something and you'd say, "That's okay." We could handle this as an automaticity, but today we don't. We say, "Okay. Okay, preclear, make another one." And that would go all out of control. And you'd say, "Oh, that's all right. So what? So it went all out of control. We're not controlling things, we're creating them."

"*Oooh*," he'd say, "I get it. Okay." So he makes these mock-ups and they get steady. You just get him to change his mind, see?

You shift from creation over to change and control rather easily because you go into the second postulate. You start creating, you skid into the second postulate. Second postulate with him is liable to be "can't control it." See, it's liable to be something—I've created it, now I want to uncreate it. And it doesn't uncreate, it goes out of control. I've created it, now I have no responsibility for it—it goes out of control. You follow me?

So wherever we look, we discover that the individual difficulty is an individuality on the subject of creativeness. Sounds very strange but it's true—terminal trouble. Got that?

California, they have termite trouble and other places they have other kinds of troubles. But your preclear has terminal trouble. In order to talk, he must be known as to location. In order to be known as to location and to get paid—to draw his paycheck called communication—he has to have a known terminal. If he can't create one, he's got to steal one. If he steals one, he then says it is his—it will get more and more solid and it has to have energy on which to run. In order to get energy on which to run, he's got to take energy from elsewhere and bank it up as far as he's concerned. Because he cannot get enough energy from elsewhere one way or the other, he has a tendency to get smaller and run less active mock-ups. Because it's hard to get all this energy stacked in and because it's very expensive, he then forbears communicating because he'll as-is the energy which he already has. Now, you get the idea?

So he tries to get people, for instance, to talk to him without talking to them. Or he gets on a compulsive outflow of trying to *make* people answer and acknowledge to him, by setting an example, and just shoots the wad, you see, he just blows this. Then he doesn't create any more in its place.

Now, the Remedy of Havingness is quite a workable process. Remedy of Havingness means to pull in *and* throw away havingness until the individual has overcome his terminal trouble, see? That's Remedy of Havingness. You'll find out after a while the individual starts to get along without havingness. But we've actually departed rather widely from the fact when we say Remedy of Havingness. And although we still remedy havingness and although we still do these things just the same—and on Route 1—as we ever did (and we don't change that at all), we do change it at Level Three. We know that he has terminal trouble and that he has power trouble. 11

See, he's got trouble with the amount of juice he needs to run the bank. And, believe me, the bank requires juice to run. That's why people have to go to sleep every night. They lie there and hope their batteries charge up or they will accidentally, fortunately, without any responsibility of their own, dream something, see? They might dream something and that will add to the bank in some mysterious way. You get the idea? Now, they just hope this will occur and they're sort of negative about the whole thing.

Now, an individual has to be able to create knowingly and know that creation is not necessarily a tremendous liability before he contemplates destroying anything in the fullest sense of the word.

In other words, we can't go over into class one of making things on postulates and unmaking them on postulates until the individual's energy hunger has been assuaged to some degree, which, mind you, is basically terminal hunger. He merely wants the energy to run the terminal. He has to have the terminal, he feels. Got it?

Now, he could be talked out of needing a terminal at all and, by postulate, making his location known. And that is an ideal state and one which can be achieved. And when a person can achieve this very easily, he exteriorizes very easily. And if he can't achieve this very easily, he doesn't exteriorize very easily. And that's the long and short of it.

An individual is not going to go away from mock-ups which are serving as terminals. He's not going to depart from a comm terminal unless he has some idea he can still communicate with it. It's as simple as that—or unless he can communicate from exactly where he is. Now, you can't make an Operating Thetan who will abandon terminals until he's fairly sure he, as a terminal, can make other people cognite that he's there. See? Get the idea?

So here are two states: one, *simple Thetan Exterior*. This occurs when the individual is sure that he can still use the mock-up as a communication terminal. An *Operating Thetan* would occur when the individual was very secure in the idea that he himself could be a terminal from where he was—make people aware of his presence as a terminal without using very much energy or by simply creating energy wherever he was and uncreating it again. You follow me now?

Now, these are definitions for these two states which are very, very workable definitions—they are action definitions. And by defining them, we know how to remedy them. Person won't exteriorize. Okay. The individual is having terminal scarcity. He's having terminal trouble.

Now, let's get worse than that. The individual kind of foggily goes in and out of the terminal and around and around. He's yo-yoing around. He seems to be down below a good stable walking terminal, you see?

And he has huge masses of energy which fly by and hit him in the face and swirl around his head and do all that sort of thing. That individual isn't having just terminal trouble,

he is having power trouble trying to empower the terminal, see? We've now removed it one further step. Got it?

So you could have power trouble. And by this, we don't mean megalomania—we mean “juice.” And this, then, would have some basis there on the terminal, so we might have to remedy this thing called power trouble—juice trouble, electrical trouble—before we could remedy terminal trouble. It's where is his attention fixed? You see? **12**

And if he's got electricity trouble, why, we start merely addressing the problem of terminals as terminal trouble itself, we're liable to be not hitting one pace low enough. What we do is say to this fellow, “All right,” we say to this fellow. (Now, get these manifestations.) We say to this fellow, “All right. Now mock-up a communication terminal.”

And the fellow says, [pause] “Nothing happens.”

You say, “What are you looking at?”

And he'll say, “Nothing.”

And you'll say, “Well now, come on, what are you looking at?”

And he'll say, “Nothing, nothing. I'm not seeing a thing.”

And you say, “What are you looking at?” This is very standard. I mean, I feel like kicking a preclear after a while. I say, “What are you looking at? Come on. Will you please close your eyes and take a look at what you're looking at.”

And he'll finally say, “Oh, I'm not looking at anything but all these rockets going by—just like always.”

And you say, “Well, are you looking at that?”

And he'll say, “Yes, I'm looking at that.”

Well now, why doesn't he want to look at something? He's afraid he's going to as-is some ergs of power, see? He's afraid he's going to waste some power one way or the other. His electrical bill, he feels, would get much too high—which is to say “no terminal.”

That's how high your electrical bill could get, you see? You could starve to death on an electrical level. All right.

You understand that the bank itself is an electrical phenomenon, that the terminal itself is made out of electrically compacted masses and that all of the conduits, lines and reactions are electrically served and that the body itself is, really, for its form and shape, an electrical anchor point system. Now, we don't have to give a darn about how this system is put together. It is utterly meaningless. We don't care one way or the other about it.

We very often find that we try to adjust somebody's anchor points with the greatest of skill and he's just as sick as before. What was the matter with this fellow? It was anchor points were sucking in and going out and going this way and going that way and they were doing things. You got it? These anchor points were *doing* things. The trouble with that individual was really not a misplacement of anchor points. The trouble with the individual is remedy of havingness.

Now, when I get people to snap anchor points into place, I always remedy their havingness of those particular anchor points. And I get the currents going fast enough and furious enough so that the displacement phenomena—the thing that's kicking the anchor point out of the line and so on—will itself be remedied, see?

I get the current, see, that is pulling the anchor point out of line cared for and then have him put the anchor point in place. Don't have him put a substitute point there, have him put the original point in. Quite important. All right.

So we have power trouble or electrical trouble as being junior to terminal trouble, see? The anchor points are not going to stay there. He's not going to be able to mock-up a terminal which will stay there at all unless we remedy this business about juice—electricity. It is just electricity, that's all.

Of course, it could be the electricity in the space in which it exists. But he tends to get smaller spaces to cut down the amount of interchange amongst terminals. And he feels

if he could get his space down to zero, he'd be all set, see? There wouldn't be any place there for juice to flow and he would have saved it all. So there's the diminishing *space* phenomenon you see with an individual.

You get increasing mass and diminishing space as you get power trouble. An individual who's up against this, then, is having power trouble, not just terminal trouble. So therefore, we get him to make a mock-up. And what does he do—this fellow? He says, "It's just these rockets going back and forth. It's just these energy masses which are swirling around my head." You understand that? You tell him to put up a communication terminal and the fellow puts up mush.

Now, you can tell him to put up an unknown mass, you can tell him to put up a confusion, you can tell him to mock-up various things and he very well will mock-up something. He'll mock-up an invisible terminal, he's liable to do a lot of things. But the point is, is these things are mushy and these things are hard to recognize as communication terminals because they're not. They're juice sources. **13**

So, if you were to tell this fellow, "Now, let's mock-up some juice."

Fellow says, "Some what?"

You say, "Some electricity. Let's mock-up something about electricity. Let's mock-up something."

"[sigh] Yeah."

"What you got?"

He says, "A power line." Only he didn't mock it up, you see? He mocked-up a power line he's seen.

Do you know that it may be the first facsimile he's ever gotten? The first thing he has ever seen besides these rockets going back and forth? Hm? You say, "All right. Mock-up some electrical sources. Mock-up some juice. Mock-up some electricity." Golly, he's liable to mock-up the doggonedest things you ever saw, see?

He always can mock-up what he can mock-up. Got the idea? He can always mock-up what he can mock-up. So you find out what he can mock-up and you have him mock that up until he then can mock-up something else. And we start in on the gradient scale of terminals—which electronically, as far as he's concerned, is to mock-up power sources, to mock-up terminals and then to remedy the existence of terminals to a point of where he, himself, can create one at will or uncreate one at will. And then his postulates and considerations will work. And they won't work until then. And you don't have him *uncreate* anything.

This sounds fantastic. You just don't have him uncreate things. You just have him keep on mocking things up. And he will know this is wrong. And each time he mocks something up, he tries to push it through the whole cycle, see? And when he gets to the point where he creates it and then it changes suddenly, he's just hit the middle of the cycle. But control is start-change-and-stop—or create-change-destroy. Now, that is how you define *control*, see? You can control anything that you can create, change and destroy.

Now, when he's mocked something up and it goes automatically, what's happened? He's simply stuck on the middle of the curve. And he knows he can't uncreate it. See, you're running up against that, so the thing goes on automatic and begins to fly around, see? That's all there is to that.

So it went on automatic! So what? You're not processing in the area of control, see? It'll age. Very often he'll mock them up and they'll unmock. He mocks them up and they unmock and he mocks them up—that's fine with him, see? You don't really realize but that's fine as far as he's concerned—mock them up and they unmock, mock them up and they unmock. And all of a sudden, he'll be doing this—mock them up, they unmock—and then he'll try to mock it up again, see? It's not there. It won't mock-up again. What's he been using for a mock-up? Who cares? Get him to mock-up something. You got it?

So you're operating in power, juice, sources and supplies, or you're operating in terminals, or you're operating on the Operating Thetan level. And the total thing is his concentration and difficulties with energy are so great—referring as they do to the everyday world in which he is living—that he won't change his mind about them unless he's changed his mind about them.

He won't change his mind about the everyday world in which he's living because he is being fairly successful. He is presenting a mock-up. It is functioning one way or the other. He can talk to his fellows so he can collect his pay.

You've got to improve his ability to have terminals before you can improve his pay. That's something that somebody in businesses ought to learn. He will ask for more pay and then protest against having it. See, he will ask for more communication and then protest because you gave it to him. Why does he do this? Because he wants more pay, but the second he starts to receive it—communication—he starts to as-is, so he stops it. You could probably unmock a whole staff by overpaying them—it's a "fact of the matter is." Instead of that, you've got to give them more terminal or a better terminal and then you can pay them what you like. You get the idea?

There's got to be more to work for or at and talk about, you know—work for and at—before you can throw them up along the line. They just sort of unmock if you give them too much pay flow. This is an oddity. This is not why the HASI does this, because the HASI is 90 percent of the time broke.

But here we have a great oddity—here we have a great oddity. We have the basic consideration of the individual centering upon gathering pay. He is saving terminals so that he might someday be paid. You get it? He's controlling terminals so that he might someday be paid. What is his pay? His pay is *communication*. If he doesn't want communication, it's because he can't afford it. He really does want it. He won't indulge in it. You give him communication that seems important enough and he will receive it.

Now, the individual who saves himself for the emergency, see, he doesn't do much talking or living until all of a sudden the emergency comes along and then he shoots the works. Well, he can do it in that instance, you see?

The individuals, then, don't do much talking unless there's some big action taking place or something like that—big emergency comes up. Do you know the type of individual I mean? Hm? Almost all these individuals will stop talking if the emergency gets high enough. The thing you must not do as an auditor is create the emergency with auditing blunders. You got it?

You mustn't create an artificial emergency. You're trying to get a preclear who can afford to pay and be paid in communication. That's what you want. You're not just forcing him to communicate. You get the idea? In other words, you're putting him in position where he can pay and be paid with communication. You got it?

- 15 Now, there's certain difficulties that abuse him with the idea that he has to be very, very careful about his communication. And this in itself is false. So that we take two-way communication and we talk with him about it and about this and about that and we as-is several things. Remember two-way communication as-is. And if we've got somebody on a terrific mass starvation and we talk to him very much on a casual basis, we find him getting sullen. And if the person is crazy and we acknowledge everything the person is saying, the person will probably spin. You got that? You got that real good? Huh?

Because if you start processing somebody, indulging in too much communication with this person, when this person cannot even vaguely afford the expenditure of any juice, much less terminal, the person's terminal starts to go to pieces. In other words, the juice supply is so small that the terminal starts to go to pieces and they'll spin to save themselves from further communication. You, then, will stop talking to them, at least. You get the idea?

You get all sorts of wild conditions with regard to this.

Running 8-C with no acknowledgment at all might be superior to an insane person. That's something you will have to judge. It's all very well to teach you a mechanical process and say, "So-and-so and so-and-so."

Now, actually, running an insane person on 8-C is not very dangerous because they're making up their havingness as fast as they're losing it by your acknowledgment. But they won't communicate with you while they're running 8-C. They usually run 8-C dead silent. And every time you acknowledge them you're cutting their havingness down. Now, they might win if you just sat there and gave them nothing but the command and no acknowledgment. See, they might win to that degree.

Well now, I'd hate to cut you loose with this without an understanding of it. But there are times to acknowledge and times not to. And the person you don't acknowledge is a person who is on the verge of the spin because of loss of energy, power, terminal. You get the idea?

You know, you can talk to some little kid that's crying and he doesn't talk back. Why? 16
He thinks he's lost a terminal. Why doesn't he talk back? He kind of thinks he's awful low on terminals, see. So therefore, loss brings him into tears, you see? All right.

He thinks he's low on terminal and the terminal has dropped off and now if he starts *talking*, too, he will just as-is more mass. And so he's really liable to go by the boards with the body he's got left. So he doesn't want to talk to you. And he's liable to do anything to prevent himself from talking to you. Well, now what can you do? What can you do with him?

Let him cry. That's what you can do with him. Don't try to cheer him up. Let him cry. Let him cry until he finally conceives that you are there.

Now, you start to talk to a kid that's crying, you'll very often throw him into a tantrum or he'll get upset or he'll fling himself around—he'll do various things. He wants you to stop talking to him. He has lost a terminal.

He's lost something—there's something gone there one way or the other. And now, you, with your two-way communication, you dog, are trying to collect some pay. You want him to say something. He knows better than to say something because he's just going to lose more, isn't he? Hm? And you enforce communication on him and he's liable to spin. But if you use communication to make him aware of the fact that he's not entirely out of terminals—get the nicety of this balance: You're there. You're talking at him. You don't really expect him to answer. Get the idea?

All of a sudden he'll stop crying and relax because he's recognized you're there. You've done this very gently. You haven't said very much. He has simply become aware of you or you put another terminal into his hand, you see?

You could take a little toy or something of this sort and you put it in his hand. He'll reject it at first. Why is he rejecting it? It's not there, that's all. He's afraid you're going to talk to him. All of a sudden he'll take it and he'll say, "Oh, well. This is fine." Give him almost anything.

The funny part of it is, he's liable to then tear it up or do something like this. Well, why does he tear it up? Energy. He's run down, his batteries are down. It's the wildest set of agreements you ever heard of. You might give them a piece of paper and they start tearing it up, ripping it all to pieces, doing things with it and so forth. Here you've gotten into the juice mechanism as you watch them destroy it. And as you watch this, you will understand it. It goes on the very simple rules of an individual can be, you might say, juice scarce or terminal scarce or postulate scarce. Three conditions: juice scarce, terminal scarce, postulate scarce.

Now, he can't make postulates because he might make something, you see, and he might make people aware of him and they might become aware of this and then he'd as-is. And he has a lot of daffy considerations, but they all depend on this. The remedy of it is simply to make him remedy his ability to make terminals. And you don't care

what happens to them. He will eventually be able to mock-up a juice mass or source or a terminal or make a postulate to make people aware of his thereness.

And he'll go up on a gradient scale of this to the degree that you successfully let him mock-up what you told him to mock-up each time you told him. And remember, he can mock-up unknownnesses, he can mock-up confusions, he can mock-up invisibilities, he can mock-up blacknesses, he can mock-up illnesses. He can mock-up anything you want him to mock-up, you understand? As long as it'll stand for, at the lowest level, a juice source and at a little higher level, a terminal. And finally, he will simply be making postulates. And then and there, he will be able to destroy by postulate.

He will say, "Not there." And it's not there. Got the idea? We've gotten him over the Frankenstein-monster effect. And this is the mission of Creative Processing today. Thank you.

Thank you.



ENGRAMS—DISSEMINATION OF MATERIAL

LECTURE 33

A LECTURE GIVEN ON 25 OCTOBER 1955

62 MINUTES

Okay. Going to talk to you about engrams. Very interesting subject—engrams and Creative Processes. 2

Sounds like this lecture should have been made back about 1952 or 1951. The truth of the matter is, today we are quite positively and definitely interested in the characteristics of cases from the standpoint of engrams. And the reason why we're so interested is because we can solve them today much easier than we've ever solved them before. So if we can solve something, why, we definitely ought to look at it once in a while and take cognizance of it. Because, actually, the fact that the reactive bank has been solved is one of the best reasons why we should do something about the engram, you see?

This entire picture of engrams and pictures is a fascinating thing. Sometimes you speak to some phrenologist, I think they're called—it's a subject taught in American universities, it studies mice. [laughter] And I don't know, they do. They do study mice. Mice are very, very important. You know, all the mice in the world came from Russia. I don't know if you knew this, but that's a fact. The first invasion from the steppes took place when seven brands of mice and rats came out of the steppes and invaded Europe.

And that's right. And the rest of the world never before that time or date, never, had ever seen one. It's very, very astonishing—great historical material involved here.

Well anyway, they got these mixed up with communists or something so they started to study them as a special subject known as phrenology or miccology in the United States. In every university, why, there's a big department and it studies mice. And I talked to some of these mice and they're not subversive. They're not. I mean, I asked one, one time. He says, "I'm an American."

And I said, "What do you mean an American?"

"My ancestors landed here before yours did," he says.

"Well," I said, "maybe you've got something there." I said, "What you doing?"

He said, "I'm trying to keep out of them damn universities," he said. "Somebody's likely to find out why I had to marry the girl."

Well anyhow, that's the way it is. In America, they do all sort of interesting things. But I'm not exaggerating it now. It really is true that all the mice in the world came from the steppes. The rats come from the Kremlin. Anyway . . . [laughter]

3 The whole problem of mental imagery is a fascinating one which has been delineated at great length in this field of phrenology. And the trouble is—mice, you know, don't—they don't talk well and so the mice have never really made many comments on this sort of thing. So they don't know about human beings. That's the only thing I can think of—that nobody ever ran into the tremendous amount of phenomena extant in the human mind, all out of—just plainly the subject of a picture. Just the subject of a picture has the most tremendous ramifications and phenomena that you'd care to study in a long month of Sundays.

The whole problem is covered in a few brief pages in this field of phrenology. It says that people sometimes get pictures. End of chapter. No, I'm not joking. I mean, it's a very cursorily glanced-at thing. I read in a textbook in phrenology one time, children

and morons often have pictures. These are mental image pictures which they look at to amuse themselves. *Nyah!*

Did you ever run some somatics in an engram? Did you ever run any somatics? That's amusing.

Well, when we walked onto the scene in 1950, as even *Time* magazine now knows—I mean, finally *Time* published enough about Dianetics and me, Dianeticists and Scientologists—they finally found out we existed. And the last time they were talking about prenatales and so forth, why, they headed the whole article giving me credit for having discovered them.

I actually didn't discover them, I just found out about them. They'd been noticed several times. The most noteworthy time was about 1914 or '15—some chap had some method of getting people to recall way back. And Freud had an awful lot to say about this. He went on and on and on and on about return to the womb and how the tremendous need for Mother finally wound the fellow back up in the womb. Actually, psychiatry knew all about this. People were curled up in balls, factually, in sanitariums, to such an extent that they couldn't overlook the fact that they were in the womb position.

And I don't know why they all believe in mysticism to such a great extent. I don't know why these scientists buy such a tremendous amount of mysticism. And that's not the proper name, mysticism. I mean, just why they buy all of this para-science—because they think that the fellow curls up in a ball because he has nothing to curl him up in the ball. You see, if there is no energy manifestation to curl him up in a ball, then we have to get four times removed in our explanation, see, of why he's curled up in a ball.

Here's an insane patient lying there in the womb position, you see. What got him up there? See? What's tying him up in this knot? Why is he doing this? I'd rather have an explanation than no explanation. My idea of science was always that it explained things. And when you see a phenomenon of this magnitude scattered all over the institutions and

so forth and when the chap who founded permissive, investigative psychotherapy—Mr. Freud (not Dr. Freud, if you please, Mr. Freud)—Medical Association of the day said he was for the sea gulls and wanted nothing to do with him.

This chap has gone on and on about this manifestation, and other people have noticed it and mentioned it and so forth. Don't you think somebody would have come off this pitch of "it's all done with mirrors" or something? Hm? Don't you think somebody would have come off this kick? Fantastic—it's fantastic that anybody would accept a phenomenon without causation. If somebody continually curled up in a ball in an institution, somebody would say, sooner or later, "I wonder what's curling him up in the ball? He sure isn't, because he isn't there. There must be something around that's curling him up in a ball." Don't you think somebody should have asked this question, huh? In view of the fact that the German psychiatrist has known about it for over a century, that it's mentioned in the records of Bedlam right here in England? Don't you think somebody sooner or later would have said, "I wonder what's curling these people up in a ball looking like babies in the womb," you know?

Well, it shouldn't have been—you see, I feel put upon. I want to tell you the truth, I feel put upon. Because when a scientist walks into a field which isn't his field, you see, and he is trained and educated in some other discipline, such as the discipline of atomic molecular phenomena and he knows his house is in order, his boys are all ready to blow the whole damn world up, you know, they're on the ball. They're right there. No humanity, but tremendous science, you know? When they wheel up the electrode, something pops, you know. And when they get the wires fixed to the terminals, why, it raises hell with somebody, you see? They can even tell who it's going to raise hell with: themselves. (They haven't found that out too thoroughly yet.)

But anyhow, here is this entire body of physical science, you see, and with a tremendous discipline, a tremendous mathematics, a great deal of experimentation, regimen. Things are

not acceptable except according to very definite plans and data and agreement. And when everybody looks at the experiment and everybody sees the same thing, they say, "That's it! All right. We're fine now. Everybody sees this thing. All right, now let's go someplace."

But if there were six of them standing around the table and five of them say, "Well, we see it."

And the sixth one says, "I don't see it at all."

They'd say, "There's something wrong with this thing." And they'd go ahead and find out what was wrong with it and make it right. Now, that's the discipline of the physical sciences. It is. It's very definite.

You never saw anybody quite so savage as a physicist who does not see the phenomenon to which his compatriots are pointing. He says, "You guys are nuts!" He doesn't know anything about insanity, but he knows that much. That if all the guys don't see the same thing, either one of them is crazy or it isn't happening somehow or there's something else occurring that he knows not what of. Well, that's the discipline of the physical sciences.

All right. A chap trained in that discipline turns around and looks over into another field which is just as well represented as scientific and he thinks, "Well, the boys have been busy here for, well, since 1879 at Leipzig. And gee whiz, they've got all kinds of data and they can give us all kinds of answers. They can give us the smallest unit of energy because they study that. And they can give us this and they can give us that and they're mathematically, statistically accurate and . . ."

What field? Not what datum. What field? Where? Where's the data? Who's been hiding it? Who hasn't looked at it? Terrible. You have no idea of the feeling of a lost terminal. You know? You suppose one is there and then you reach out and you can't

Note: In this section of the lecture there is a change in sound quality as in the original recording.

find it. And the textbooks are all in disagreement. And nobody is doing anything and there isn't any cure for anything. And, you know, you get the most lost feeling you ever felt. It was a great shock to me when I first found this out.

- 5 Now, you have to know this. I'm not just talking one way or the other about this. I'm trying to point something out to you. Out of this entire field of research and the disappointment of failing to discover that anybody had been busy or that anybody had been in agreement with anybody since 1879, evidently—to find at that end of the line, a great deal of no data, no observation to amount to anything. The stuff was strictly balderdash—statistically inaccurate and the research materials bad—very poor.

You take the sleep curve. This is a case in point. This confounded sleep curve. I finally ran down the doctorate thesis which told me what the sleep curve was. The sleep curve had been dreamed up by throwing away all of the data that didn't agree with it back about 1902. And that same curve that appears in all of the textbooks, prior to 1950 in the field of the mind, was originally dreamed up on a series of about three cases. And it was published by a student. And it was picked up by his professor and published in his textbook with a complete explanation of it and then was lifted by the next textbook writer on the subject without the explanation and has been riding ever since without further check or addition in that (quote) “science” (unquote) without any elucidation of its accuracy. The sleep curve printed in the textbooks of the mind sciences prior to 1950 is not inaccurate. It just is not!

Now, I was fascinated with this because after I had run down trying to correlate some data and find myself . . . You see, for a long time I simply said, “Well now, wait a minute here. It is I that is lost, see? I am the one who is lost. I simply don't know what text to put my hands on and it requires an orientation.”

I studied this subject from that viewpoint, then, in a very definite effort to get good orientation and so forth. But it was just more lost terminals, you know, more lost terminals.

And I finally found out that if these jokers at least would stop lying for three minutes, they would have told me long since that there is no subject there. It's just a bunch of opinions which have congealed—like this sleep curve.

And finally I found the doctorate thesis of the young man who had finally traced back the sleep curve. He was a PhD. He had done his work beautifully and accurately. And he finally found out where the sleep curve came from.

And I went down to the Library of Congress and I looked up the textbook he referred to. And sure enough, there was the original sleep curve in about 1902, with a full explanation of how it was a series of three and how it was for the birds. And there was the same curve. And all those years, all those decades later, this sleep curve was being published in every single textbook of any note on this subject as the *fact*, as the complete fact. And it said that in the first hour of the night everybody slept deepest and then at certain hours of the night their sleep lightened and so on. In other words, depth of sleep during the night for the average person. Now, that is the sleep curve, you know?

And this boy ran a curve on this. He finally ran a curve on this himself and found out that it was too random to be plotted. There is no sleep curve.

How would you like to be a scientist researching in the field of the mind where all of the data on which you were depending hadn't ever been raked up, but the data that had been raked up was of this quality?

Somebody speaks of *Dianetics: Modern Science of Mental Health* making wild statements. It's very interesting. A textbook in the field of psychotherapy has these lines as follows: "Every time a kleptomaniac fails to steal something, he burns down the house." I mean, that's a direct quote, I'm sorry. People don't believe this sort of thing, see? How would you like a statement like that to be a factual scientific statement in the field that you're researching, see?

Well, another statement: "Every time a kleptomaniac steals anything, he has or she has an orgasm." This is science? No, it is not science.

Now, why am I talking to you about this? Because you live in a society which has been living alongside of this incorrect information—not just incorrect, but falsified. That's a hard word. For lack of actual knowledge, for lack of observed statistics, information was falsified. All right.

What's this got to do with us? It means that we're living alongside of a chain of lies of one kind or another. We're living alongside of a bunch of misconceptions which are so overpoweringly huge in magnitude that the data of the engram, the picture, the anatomy of the mind, the behavior of energy in the mind, the situation of the awareness of awareness unit and so forth, dredged up, looked at very hard, classified, so on, comes under considerable strain as nonscientific.

Now, let's get this real straight. Let's look at this plainly. Here we *do* have a tremendous body of technology, don't we? Here's the engram and energy picture manifestations, the time track—all of these various things which are discernible, are detectable, which are measurable, person after person. And this body of information is in existence in a superstition—I hate to have to call it by this word, but this thing called a *superstition* is simply a—it's an old Roman connotation. It means a bunch of the boys got around and dreamed something up and said that was it and it was kind of mysterious. It was their early word for church and so forth. It's a bunch of more or less erroneous or dreamed-up beliefs of one kind or another that sit as a body used by some cult. All right.

7 This data about the engram and the reactive bank sits there as a series of precisions, you see? And it is being bedmates with a superstition. What do you suppose is going to happen? It becomes almost unsafe to publish the actual data on the subject of the phenomena of the mind. It becomes almost unsafe to do so. Because the agreement is the superstition. Do you see this? The wide "scientifically held"—and that in about eight

sets of quotes—“scientifically held” opinion is a superstition, but it is the widely held opinion. I want to call that to your attention.

Therefore, anything you offer in the field of the mind which is factual, measurable, observable and remediable—out of the body of material called Dianetics—is immediately up against a series of superstitions which are *much more* widely held and believed. It’s an incredible thing—*incredible* thing. Because it renders your preclear liable to a peculiarity of restimulation, which is the first problem of address to auditing engrams. After all these years I know this is the first thing that an auditor has to take into account: the credulity or the extant superstition concerning the mind.

And into this he hands a precise, knowable datum: he says, “A prenatal.” Now certainly, if bodies are going to curl up in prenatal positions and behave prenatally, although now, (quote) “fully matured” (unquote), it’d only be a superstition that tells you that there’s nothing that makes them do this, see? There’s no actual experience, there’s no belief, there’s no consideration—it just happens. Oh, my God, I mean, how wild can we get, see? We’ve got to have some kind of a causation. We know this body has been developed in a womb. This is an observable fact. And therefore, we must assume that the body must have carried along some of the patterns of its development.

People talked all the time about the genetic blueprint. A fellow by the name of Darwin came up and screamed like a banshee. Lamarck—these characters—I mean, they’re just characters! It’s fabulous what these men have done! They say, “There’s an unending stream of protoplasm that develops itself by accident. And there’s no blueprint of the development.” Oh, Christ.

Go out here and find a bunch of workmen and say, “Okay, workmen . . .”—we’ll treat them as the unending stream of protoplasm—we’ll say, “Go ahead, workmen, build an auditorium.” And then walk off. You come back a long time later and you say, “What you doing?”

"I don't know."

"Well, what are you doing?"

"Well, we're supposed to build an auditorium."

"Well, why don't you get busy on it?"

And they say, "Well, there's a lot of material around here, but what's an auditorium? Where's the blueprints? How many floors does it have? How many people has it got to hold? Where's the entrance? What street does it face on? What's the numbering system of its offices? We've got to have some data. Give us a blueprint and we can build."

All right. According to past theoreticians, you would then have made a magic pass in the air, see, and you'd say, "There's your blueprint," and walked off. *Rrrrrr*. I mean, after all, how silly can we get? I mean, the workmen would have stood there and said, "That certainly was a pretty pass. His little finger was held just right while he was making it. But where the hell does the front door go?" You get the idea?

8 Now, let's just look at some of these things and face them up—not out of rancor. The only rancor in this, by the way—you should understand this clearly—is the fact that it made me do work which I didn't want to do, see? I had other fish to fry. I had had a lot of other things that I was interested in without accumulating all this *basic* information. You get the idea? And therefore the accumulation of all this basic information. . . . [sigh] Why didn't somebody accumulate it?

I mean, you know, you think you're playing on a team and there you are on the football field and you say, "Thank God for all these other players. You know, there they are—all ranked up. We're all ready to kick off here." And you run down the field and you say, "That's funny. The ball hasn't been kicked off yet." And you look around. "What other players?" You're standing out there all by yourself feeling like a silly ass, see? The most

nonsensical thing that could happen to anybody. There's supposed to be a game in progress and nobody kicks the ball off.

So you, wisely or unwisely, go back and say, "Well, all right. I will run down the field, kick the ball off and then I'll run back and protect the goal." You get the idea? This becomes, then, a wild confusion—my life, and yours, to a marked degree, have been confused for just these basic and fundamental reasons: we were doing too much work for the same period of time that we should have been developing its application for people, you see—analyzing already existing phenomena. We were examining phenomena when we should have been doing many other things, you see?

Actually, nobody took responsibility for it. It does not lie in the field of medicine—definitely. Medicine is observable structure—it's a business of observable structure. And this stuff is not clearly observable—it's mental structure, see? Although it influences the body structure, medicine—it never would have occurred, really, to medicine to have examined this thing. So, really, nobody was around. The psychiatrist, he was observable structure. The fellow was insane, so he'd just record everything the fellow said, you know, and hoped that sooner or later if he took enough notes—you know, if fifty million monkeys write on fifty thousand typewriters for twenty-five million years—some datum like this—they would write all the books ever written. Well, they just recorded data. Nobody assimilated it. Nobody put it together. Then, very often they would throw away the wrong piece of paper, you see?

So we came into this incredible thing of where we ourselves are tumbling over the basic work. And we're doing this fantastic thing: we're trying to wrap up much better than a hundred years of scientific mental research in a period of about six or seven. That we've done this shows only not how wonderful it all is. It just shows that it could have

been done much more easily a long time ago. This is the only thing you can assume from this.

- 9 And you come up with this suddenly developed, suddenly presented datum. It was simply there to be seen. It was there to be cataloged. It was there to be classified. And you come up with this datum as an auditor and you say, "There you are. A prenatal."

The fellows say, "Prenatal what?"

"Prenatal energy picture."

"What's that?"

"It is a moment of experience which has been solidified and is ready to react again upon the body. It is the heart of the stimulus-response mechanism of the body. And it's done by pictures and interaction amongst pictures. And this is one of its pictures. This is the blueprint. This is part of the blueprint of the body. Now, it . . ."

"Part of what blueprint?" is the reaction you're going to get, see? "Part of what blueprint?"

You say, "The blueprint of the body. [sigh]"

And they say, "There isn't any blueprint for the body. It's an unending stream of protoplasm."

You say, "It might have been an unending stream of protoplasm, but I'd sure like to see these workmen out here build that auditorium without any kind of a blueprint."

"This is one of the pictures. This is probably blueprint eight to the eight billionth power of one instant in space which may be duplicated in certain instances. And this is a piece of that gigantic blueprint which finally evolves a human body. [sigh]"

The fellow will say, "What's a prenatal?"

"It's a mental energy picture. It's a mental energy picture that is part and has become part, because of its peculiarities, of the blueprint by which is made the body in which you are looking at this with."

"Blueprint. What do you mean a blueprint?"

"It's the accumulation of experience which monitors and modifies the structural and functional characteristics of a body."

"Where'd it come from?"

"Well, it happened at the time it occurred. A certain amount of stress and duress came about in an instant of time and the body took a picture of it and filed it. And it's filed in the reactive banks because unconsciousness is part of it. And that's what it is. Blueprint."

He'd say, "[sigh] I don't know what you're talking about. I am a psychologist." You get . . . ?

So it isn't any man's viciousness. It was a bunch of men's laziness. And it's the only real fault you could find with these characters. They were just too stinking lazy to be let live. I'm sure Professor Wundt had an idea of what he was doing, but he should have writ something and told the boys, "You are applying scientific principles of physiology to the field of the mind and this is the way you do it and this is the scientific regimen. Scientific regimens are performed in the following fashion: a, b, c, d, 2, a, b, c, d, 3, a, b, c, d." You know like Bacon did. There was a man. There was a man.

But of course this Wundt was, I guess, thorough only in collecting his salary, as near as I can figure out.

It's a fantastic fact—it's a fantastic fact that a science can be dreamed up all in one fell swoop. Did you ever look over the science of and classifications and so forth of botany? Bacon sat down one day and he says, "This is the way you put a science together." Scribble, scribble, scribble, scribble, scribble. "As example, a science for flowers." Scribble, scribble, scribble, scribble, scribble. "That's botany, folks." He just used this as an example. And the botanists took it and they said, "Hey, you know, this is all right!" And that *is* botany. Did you know that? He told them how to put something together, how to classify.

They use, by the way, the exact classifications today that he scribbled with this quill pen—1500 and what was it? Way back, way back. Actually, it hasn't moved an inch except

to add to its classifications. But as a result you have an orderly horticulture. You have a very orderly—what is it?—floriculture as well.

Out of this original study of botany came classifications of all kinds of plantings—food. The agrarian civilization became so efficient that we no longer had to be interiorized entirely into raising a couple of peonies and a spud, you see? We knew enough about it so that we no longer had to stand there looking at it, because people could add to this classification and get somewhere with it. You see this? So it would have been possible a hundred years ago to have done this.

All right. We've done it today. And it's brand-new. And it's workable. And it exists in the midst of a superstition created by a bunch of guys because they were too lazy to create facts or look. They let the human sciences fall abysmally behind the physical sciences. And this occurred only because the physical scientist in his disciplines did not know that the human scientists were falling behind. And they have fallen behind to such a degree that now the nuclear physicist is a nut in control of an atom bomb. This could be a very destructive mis-pace, couldn't it? Hm? This could be cataclysmic. As a matter of fact, you might get your right index finger radioactively burned because this datum has occurred. Out of pace.

Now let's look at the physical sciences—and here they are, sitting here roaring and ready to go, with an understanding of everything but human beings, politics, sanity, economics. Here they are, see. But here they are, all set and raring to go. Boy, can they build motor cars! Man, are they hot where it comes to setting up new refrigerators! And, gee, they're certainly sharp when it comes to stringing new power lines! And they can build planes that go *swoosh!* They're in terrific condition, see? With what? They have armed a thing that doesn't have any understanding or real control of itself with weapons

beyond the capability of the single individual to resist. All because this other thing has occurred.

Now, I don't want to get you the idea or any of you who are trained in this past discipline (although very few people have ever been trained in it, they've studied it), don't want you to get the idea that we are berating these fellows for anything else than an incredible laziness. And I don't want you to get any other idea about my rancor concerning this. It's simply the rancor of a busy man who had an awful lot of basic spade work to do, see? And I do feel a bit of blame, particularly since they were not helpful. But there was, then, a terrific dis-pace here. **11**

Here's the physical sciences, way up here. Here are these mental sciences, way down here.

All right. Now, I want you to look at the comparable datum. If these low-developed superstitions are what are passing for humanities, right now—if that's the case—then you, whereas you may not be up to the same perfection and precision, but damn near, of the physical sciences, see, you've still got the same gap. And your impatience with these humanities is apt to be—is *apt* to be as wroth as mine, after you've been at this for a while.

If you were to go around to a few universities and so forth and try to give the boys the hot dope so they could come up to present time on the material, you would find that you were running into a cult-like superstition which depends upon a sort of a priestly belief-in rather than any data. They're not there to have anything proved to or anything. You're going to be out of pace with them. You savvy? All right.

You're going to be out of pace with these people. To that degree, remember that the physical sciences were carrying everybody pell-mell toward disaster by being so out of pace with the mental sciences. And it's very, very curious that you're just as far out of pace now as a mental scientist. Here you are, a relatively small group in a world, with a

tremendous command of the mind. You do have a command of the mind. The people sitting right here have looked over this work, they have acquaintance with it.

One chap this morning was telling me, "You know, I've never run an engram." Well, he may never have run one, but he knows what they are. He knows what the score is with them and he could handle them in several different ways.

So the first and foremost lesson you have to learn about the engram and about its materiel is that it, as a technology, is as far displaced in development in comparison to the extant humanities as the physical sciences are displaced.

The physical sciences can ruin Man, can't they? They're in a position to ruin Man. That's because the wide and broad agreement on this subject has not been brought up to parity.

12 I'm going to tell you the first thing you've got to learn about the engram. The first thing you've got to learn about all the odds and ends and Para-Scientology, what you've got to learn about prenatals and past lives and future lives and thetans and Lord knows what tremendously wide category of materials—the first thing you've got to learn about it is how to use it in dissemination of materials. That's the first thing. Because you can use it in such a way as to reform and recapture and overcome a hundred years of laziness on the part of the mental scientist. Or you could use it to drive any extant groups or persons interested in this subject into maybe a psychotic rage and maybe an apathy of depth.

Now, we're talking just amongst us girls now. You got the idea. Here you have the physical sciences driving Man right straight out the bottom of the barrel by developing weapons, transportation, technologies and machines far beyond Man's capabilities to understand or use on the human plane. And with that, the world faces chaos.

Similarly, having developed the material which you have in your hands at this moment, you are in a similar position with relationship to the entirety of the field of healing. I want to teach you this, right now: that if you use your information well and within

certain principles and bounds, you can recapture and reform and bring up to date the entire field of healing, the length and breadth of the world, with no difficulty. But misusing this information, which is to say, mishandling it in dissemination, you could bring about a complete chaos in the field of healing.

Don't for a moment believe that it is a question of does the engram exist or doesn't it exist? That is not the question today. The question is this—is the phenomena of Dianetics going to be employed to remedy the tardiness of the human sciences or is it going to be used, as the physical sciences are unfortunately being used, to completely smash the world of healing? Now, that's what it amounts to.

Now, as you sit there, you have available either in your own experience or at your fingertips in books, which you are trained to understand, an enormous amount of this phenomena. You know what this phenomena is. It's old hat to most of you. It seems common to you. Now, the way that you have understood this collision between the precision and mechanical understanding in Dianetics and the superstition of past studies, is that you very often got invalidated and your preclear very often got invalidated. And then you believed that your material in the engram, locks, secondaries, facsimiles in general, past lives and so on, you believed that this material then stood on a queasy, uncomfortably, unsound basis. But you know very well if you have studied this material that it does not stand on any such unsound basis. It's standing on concrete. It's the physical sciences—the physically developed but undeveloped superstitions that are standing above a void. Now do you understand this?

The material which you have, number one, can be or is invalidated by the general agreement which has not yet caught up to this material. Follow me?

Audience: Mm-hm.

The general agreement is not there yet. All right. Therefore, it has an invalidating effect upon you. But you kind of—get kind of sore about it. You've seen a preclear run a

prenatal or you've had all kinds of things turn up in the bank—you've run certain kinds of processes and you achieved certain phenomena and results on a preclear. And you're getting good about it, you know how to predict these things.

And here's the oddity: your faith is not required. That is the disadvantage of the physical sciences. Nobody's faith is required. The phenomena exists or it doesn't exist and if it doesn't exist, it doesn't exist. If everybody can look, all six guys around the table take a look at this phenomenon and they say, "Well, that's it." That's it. You see? It's not a case of argue.

This is a terribly destructive thing. It puts into the hands of an individual such weapons of conviction that nothing else can occur but that everybody bows down to that conviction.

A man would be mad, indeed, if you took two little sticks, you put them just under the edge of the table and you said, "Now, you know that when I lift my arms and put two little sticks on the table, there are going to be two little sticks on the table."

And this fellow sitting across from you says, "Oh, that doesn't seem very likely. After all, I've been given to understand that when somebody puts his hands on the table, they're always and invariably empty."

And you say, "Well now, watch out, because I'm going to do this."

And the fellow says, "Oh, well, I wouldn't believe it if I saw it."

And you put your hands on the table and there are two little sticks in them. And you put the two little sticks there and you say, "That's that."

This guy will look at you. He will be upset with you.

Do you realize you're in a position to do that? With psychometric tests, you can demonstrate conclusively that somebody was wrong for a real long time when he said the IQ of an individual could not be changed at will. See? That's an awful battering ram right there. Anybody could take these tests.

There is such a thing as a lie detector—not our E-Meters, but the police lie detectors. We can show by the operation of the lie detector exactly where these things lie and how. It's an awful crusher.

And along with these two things, you have dozens of crushers, not the least of which is that people get better and psychosomatics disappear. You've got these two little sticks in your hands and when you put your hands on the table, there are two little sticks there. And the superstition is going to say to you, "No, no. There are not going to be any sticks there. When people put their hands on the table, they're empty."

And you say, "When I put my hands on the table, there are sticks." You do it.

What's he going to do? You're in a position, as I say, to enturbulate the entire field of healing. And not to drag it out or look it over any further, you are at this moment enturbulating healing. And so am I.

A few years ago in the United States, psychiatrists used to say, "Dianetics, hah, hah, hah! Hah! Oh, that ridiculous stuff. That guy, Hubbard. Yeah, well!" They don't do that today. They sit there, they look like birds that have been suddenly faced with a snake. They are coldly upset about the whole thing. They are not vicious. They're just coldly, politely reserved. 14

Some patient comes in and says, "I have been worked on with some Dianetics (or some Scientology)." He tells a medical doctor or a psychiatrist this in the United States, the fellow greets it with silence. He doesn't come up against it anymore.

What do you want to do? Knock out the whole field of healing? We could go on a sufficient advertising campaign within the United States or elsewhere at this moment to unsettle and unstabilize a great many things that have been built up over a great, long period of time. Yes, it may be true that the people in the United States in the field of healing are not doing the best they can do, by our lights. But I've shown you already

this morning the intolerance of the physical scientist for bad scientific work—just one field of investigation—terrific intolerance. If you lost that intolerance, you never get anyplace. Always spit on somebody that's doing a lousy piece of research and telling you it's a good one.

Similarly, in the field of practice, you could so thoroughly invalidate, if you really got busy, any field of healing that you ran into, that you could upset and destabilize the field of healing.

You could advertise Dianetics and Scientology, I could write some books, I could demonstrate some proof, I could put some weapons of one kind or another in your hands and you could go out on a campaign of trying to sell Scientology and so on to fields of healing. And Scientology is not purely a healing science, you understand. You could go out and do this.

You know what reaction you'd get? You'd get a complete confusion. Now, why would you get a confusion? It's because you would be knocking out the stable data of those fields. And remember the confusion in those fields is held in check by its stable data. Got the structure?

- 15 Here's a stable datum that's quite interesting. There are some fields that believe that structure monitors function. And that's the totality of it: structure monitors function. And they align all of their data to that fact. You see this?

All right. You come along and you say, "Look. Look here. I can prove to you"—and you could, by the way, in their own framework with the endocrine system—"I can prove to you that function monitors structure." You could say this. And you could say, "Now, we're going to take this fellow and we're going to give him hormones and then we're going to—and we're going to find out there's no change—and then we're going to clear his attitudes toward sex, and then we're going to give him hormones again and now they're functional." This is not a total proof, but it's an awfully upsetting one. There are

several other such proofs. In other words, you could bear down on this poor chap to a point of where he was practically spinning.

Why would he be spinning? You would be invalidating his stable data. The stable data of that field in which he's associated is that structure monitors function and that function does not control structure. And you've just come along and said, "Look, thinkingness or function controls the structure of this man's glandular system." And this man's glandular system did not change unless you changed it *via* the monitoring factor—*function*. It didn't change by the mere addition of some drugs or fluids or secretions. You see what you've done? You've shaken that basic datum. You've shaken it badly. And as a result, you are met by confusion. And the confusion in that man's eyes is going to be headed at you as anything on the Emotional Scale: Anger, Fear, Antagonism. Any of these things could occur as an emotional reaction to your very definite proof that structure did not monitor function.

Now, you understand his entire network may be built on this datum. And if his network is built on that datum—look, you've just plain ordinary, pure and simple, got to choose between the will to heal, the will to help of this individual and his position and role in the society or his extinction by confusion.

Now we're taking up a problem that actually I seldom think about. I mean, it's good roads and good weather if somebody out of the field of healing talks to me . . . Last night I spent hours and hours with three very fine fellows in the field of healing. We found out we had tremendous points in agreement. These chaps had heard a lot about Para-Scientology. It upset a lot of their basic data. They were confused. And all of a sudden they said to themselves, "You know, maybe Hubbard isn't as goofy as some of this stuff sounds. Let's go get ahold of him and talk to him."

And so we all had dinner together. And they were real happy at the end of that time. Why? I didn't upset any of their stable data. I told them what was Para-Scientology and

what we really worked with. You see? I simply answered their questions and let them fit into their frame of reference any data they wanted to fit in. If they wanted to throw some of that data away, that was all right with me. I wasn't insisting they were taking the whole boodle. And they finished the evening, they felt calm and they felt cheerful about the whole thing. These men were in the field of healing. They were professionals. All right. Now . . . (Very important ones, too.)

Here's an interesting thing—very interesting. The wrong thing to do would be the thing you are prone to do, which is to throw aside your actual information on the subject and say, "Well, we will hold this somewhat in doubt and we will agree over here a little bit with this superstition and then we will get a bridge of communication." See, that's not smart either, because you're just dropping your abilities and discounting them. You know what you know. If you don't know it, you don't know it. But if you know engrams exist and all of this other phenomena exist, why, don't let yourself be invalidated. You just happen to know more about the mind than somebody else. You see? And that's no reason for you to drop your hard-won information on the subject. At the same time, it's no reason to upset his stable data. You follow me?

16 So I'm going to tell you here very briefly how to handle the engrams and phenomena of Dianetics and Scientology so that they become very digestible—very briefly.

You find out what the other fellow is doing to heal. Follow me? What he's doing—what technologies he uses. And then you simply show him—having discovered what he is doing—then you simply show him that you might have a datum or two, you see, that would assist him to do this very thing and which fits within his framework. Don't throw the book at him. Work with him slowly. Do you see this? You see, you could do this.

I'll give you an example. A very, very well-known chap here in England told me the basic theory of—you should realize that these fellows are used to being confronted with other fields of healing. You should realize that, see? They're used to being confronted

with wild guys that suddenly step up with a panacea for the world's ills. See, they're used to this guy. Right now, they feel funny because we don't quite fit in this bracket. See, we're not fitting in this bracket. We're not doing just exactly that. And therefore they are a little bit out of condition as far as we're concerned, so it has to be gently handled. Otherwise you're going to make a lot of people stay away.

Now here's this chap and he described to me how the body is trying to finish off . . . By the way, his basic stable datum is that the body is always trying to get well. See, that stable datum in that science—the body is always trying to get well and if you simply let it get well, it will get well. We know this: the body is trying to survive and it will do anything to survive, even kill itself so it can have another form which will survive better. That's just a broader statement, you see, but it certainly does knock out this other stable datum. It demonstrates that it's wrong.

All right. I didn't contest this or talk about this. I got him to talking about this. And he said the body was trying to finish off an illness anytime it had a chronic illness. See? Anytime the body had a chronic ill which went on for a long time—anytime this occurred—why, it had been sick at one time or another and somebody had healed it ferociously or suddenly and it had not had a chance to finish off that cycle of illness. You get this? You get this as an interesting theory, though.

Now let's just look at this as a theory. The fellow, let us say, had diphtheria. And about halfway through diphtheria something happened to change the course of diphtheria. The body was trying to get rid of certain toxins and ills with diphtheria, see? And it would have gotten rid of all of these and would have gotten well. But it was stopped right in the middle of diphtheria. Now, you see where this comes in?

You see how a fellow observing this phenomenon . . . It isn't whether he's right or we're right, see, that isn't the contest. You have the actual information to know exactly why a body would appear to be this way—there would be a stop in the middle of diphtheria.

And so they're trying to explain a very cleverly observed fact. This was Hahnemann, by the way, a hundred and seventy years ago, developed this theory, if I remember rightly. All right.

- 17 We do know that the body can get stuck in the middle of an engram, don't we? And here's somebody with an explanation for it. We could tell him, "Well, now look, there's a picture of the engram and it does this and it does that and it restimulates. And, of course, there are stop spots in it and the body, of course, looks like it was trying to get rid of an ill or finish something."

Well, he's right in saying, "Finish a cycle-of-action." He's right in so many categories here that it's quite astonishing. See? But it's just hung together with the wrong thread somehow or another, so it doesn't quite work. So practitioners in that field are in argument with one another.

You know what I did with this chap? I showed him how to handle an engram with Creative Processing but never telling him the engram existed at all. "Oh, the body is trying to finish off an illness? Well, that's very interesting. That's extremely interesting, because we have a process in Scientology which finishes off an illness with created image pictures in the mind. And maybe this would work as well as a drug injection. How about let's figure out what illness the body is stuck in" (since they have this well-categorized) "and then let's just finish the whole thing off with creative image pictures. Then the body won't have to develop fevers and lie there for six or seven days and get well the way it's doing. Maybe we could speed this up and it just might be, then, that we'd have a little advance in *your* field." And so on.

And this fellow looked at me and he thought that was wonderful. He said, "My golly." He said, "that would be terrific." He said, "You wouldn't have a patient lying around the hospital for three or four days, see, finishing off this illness after having been given an injection of certain drugs." You see? He said, "This is remarkable." He was all steamed up.

His certainty had been increased. By what? A body one way or the other must finish off a cycle of illness.

Well, if you can make the body think it has, that might be just as good as pushing it the rest of the way through. And it just might be that this would just work fine. We didn't have to change any of the basic concepts on which he was operating. That structure monitors function is one of them. And that a body is always trying to get well is another one of them. And that a body is trying to finish off an illness to get rid of certain toxins. We don't argue with those. If we argued with them, we would have a man in confusion. We'd have a man in chaos. Do you understand? You're looking at a delicately fabricated thing. You're looking at aligned science which isn't very well aligned. And it's easy to shake it up and it's easy to bring about the confusion. You see that? Hm? Very easy to do that.

All right. So we could with creative image pictures make this individual finish off his cycle-of-action. And the fellow says, "Good. Good. That's fine."

And it not only works with an individual when you're trying to teach him something, it also works with a preclear when you're trying to process him. You don't upset and dump on his head all the confusion in the bank.

And if you follow what I've been saying here with the field of healing—just try to give them a little bit more, then let them align it themselves—the whole field of healing will better and Man will have healers.

If we do it the other way and prove it to them and drive it home with battering rams, we would have a world of healing chaos and probably no healers at all. Because, remember, you can't stop an artery pumping blood by running an engram. You can't do that yet. The day you can do it in three minutes, you can do away with medical doctors, but you can't do that yet. You've still got a few things that have got to be done one way or the other. There are lots of them.

25 OCTOBER 1955

But if you maintain the stability in the healing field, give them the data that they can align with their own data, we will win. And the engram and its theory and all this other phenomena will become common property to the entire field of healing. And I think that's worthwhile.

Thank you. Thank you.



THE HANDLING OF CONFUSION IN THE PRECLEAR OR ON ANY DYNAMIC

LECTURE 34

A LECTURE GIVEN ON 25 OCTOBER 1955

61 MINUTES

All right. We have a lecture now on the 25th of October, 1955, second morning lecture, concerning the handling of confusion in the preclear or on any dynamic. And I don't want to start out at once when I say "any dynamic," by inferring that you could confuse God. I don't want to start out on that particular level, but it's a very handy one to start out on since the whole subject of God is a very fine subject in which to exemplify this. 2

Now, I've already spoken to you concerning upsetting the stable data and thereby avalanching in the confusion of healers. It is really not fair to take a man who is sincerely devoted to helping his fellow man and victimizing him one way or the other by kicking out his basic data. You can actually put him into such a situation, you see, that he no longer dares quite trust his old material and he certainly can't trust yours.

And right in that in-between right there is the reason why, occasionally, somebody will come from, let us say, chiropracty and be trained as an auditor—and in being trained,

his own stable data is unsettled—and he, to some degree, stops being a chiropractor. But also he fails to become, to any great degree, a Scientologist. The man is left in between in confusion because the data on which he is aligned has not been augmented by you. It has been invalidated.

Now, let us take somebody—the pattern of a—how do you make a squirrel? This is one of the more important things that we face because every once in a while we have a squirrel. “What is a squirrel?” people say. A squirrel is looking for somebody who is nutty enough to be processed by him. So a squirrel is a very specific anatomy. It is very interesting. It is an individual who has sought to achieve, in Dianetics or Scientology, a stability of an alignment of data which is there to be achieved. And having begun on that line, he is fairly successful up to the point when someone nearest and dearest to him starts to kick out from underneath him, the new stable data which he has assumed and on which he is now aligning his existence. Follow me?

We have, then, a situation here where an individual's stable data has been invalidated and unstabilized by someone very close to him. I can almost tell you exactly who is going to squirrel where. I predict it now. It will be some chap or some girl, whose wife or husband, as the case may be, is violently opposed to the subject. Now, that fellow or girl who is very sincerely interested in Dianetics and Scientology will be under a continual bombardment of data, data, data, you see. And this bombardment will invalidate the stable data of Dianetics and Scientology and this person will not know where to turn or to what to attribute this confusion, and will (when they become a squirrel) simply turn on the organization and find all sorts of things wrong with auditors and me and so forth. In other words, they'll turn the confusion on us and they will sit down in Oklahoma or Cattagut or someplace and keep knocking themselves out on this basis. The material which they print is confused. It is not factual. It is very, very confused.

Now, in any human organization, it is almost impossible to look around it without finding a great number of imperfections. One can find a great number of imperfections. One can also find a great number of hopeful facts and a great number of assets. And these people do nothing but look at these imperfections. What are they really looking for? They're trying to completely unstabilize the data of Dianetics and Scientology, do you see? If they could completely unstabilize it, then they themselves would be in a situation of mental stability and calm, they feel, you see? You get the idea?

Now, a drunkard (and this is important to you in processing by the way, it's not just a random fact thrown in) is actually trying to do this—by test, he's trying to do this—he's trying to get a full glass in front of him. He knows he felt all right before he drank it, and so the answer to drunkenness is a full glass of liquor. This is very odd, so they have another drink and another drink and this is compulsive drinking. They've got to get a full glass of liquor in front of them. Then that they drink it seems to escape their attention. And if they could just get that full glass of liquor in front of them, they'll feel all right.

This works up in mock-ups. You can do this by Creative Processes. You can take an alcoholic and you'd make him mock-up a full glass of liquor. And make him mock-up a full glass of liquor and it'll start doing all sorts of automatic and interesting things. Of course, you would then make him mock-up full glasses of liquor and make him drink them. He will go through all the symptoms of drunkenness: giddiness, compulsion, obsession. He finally gets to a point of where all he has to do is mock-up a full glass of liquor and it can sit there in front of him or he can move it to the left or right, or back and forth, or drink it and so on.

An auditor, in mock-up form, can actually make him put the flavor of the alcohol and its kick and expectancies and all the rest of it into the alcohol. You can do a very tricky job of it, but the point is you've got to get him to where he can sit there with a

full glass of liquor in front of him without either feeling all right or all wrong, you see? What's wrong with him basically—he will tell you, eventually—is he's trying to get a full glass of liquor in front of him because he felt all right before he got that glass.

Now, similarly, the squirrel knows he was all right until he drank this horrible, unstabilizing confusion: Dianetics and Scientology, see? And if he could just get rid of it and put it over there—invalidate it completely—he'd be all right. But he's in the uncomfortable position of already having a conviction upon its truth and having had these convictions thoroughly invalidated for him. So his solution—there are many solutions—one is simply to leave the whole thing and go join the French Foreign Legion or something. But one of the solutions which troubles the organization is that they think then if they can unmock everything connected with it—everything connected with the subject, the organization and so forth, by fair means or foul—they will then be rid of this confusion which is unbearable to them.

- 4 Now, almost all of these people have an intolerance for confusion which is fabulous. It's way up in the stars. And their level of criticism is very high.

All right. Now, let's look at that mechanism. The Axiom there: *A stable datum is necessary to the alignment of data.* Well, that's fine after the individual has a confusion all aligned, you see. There's an awful lot of data that's in confusion. Stable datum—he gets it all aligned, very nicely aligned, then somebody starts knocking and kicking at his stable datum, you see? And he gets the confusion back again. And he didn't like the confusion. Now he *knows* that it's a confusion and in that is a tremendous clue to this whole picture. He now *knows* it better. He cannot not-know it, you see? His effort to not-know is to not-is everything connected with the subject.

All right. Now, let's look at this further. Let's look at your preclear and let's discover that he could be swamped about the stable data of his life unless he is permitted, as permissively as possible, to rearrange that stable data. And if you permit him to arrange

this stable data, neatly and nicely and squared away, why, he will be, then, in pretty good shape.

But if you are to take engrams and locks and secondaries and past lives and all the rest of it, and dump them on his head, and you can, you know—oh, man, the obedience of some of the mental mechanisms to the auditor is something we've really never discussed. But this thing called a somatic strip is really there and it goes to the exact point and space in time (and space) where the auditor tells it to. And it starts going through anything the auditor tells it to. He starts it going through some kind of an operation, it'll go through with the operation. Fabulous—you can hold a stopwatch on the thing. This is some terrifically powerful phenomena you have here.

One time I had a medical doctor say . . . Well now, I took a patient and I put him through a tonsillectomy. And medical doctor was holding a watch on the thing. And we just let the patient go through the tonsillectomy—just the strip just went through the tonsillectomy, that's all. I just told it to go through and it did, see? And the fellow went through all of the dramatizations of the whole damn tonsillectomy, see. Medical doctor sitting there holding a watch on it and he said, "Well," he said, "that was a fairly good throat surgeon." He said, "He did that in nineteen minutes and that was just about right," and so forth. And then realized what he'd said. Fellow was so taken up with the situation, he didn't realize that something fantastic was occurring here. There was a time machine of some sort or another which was going on at the command of another person, which was putting somebody through a tonsillectomy from beginning to end. There's a tremendous number of this phenomena. We neglect it. We don't bother to teach it because it's all "proof" or "conviction" phenomena.

All right. Your somatic strips now can come up out of your tonsillectomy to present time. [laughter]

5 Now here, then, is where an auditor is armed with information of such accuracy and information about things that are of such a broadly influencing nature that a preclear or a person is very much putty in his hands (to coin a cliché). Wherever we look, then—an ability on the part of the auditor to upset the stable data of the preclear and land him in confusion. Preclear thinks life is built this way or that way. He has subscribed to some superstition or another and probably just subscribed to this many times, you see, various things through his various careers and so on. He's got a lot of stable data and all of a sudden, we just upset this stable data to him by overpowering him with evidence which we drag out of his own bank. And which he cannot thereafter do anything but believe—crush! You see what you could do? You know—crush.

Well actually, we do this slightly. We give him some reality on Scientology. The best reality to get on Scientology, though, is that it will enforce one's stable data or will supplant one's stable data with better stable data. See, that's the best reality that one could get on the subject.

All right. Let's take this dynamic of the Supreme Being. That's an interesting one to investigate from this standpoint. And we discover that it is totally a structure of stable data. It is the one structure which is not really represented in any way, shape or form with mass, except of course as we consider churches mass and priesthoods mass and so on, and that's actually a Third Dynamic mass. We're talking about the Eighth Dynamic now, pure and simple, and this thing is totally supported by data. And it tells you, first and foremost and at once, that you had better seize upon a stable datum, folks. You better just get hold of that stable datum—"God is"—and you got to have faith in him! And if you don't, we're going to burn you, fry you, condemn you and do other religious and spiritual things to you. [laughter] Now, that's the way one of those things keep going.

And here is a structure of data totally supported by a faith—an exterior faith—one that the individual must be always coached on. He must be delicately handled with regard

to this faith. At no time can we take our finger off this fellow and let him wander off into any speculation.

Well now, in early stages, a religion is relatively successful because a bunch of fellows get around and they say, "Hey, let's have a bunch of faith in this thing. And we've heard something or other and we've seen something or other and we think that this is fine. And now, let's all get together and let's have some faith in this. And we'll all agree that this is a nice, interesting thing—that God is—and that we have faith in him and he will help us out."

Now, evidently thetans originally, on this, were mocking-up a group spirit, you see, of some kind or another. They're saying, "Well now, we're all together in this and we'll mock-up this thing and when any of us gets into trouble, why, this thing will go into action and we'll be all set." Well, that's all very well and is perfectly workable and usable.

Now, in its early stages, a religion comes along the line neatly and nicely, does well, does smoothly because it is subscribed to without force, duress, proof or conviction. Then they start manufacturing the relics. The relic factories start turning up to "high C," and the bones of a martyr or the clubs of Hercules or something like that start coming out in an unending line from some very faithful follower of the faith for a couple of quick drachmas. And now we're getting conviction, conviction, conviction. People start coming up with proofs. Why? Because people who have no part in the original agreement or have not really subscribed to it later, but have gone into it for social reasons or something of this sort, are there. And people suddenly awaken to this horrible thing—heresy. Heresy of some sort or another: disbelief, faithlessness, sin. All these things start cropping up and what do they mean? They mean this individual hasn't subscribed to our stable datum.

Nowhere do we find he is *right there* with our stable datum. So if we haven't a stable datum in common with this man, then he's got to be held in line. So we tell him he better

have faith or else. He doesn't now have an understanding of this thing, does he? He has no understanding of it. He merely knows that the rest of the group are saying their prayers in a certain cadence before a certain altar and they're supposed to go through this. You see?

And this group demands this of him, but he hasn't seen the light or anything of the sort and he sort of goes along with it. He's trying to operate in the field of religion without a stable datum. And what's very strange is, religion is thereafter a complete confusion to him. Do you follow that clearly? See that?

Female voice: Yes, follow that clearly.

No stable datum to begin with. He's simply there because good roads, good weather, the rest of the folks go down there too, you know. And he hasn't had any revelations or something of the sort. No proofs have ever dumped on his head. He didn't ever wake up in the middle of the night and find Isis bending over his cot, you know. He didn't ever do this. He stayed awake a couple nights to find out if she would and he decided "Oh well, heck. I haven't got any engrams in that string, so I won't see any visions. I mean, you know, well, it's all right, but I don't understand what these people . . ." and there we go. See? "I don't understand this, I don't understand that." Confusion, confusion, confusion.

After a while somebody has to come along and manufacture relics. Somebody has to come along and put people up on pedestals and say, "Now, this person had a vision last night," in order to hold the faith together. Let me assure you that if they have to hold the faith together, there's no faith.

7 Now, we have, on the Eighth Dynamic, the most artificial stable datum we could assume. See? It's an artificial stable datum. It is generally early on track, arrived at by a bunch of thetans who say, "Now, our thought powers are going to help each other out if we ever get into that and this kind of makes a deity of our group. And this is the

deity of our group.” After a while, somebody gets dissatisfied with this, so they pour him into brass, you know, and set him up and say, “Now, *that’s* the deity of our group.”

See, they’ve lost the idea. Now we’ve got to have force, duress, proof, conviction, you see, and know there’s no religion there. And all of a sudden, why, you have huge edifices all over the place. You have temples on the hill and in the valley, in ruins. Edifices all over the place with their roofs caved in or somebody stabling cows in them.

That’s the faith of religion. And that faith, going to pot, brings about a rather inevitable fate. It’s happened time after time after time. I mean, this is not new phenomena amongst Man. This is the most old, moth-eaten phenomenon you ever cared to look at.

Ever down in Athens? If you are—run a preclear sometime or something of the sort, and you haven’t got anything else better to do—sit on top of the Acropolis. The amount of ruin discernible from there is considerable. And yet those gods were once—not people in temples—those gods were either actual thetans that came in and ran a game, or those gods were a group spirit that these people just got together and mocked-up, you know and said, “This exists” and because they had faith in each other, then it would take care of them.

Those gods had—you might say, as much as any structure ever had—they had life and breath. It was a live, real, vibrant thing. And after a while somebody came along and they built an image to reinforce it and a big temple to make it real and they started getting small girls and putting them up before the congregation, that had a vision last night, and, you know, here we go. It’s an interesting game, but it doesn’t have anything to do with the Eighth Dynamic. See it’s, “How can we keep this faith enforced?” And the end of it is confusion and the end of the confusion is a shattered temple.

Now, here is the cycle of religion—inevitable. But it needn’t be inevitable. You’re in possession of material which removes it from the field of the inevitable. Let’s look over this. We’re dealing with a body of data. It does align—it is aligned. How can the person

align it with his existence? You have a sane transition. The oddity of the data which you have and which you give a preclear and which you give groups and the public at large is that it aligns with their experience. Because the data is a body of data, not speculative, but most of it very concrete and therefore you'll find it aligns very smoothly—if you permit it to.

Now, your action in running an engram on a preclear just to show him, is the same action as putting a mass in the temple to show people that God does exist, see—proof, conviction, one way or the other. An individual would be a pretty stupid individual if he couldn't conceive out of the materials and the truths which you have—and by the way, they're simply truths because they're agreed upon and they're here in this universe. They already exist. We're rich by the accumulation of 76 trillion years worth of agreement evidently. And if people can't see these things and align them with their own life, then they're stupid. All right, so they're stupid. You think there's something else on the end of that? It's like that song the Marines sing, "Be kind to your web-footed friends." . . . "You may think this song has no end, and you're right." It ends on a complete offbeat, drives people mad. There's no end of cycle there. Well, there's no end of cycle to this either. That's the way it is—just hangs in midair.

- 8 Now, it's an oddity—it's a great oddity—that Man has a tendency to try too hard and when he's trying too hard on one fixed point, he then doesn't see any other points. And he becomes stupid. See, he loses all other points, you might say. He gets an unknownness of existence or position of too many objects and subjects and thoughts and he's very fixed on one point, you see? And here's all these unknowns out there and you pick his attention up and put him on one of those unknowns, the whole thing is liable to collapse on him—because he is a spark, a minute spark of livingness totally bounded by unknowns. That could be a definition of Man. And the only thing that is not unknown to him, perhaps, is one small sphere of activity (tiny, you see, small). And into this he

has interwoven his agreements. Now, he has his attention squarely on that spot and he doesn't know (amongst his other unknownnesses) that there are any unknowns around to plague or bother him until you unfix his attention and the unknowns start to hit him.

Well, processing an individual too fast with the processes you are using today—force, duress—of any kind or another, trying to force him through, running him on upper levels and that sort of thing, will drop too many unknowns on him and he gets confused. If you start to pull stable data out from underneath him, he gets confused, see? If we try to invalidate or evaluate for him, we are unwittingly, almost always, knocking against and upsetting some stable datum.

Now, a stable datum can be very, very aberrated. It'd be something with which you would have the most impatience imaginable. Some fellow comes along and he tells you, "All automobiles eat hay."

And you say, "Wait a minute. You think all automobiles eat hay?"

And he says, "Yeah," he says, "I know. They all eat hay."

You say, "They do not. Come here." And you open up the gas tank and let him smell the gasoline and show him that it goes into the carburetor and, "It goes there." And the guy spins. He may be holding a complete automobile accident at bay with this outrageous datum.

Now, little kids are more prone to have data like this than grown people. Grown people have been slugged into line. Little kid is liable to come up to you and tell you something fantastic. He's just trying to align data anyway he sees fit. His attention isn't fixed on anything, so it doesn't particularly matter how he aligns data. It isn't a life-or-death, make-or-break proposition, how he aligns this data. So, in childhood, we get all sorts of misalignments of data, which is the thing that attracted the attention of Freud to the childhood period of life. He found that there was more randomness in

that and more aberrated ideas in that area than any other area. And he, foolishly, dived for the aberrated idea in an effort to correct it and so correct the rest of the fellow's life.

It isn't the aberrated idea and it isn't the idea at all that brings us into a condition of stupidity, confusion, dizziness, somatics and so forth. It is not the stable datum. That's what you've got to learn about religion, see? Religion has the most outrageous stable data you ever heard of—just (we're talking about religion so we can talk about the preclear, see?) has the most outrageous stable data you ever heard of.

- 9 Let's take one well-known faith with which I am very friendly, by the way. I feel very friendly toward this faith. Nevertheless, it has unfortunately propounded these as stable data: "God is all." "God is good." "Man is evil." Think it over. If Man is evil, is Man part of all? Yes. Is Man part of God? Well, yes. God is good. Is God totally good? Yes. Is Man evil? Yes. Is . . . ? *Dab, dab, dab, dab.* See, it doesn't equate. We're asked to violate our logic on this thing. Man couldn't possibly be evil and be part of a good God, see? Or if Man is so evil and Man is part of God, then God can't be too good either. We must have some sense in this. And yet this religion goes along very happily and builds huge edifices and does all sorts of things and has more hope than success, but why not? It's—actually arranges a bunch of stable data.

Now, the horrible thing about it, the horrible thing about this particular religion, by the way, is that, every now and then, people spin in it. They spin, suddenly, rather extravagantly sometimes. Why did they spin? Well, it isn't the stable data that spun them. They didn't get into the religion in the first place for any other reason than to try to get some stable data. What they were running from was confusion and stupidity. They were running from brutality. They were running to the use of force, to the enslavement of Man. They were backing up from a society which believed the only way to make an honest man was to make a half-dead one—which didn't work. And these people protested against that and they fall back into this sphere which is unstably based on the stable data

I've just enumerated to you. You can heal a man if you make him think right thoughts and so forth.

All right. Don't look at the stable data as the center of the trouble. Look, it's *at least* stable data. And if you can just get that thought clearly about your preclear, you will understand him, yourself, *very* much better. He's crazy as hell. He believes that uranium is mined in church belfries. He believes that the way children are born is you find them in watermelons. And he will argue with you at great length and with terrible force and furor and conviction to try to demonstrate to you these terrible truths about uranium and if you did away with churches, you wouldn't have an atom bomb and therefore, we could avoid the atomic war, you see, because there wouldn't be any more church belfries to find any uranium in and . . . you know? "Boy," you say to yourself, "Holy cats! This fellow is strictly fruitcake!"

Now, the stable data, aberrated condition of, simply tells you how much confusion this fellow is having to breast. He doesn't have the leisure, he can't take a breath without having such enormous confusions and stupidities and unponderables and unknowns cave in upon him that he himself would be swamped. And so he picks up any straw with which to dam that roaring flood, you see?

Now, if we're going to understand the preclear at all, we must understand the idea that confusions and unknownnesses in that person's existence have caused him to seize upon certain data which, aberrated, right or wrong, is nevertheless some straw mat in the dike. And you, as an auditor, actually have the power to pull the straw out of the dike with the greatest of ease. All you've got to do is say to this fellow, "Uranium, belfries? Come on!" You know your engrams. You can run him on this and that and the other thing. You just say, "Come on. Come on up here in the church belfry. Let's take a look around." He's all set. The uranium is not there. Get the idea? The guy is *bzz, bzz*. And all of a sudden, he looks stupid. He looks confused, see?

Now, the funny part of it is that an individual can be told about locks and experience and that his past experience can influence his present-day conduct or behavior. He'll tell you this too, he'll say, "Yes, I know."

And you add this little datum. You say, "Well, they're contained in pictures."

He'll say, "No kidding. What pictures?"

"Well, do you have pictures?"

Well now, you don't have to lower the boom on him. You can usually elicit his interest, to this degree, because he's cognited to some slight degree right on that fact. Yes, that's how these damned experiences are riding along with him, see? Wham! And it gives him a little better stability which is quite curious. Then, of course, as he goes further into it, if he finds the actual tremendous power and duress that these pictures can exert out of a reactive mind, he's liable to spin again.

Why was he interested? He was interested because he knew he was being subjected to a confusion of one kind or another. And this confusion was harming him, was making him less able to survive. He *knew* this confusion was and now he's seized upon the engram (not really as a source, but as a new stable datum) and he's starting to align things on this new stable datum.

Now, we ask him to give up these beloved, precious engrams. He's aligned a body of logic on this subject, see? Now, we say, "Run the engram." Okay, he's perfectly willing to do that. We actually can change him. We can change his psychosomatics and everything else, but when we ask him to give up (this very, very confused person) the entirety of his picture storage, he's going to regard this with grave suspicion. He wants the picture to prove to him that the reason he's acting the way he's acting is because he has a picture of the way he acted.

You understand then how this can be a boomerang? Huh? How this could backfire? That's why we always have to give the individual his picture back after we make him

get rid of it. What we do is give him *power of choice* over whether he has or has not the picture and let him have the picture. Do you get it? He still has the mechanism. He can still prove it to himself. He feels he can carry this thing around and show it to somebody else—which he can't. He doesn't mock them up that thick. Unfortunate, but he feels he can carry this thing around and do things with it. It's an explanation to him. This tells him he wasn't to blame. This tells him he wasn't responsible. The second that we got up on the basis of telling everybody they were responsible for everything that had ever happened, the popularity of Dianetics went *zoom* [descending pitch]. See? As long as we told everybody that they weren't responsible for anything that had ever happened, they were happy about the whole thing. They said, "It's these pictures." We'd given them a point of blame, see? And they were perfectly cheerful about this.

But here is an item: This individual knows it's pictures. See? He knows these pictures are reactivating behavior and so on. He knows these pictures have causation and the pictures themselves are woven into the body of stable data which he has and have stabilized far, far more data than was stabilized with him before.

Now, if we made him give this up, if we knock this out—which we could do merely by invalidating it, not by proving it wasn't true—we'd just keep hammering on it, you know, and making him queasy about the whole thing and he says, "Well, it wasn't pictures" and that sort of thing, "it—something else." Well, he would then have a tendency to be as spinny as before, see, if we really invalidated him, because we've cut loose an awful lot of confusion on this person.

Now, when Dianetics stepped across to Scientology, it was absolutely necessary that we changed the name of the subject. You say, "Well, good heavens, that really wasn't necessary because it was an outgrowth of the same thing." No, it wasn't. We changed position. We changed position. We said "It's that picture and this is the whole body of stable data on the subject of pictures themselves. And this tremendous body of stable

data is right there and it's observable and it's valuable and you can use it. And the basic datum is: the Dynamic Principle of Existence is Survive. And the picture tells you survival and non-survival patterns and you've got them and they're all over the place and they're very interesting and you can run them out and they're causative and you can do this and you can do that with them. You can throw them into and out of restimulation with the greatest of ease." In other words, it was an entire rationale, you see?

Now, we started talking about the thing that looks at the pictures. Pictures are all very well, but there's a thing that looks at the pictures. And a lot of guys said, "No!" See? You are asking him to some slight degree to look at themselves or look at the state other people were in. And we said something else was wrong now. We didn't say it was totally pictures. We said something else was wrong. We elucidated a greater truth. We said it was the tolerance of this awareness of awareness unit which was at fault—the tolerance or intolerance of it. In other words, the way it thought was the way it lived.

It could change its mind and it could change its mind about pictures. It could change its mind about anything. These are actually two different subjects and two different bodies of aligned data. Do you see that clearly? One is a mechanical look. It's a mechanical, mechanistic explanation, very valuable—no less true—demonstrable phenomena. So true, in fact, that you can always back up the engram on the preclear. You have, in your possession, weapons for conviction of such force and magnitude that the priesthood of Egypt would have regarded you with some awe.

The Aesculapian temple in early Greek times (or middle Greek times) had another mechanism which survives today in one of the superstitions of the mental world, and that is the dream. They knew the mechanism of the dream and they could turn a dream on and they could turn a dream off. And they could throw a guy under duress by smoke or drugs. They could put him down on a couch, slip him a Mickey and then a priest would stand alongside of him while he was in an hypnotic trance and tell him what to

dream and what not to dream, as the case may be. And he would come out of it and he'd had quite an experience. And I think any one of you, dragged into an Aesculapian temple and given this experience would've come out of there saying, "Well, my God, it might have been simply a hypnotic trance but, brother, it was real!"

Now, here's demonstrable phenomena, but it was unfortunately phenomena which didn't easily lend itself to an alignment with life itself. It aligned itself with superstition. It aligned itself with further stupidity. You had given the fellow an unknownness now—a further unknownness—and he already had too many. And the people used to stumble out of those Aesculapian temples just like they stumble away from electric shock machines saying, "Dabbbb! Well, I guess I better pay my dues or report back or do something." See?

We had a *control mechanism* because we'd added further unknownness to the case, but nevertheless, they had phenomena and that phenomena was usable—and very often, I do not doubt for a moment—it was used as near and as far as they could use it to benefit the patient. See? I don't doubt this for a moment. Also, occasionally, they used it (I know this for a fact) to put some prince under the total duress of the Aesculapian temple.

Now you yourselves have more powerful phenomena than this one without really backing up the unknownness. But you could take engrams and flip them, one right after the other, through the preclear's cognition and he'd wind up spinning faster than anybody you ever heard. You could take the accumulated spin of the last twenty years and throw it into action. You talk about producing unknownness—you could produce unconsciousness this way. It's just something we don't do. But we would not mishandle or misuse this data, you see? It would be a misuse of the data both ways from the middle. It would be a misuse of it because it would backfire amongst other things (if we have to have a punishment involved in it), but it just wouldn't get us anyplace. So we'd have a lot of slaves. You know, you look out at this world today, you find out there's enough slaves around.

All right. Now therefore, here you have two bodies of stable data. One is the body of picture systems, overt acts, motivators, black and white phenomena. Here's a *tremendous* category over the years that has been turned out and all of this is a field of stable data. And it's based upon this fact that stimulus-response mechanisms work and anybody—to some degree—is a stimulus-response machine.

Well, however, that stable data has an unknown in its midst and the unknown is this: Why does one person react more severely than another to the same series of engrams? That's an unknown, see? That's an instable data.

That's a very imponderable thing if you start thinking it over. You know, we take Joe and we take Bill. And Joe and Bill quantitatively have about the same number of engrams, but Joe is jumping (like he's been shot) to the tiniest lock and rolling up in a ball. You simply send his somatic strip to the first engram in the prenatal bank and he rolls up in a ball—zip! And Bill, you take him back to half a dozen AAs and all kinds of things and he says, "Ho-hum," he says, "this is cute. This is interesting. Look at these things." See? Here's a tremendous difference amongst people—a wild variable. What is the reaction of the individual to the picture? Well, let's find then the *individual*, and let's find out *why* he is different, one person to another person, and let's see if by adjusting *this* factor, we then do not make it absolutely necessary to run the pictures.

Now, we haven't said the pictures didn't exist or those stimulus-response mechanisms weren't there or that word structures and that sort of things weren't responsible for a tremendous amount of aberration. But we have said that there is a variable here, too. And we've said, "Who is looking at the pictures?" And now we get a brand-new body of phenomena, all of which stems from consideration as its top echelon, and concerns the idea that a thetan is an observer—the observer of these pictures. And it goes further than that. And we find out the considerations and ability of a thetan to exteriorize and so on is all . . . So you see this as another body of data?

We say then, "Life consists of a static," and we go on and describe this static. And amongst the capabilities of this static is the ability to make pictures. We study this a little bit further and we find, then, that in this other body of information where we're treating the awareness of awareness unit, the thetan (and remember the awareness of awareness unit was present in Dianetics, we just didn't think about it very much and talk about it), this awareness of awareness unit is capable of changing its mind and by changing its mind, it changes all of its various other characteristics. It's fantastic the number of things that can be changed by changing a thetan's mind.

But remember, it's another body of data—another body of data totally independent to the other. And it has a couple of top-echelon phenomena. And I talked to you about those yesterday when I talked to you about classes: the first class, the second class, third class and the xth class, see? All right.

If this is a body of data, it certainly must have certain alignments. But good heavens, this thing is in alignment with every human being that walks. This *is* the human being. This *is* the guy. The guy is not a collection of pictures. That is the form the guy is wearing at the moment. This thetan *is* the guy. He thinks, he talks, he loves, he hates. This is all being done by the thetan.

And he obeys the pictures to the degree that he is tolerant or intolerant of stupidity or confusion, both of which we relate. He's either tolerant of stupidity and confusion or he's intolerant of them. If he's intolerant of them, if he's made up his mind in the direction that he's intolerant of these two things, why then, what an awful time he has because he starts fighting them and finally he says, "To bring order to this chaos, I have to have a stable datum." Chaos: a couple of newspapers blowing down the street, see? And at this instant he sees these two newspapers blowing down the street and he realizes that he's got to stop one, at least. He's got to bring some order to that chaos, see? Now, he may bring order to the chaos by simply not looking at it, but he's got to bring some

order to that chaos. Another fellow goes out, sees a half a hundred loose newspapers blowing in whirlwinds all over the street and says, "My, what a nice March day." See?

Now, what's the difference between these two fellows? Is there any structural difference? No, there is no structural difference. One has his mind made up along the line that he cannot tolerate much confusion. And the other has his mind made up that confusion is, well, four or five universes being beat up in a concrete mixer. That would be confusing to him, you see?

Now, why does one depart from one state of mind to another state of mind? And one departs, by the way, rather difficultly. It's not an easy thing, really, to take some fellow (I mean, it's not at first glance) a very easy thing—take some fellow who is intolerant of two newspapers and change him into a fellow who is hardly noticing fifty or a hundred, see? It's not an easy thing to do. It's because he has certain vested interests in a game and he feels that if he maintains his agreements just right, he will continue to have a game. And he has certain agreements and if he follows these things out, he will go on with a game.

And so the fellow who is intolerant of two newspapers feels that his game is intolerant of two newspapers. And his vested interest tells him that he must have this level of intolerance in order to set a good example to others, in order to get a job done, in order to put the spurs to himself. He's got it all worked out, you see. And the other fellow says that his serenity and calm and whee! attitude toward existence and so on, is just what he needs in order to keep his game running.

So we have the whole thing adjusted back to something very like pictures or at least forms. We have the whole thing adjusted back to forms. In other words, what's a game? So we have several considerations that could change. Unless we change several of these considerations, *not by duress*, but by letting the fellow look around and realign himself

with existence, why, we don't get much change in the preclear. Now, I've told you just then what you do. You "realign oneself with existence."

Now, he's got a tremendous number of stable data, this thetan has, in the game, see? And therefore he has a lot of confusions nailed down. Even this fellow who is looking at a tremendous number of newspapers swirling around in the street and doesn't consider it a confusion, nevertheless, has a lot of stable data. And these stable data, each one, is anchoring down and aligning a considerable body of data. This fellow's competence to a very marked degree will probably depend upon his ability to use certain faculties and capabilities.

And the other fellow is adjusted in another way and his stable data must be differently aligned somehow or improperly aligned.

Now, neither one has been subjected to more confusion or stupidity than the other. See, you got to get that clearly—that we're talking clear out of the sphere of environmental difference. We left that when we left pictures, see?

But we do have areas of knowingness in favor of keeping a game going. And the individual reacts to these confusions to the degree that the data in them, he believes, is or is not aligned. So you see how the thetan himself is a rather delicate thing. Now, because he says there are areas of knowledge: "I must have a game and in order to keep this game, I have to stay in certain agreements and the agreements with which I am connected at this time and in this place depend on certain stable data. And I've got this confusion sort of lined up and squared away and there it is." 14

And therefore, he is careful before he changes his mind because he might change his whole game and he might lose the whole game. He knows how easy it is for him to simply change his mind that he isn't there or something of the sort and off he goes, see, swish—he's gone. He's lost his game. So he thinks this might happen. So he's very careful about how he changes his mind regarding certain basic, definite principles. And these

basic definite principles may be, "Automobiles burn hay," but he'll have to keep this up, you see, as a pretense or as a game. And you come along as an auditor and you say, "All right, now all this fellow has to do is change his mind-click."

Oh, if the fellow had no game at all—listen, this would be the easiest thing in the world. This would be so easy. You simply say, "Now, get the idea you can't have a game." "Get the idea you can have a game." "Get the idea you can't have a game." "Now, get the idea you should invent a game."

The fellow would say, "Okay. All right. What kind of a game shall we invent? Well," he says, "let's invent the game of throw out a whole bunch of confusion and then unconfuse it." Problems and solutions. "All right, we'll say we don't know something and then we will go ahead and play at the game of finding it out." Get the systems he employs in order to create a game?

Now, you start cracking these systems up and he will object to your cracking them up too fast, and he will slow you down in your progress, unless he himself has this: that he can still keep a foot in the game and still keep the confusions he faces as-is. So you can change his stable data, actually, only to the degree that you don't swamp him with the confusions. Because he's going to stay in the game, see? He'll stay up against these confusions and if you don't swamp him by knocking out certain stable data he has with a bunch of unknowns, he won't find out that he is changing his game very rapidly.

You give him a tremendous number of unknowns. He tells you at once, "I now have a new game." You see this? So if we swamp him, he now has a new game—that's to wreck you—or it's to do this or do that. It's to knock out these unknowns. All kinds of various computations can come in about this.

- 15 The stable data which the preclear has is not the trouble with the preclear. That's the first thing you've got to realize. It is his lack of stable data which prevents him from changing, because when he starts to back out of any particular sphere, area or skull, he is

liable to encounter a great number of unknowns he has not hitherto noticed. And this makes too good a new game. And he doesn't raise his ability because he doesn't change his agreements. It's not that he's afraid of anything, you understand. It's just that he says, "You know, I don't know all about that," or "There's a bunch of stuff to know there. There's a bunch of confusions to handle. Here's a wonderful chance to be dramatic and so we'll go into *this* game."

And so if you're going to do anything for a thetan, you've got to do it gently and without much dramatics, you see. And then he smoothly works up and assumes new sets of agreements, realigns his data to old data, gets his house in order, you might say, and comes out of it feeling very, very good. Now, there are certain definite feelings and concerns he has, but most of these concerns are based upon his own ideas of what is confusion and what is stupidity.

I can see that you can tell this very easily. A fellow comes down from Alpha Centauri which is doing spaceflight. The whole system there is having a wonderful time. It's an electronic society. It's gotten so good it's even solved its propensities for blowing itself up atomically. It's really advanced. A man can live with the machine.

He's just getting along fine and he comes down and he happens to talk to the late Albert Einstein. And Einstein who, late in his career, was saying that it was too bad, and he was sorry, and he hadn't had anything to do with the A-bomb. And who yet in his first letter on this subject to Franklin Delano Roosevelt told him in its second paragraph that he had something which could blow up whole cities and do other interesting military things. It was Einstein that proposed it, you see?

A man then has some social confusions one way or the other. And this fellow from Alpha Centauri talks to the late Albert Einstein while he was still alive and he goes away and he says, "Boy!" he said, "They really got some yokels around here. Man, I tell you.

Oh well, I'll probably meet a bright fellow here one of these . . . There might be somebody bright in town." See?

Tolerance for stupidity. See, he takes a look at the brightest brain that the physical sciences have produced in this generation and he says, "Ahh, that's stupid!" You get the idea? Some little dog comes romping down the street and he can't get a ball out from underneath a pushcart and his little master pushes the pushcart out of the road and gives him the ball and the dog says, "Boy, is he smart! [whistle] Most brilliant genius the Earth has produced." Get the idea? Here's differences of attitudes toward what is intelligence and what is stupidity. And the only thing we can argue with or talk about is what is the mean average, you know—what is the mean? What do most people think is stupid? What do most people think is intelligent?

All right. Now, right along with that, since it's a problem which is of the same order of magnitude, it's merely a different mechanic and statement of the same thing—take confusion. Now, one fellow comes along and sees the two newspapers, another fellow comes along and sees the fifty and you've got different attitudes between the two about a confusion.

- 16 What is a confusion? How confused is a confusion? How stupid is a stupidity? How confused is a confusion? Now, a thetan has to be able to answer those questions to some degree, but more important than that, he has to settle with himself his own tolerance of these two things.

If he increases his tolerance of confusion, he, then, of course, can give up certain bodies and areas and let them spin without having to inject into them new stable data at every hand. If his tolerance of stupidity is increased then he himself won't be forcing his body and everything else around him to get bright, at the pistol point. He doesn't on the Eighth Dynamic have to build an altar in the temple. And he doesn't have to convince this fellow. He doesn't get out of patience, because his tolerance for the other

fellow's stupidity is not so poor that he has to immediately convince the other fellow. See that?

He can let the other fellow find out—if the fellow is going to find out at all. And the oddity is that only that attitude will bring about a smart society, smart children or anything else. It's not telling them how stupid they are. The only thing that you can do is to offer them the information which is acceptable to them and let them buy it or not buy it, as the case may be, but let them buy as much of it as they will buy—or gently, bringing them into an understanding that something can be done about livingness, change smoothly, pleasantly, with good ARC, their tolerances for confusion and stupidity.

And if you do these things smoothly, you'll have awful bright people. You'll have very bright, bright people and everything will be swinging along very nicely. But if you do with force and duress, if you crush in, if you convince them, if you press upon them new data which unstabilizes their old stable data, they'll simply go into such confusions and so on that they'll have to unmock something, and most usually it's you.

The handling of a preclear is better understood, of course, if you understand that there are two subjects here: The subject of the material, mechanical, stimulus-response pictures, and there's this other subject of the thetan who is looking at and making the pictures. And these two subjects are quite interesting. They're quite differently handled and different processes really are addressed to them, but the end product is the same. An individual is able to live with less liability and with greater happiness. Thank you.

Thank you.



STABLE DATUM AND THE STUDY OF SCIENCE

LECTURE 35

A LECTURE GIVEN ON 26 OCTOBER 1955

61 MINUTES

Good morning.

Audience: Good morning.

This is, I think, October the 26th, isn't it?

Audience: Mm-hm. Yeab.

1955, 4th London ACC.

The talk I gave you yesterday really did not intimately concern engrams. It concerned phenomena—handling of, relay of. You should know that the introduction of new phenomena into the life of an individual is accompanied by one of two manifestations: the un “stabling” of him or the stabilizing of him. You bring about, by the introduction of new phenomena, an instability or a stability, depending on how you introduce it to the individual.

Now, if an auditor were to take a preclear and start running the somatic strip in a new and startling phenomena, it is highly possible that the preclear would not be able to integrate this with his life. And being unable to integrate it, would then feel unstable. He would become more confused than before even though we had eradicated, perhaps,

the source of one of his major ills or difficulties. You see how this is? We could suddenly introduce him to new phenomena and he would be less well than before, even though by introducing him to new phenomena, we eradicated one of his chief and basic worries. Follow this?

Audience: Yes.

The handling of engrams, then, and the handling of phenomena in the mind should be done with a certain gentleness as far as the preclear is concerned, just from a standpoint of knowledge or wisdom. The individual can assimilate knowledge without an unstabilizing effect only if he is capable of integrating it into his existing sphere of reference.

Give you a case in point. We take, let us say, a person who has been practicing, well, let's say chiropractic. And he has certain basic tenets on which he bases any successes which he has had. Now, that he hasn't had a 100 percent success tells him already that there is missing data whether he likes it or not. If he did not recognize this, he actually would not be sane. Now, in the effort to assist himself in a business way, he may constantly and continually inform the public that he is all-out and in beautiful condition and that he gets results every time. This is a business concern. It's only when he himself believes this, contrary to observable evidence, that he would be considered to be at least fairly neurotic. Therefore, he would be, normally, aware of the fact that he has some missing links in his rationale. See, you see he's aware of this. Now, this will make a certain vacuum, you might say, you see—where he is—for data which you might care to give him.

- 3 Now, the making of this vacuum was of his own doing. That is to say, he looked at life and he found certain answers given to him by his own profession, by life at large. And why did he have to look for this information in the first place? He looked for this information for one reason only: he had “not-knewed,” you might say (to be grammatical)—he had “not-knewed” the amount of information which he already ought to have had.

We take an untrained witch doctor and we discover, very often, in his primitive state, a tremendously advanced state of knowingness. He has just never been asked to not-know a tremendous quantity of material about healing and, therefore, he sort of knows it instinctively. And he could not articulate it, he has never put it into words, but he has a feel, an instinct.

That is, by the way, the anatomy of this intuitive or instinctive healing attitude. You see, that is the source of it. An individual has simply never done a large and arduous not-know on the subject of the mind or the subject of the body or the subject of something else. You see this? He's just never done this. And, as a result, he sort of feels that his state of beingness can monitor or is monitored by certain influences. And he doesn't articulate them, but he has a very good idea of what's going on, you see? He is above syllables in his operation, and so we call that instinctive or intuitive or a sort of a natural knowingness, you see? And it simply exists unless you have "not-knowled" it.

This is very easy to rehabilitate. Any auditor, as he goes along under modern auditing, should rehabilitate this instinct rather easily. It shouldn't be too hard for him to do this. But that is that instinct. All right.

Let us take this unfeltness and let us discover that an individual seized upon some incorrect datum as his stable datum. Now, let us take the stable datum on which chiropractic operates. We're just taking up chiropractic, not because we're interested at this moment in healing, but because we can very easily epitomize the effort and action of a preclear in this wise. It's based upon the datum that a body, given a chance, will get well. See, that is, I think, Palmer's primary tenet. Just given a chance, the body will get well. Lay off of it, in other words, and it will resurge one way or the other.

That's not a correct datum, you see. Given a chance, it will follow its natural mechanisms of survival. It will kill itself off as an extant form and pick up or build another form, you see, which is better, or better adapted, to the environment in which it's trying to survive.

That is the fact of the case evidently. In other words, it solves the problem of survival, very often, by knocking off the extant mock-up.

So, the chiropractor does this: he suddenly takes the stress off of the body that it's at that moment undergoing and he then expects it to resurge if it's adjusted or we've adjusted its nerve centers or something of the sort. You see that? And off we come. And the fellow goes and dies. See that? Or we straighten the body out so it can think and it gets sick.

- 4 Now, there's another datum there which is of very great interest to us since none of us are very interested in or studied in chiropractic (or a few of us are). So therefore, it would be of interest to us to look at this as a parallel, you see—a parallel which has in it some unknowns or some not quite true or not quite totally correct or embrasive stable data. All right.

And there's some unknowns sitting in there then, you see? Now, immediately that he takes the stress off of the body and permits it, more or less, to adjust itself and to stabilize—immediately that this occurs, why, the fellow worsens and dies. The body is being permitted to do exactly what it should do in order to survive, but he does not interpret it this way. He is going on an enforced-survival current organism, which is a fatal error in healing. If you make this error all the time you, of course, are causing people to survive against any choice at all and you have removed one of the principal two choices. There are two choices, both of which are survival choices, but they are opposites. And one is survive and the other is succumb. You can do either one.

Now, if we just make it impossible for anybody to choose to succumb at any time, we will eventually arrive in the interesting position of enforced survival. And a society which is dramatizing full-out enforced survival is a very, very interesting place not to live in.

There have been societies on the whole track which had advanced surgery and healing up to such a point that a guy would go out in battle and he'd be all shot to pieces, you see.

There wouldn't be enough left of this mock-up to worry about. And the surgeons and the neurosurgeons and the rest of the boys would fix him up so that he was functional for a new post. You know, he's now going to conduct a desk, without legs and maybe without any genitals, and—you know. This is going to be life? You see? He has to wheel himself up and down corridors and so forth. And the society is in a sufficiently good state that it can utilize the services of everybody around. It's worked out ways and means to assist everybody.

And what do we get out of this? Well, he has a nervous breakdown of one kind or another working at the desk and pushing his wheelchair around. So they put him to sorting envelopes. His one answer to this is to go mad. Do you see this? His one answer of enforced survival is to go mad.

And there is where we have gotten all the insanity which is current with this society today. So you see, this is not an unimportant datum. When an individual is enforcedly made to survive and when at no time is he ever in any wise permitted to fail or succumb in any way, the end result is an inability to survive and a definite inability to succumb—which takes away the two most basic choices of which he is capable, now—that choice, one choice on the two basic data. And we get this fantastic thing: insanity. That is his final answer.

Insanity is an answer in another way: "You have hurt me enough. You have now made me irrational. Not even my protest or praise would be of any value to you because I am no longer a rational being. I have departed into the never-never land of insanity." This is the real statement that is being made, as we see it, by the insane.

Now, we know this must be very close to the statement, but we do not buy this a thousand percent for this reason—is we have not treated any insane from this viewpoint. You see, this is sound theory. But in view of the fact that our business is *not* with the insane, we have not had any opportunity to use this. Nevertheless, the theory is backed

up by conduct in our midst. And we discover that the aberration of an individual is very often pursuant from a moment when he felt it was very, very best—the very best thing he could do was to succumb and he has never changed his mind. He's never undecided that thing, you see?

Now, a sane person has simply decided to live again. At any time you could decide to live again; at any time you could decide to die. These are two powerful choices. Follow me?

Well now, this basic rationale that I'm telling you here actually probes below the stable datum of the chiropractor. See, it probes below that. The chiropractor makes somebody well, makes him so his back doesn't hurt and the fellow starts to spin. See? This does happen, you know? He patches him up, he makes him feel better (he thinks) and he says, "Ah, I've done a good job about this now!" And the next thing he knows, this person is counting the spiders on the wall or some odd thing is occurring, you see? He has taken away by exterior manipulation and without consulting the choices in the matter, one of the triumphs of the individual. This individual is trying to succumb, so therefore, he has a triumph—he has accomplished something. He has pressed this body down further from the conviction that this body is not now fitted for the environment in which it discovers itself.

Now, if it's not now fitted for it, what do we do with it? We jettison it and we hit the track again and build another one which is better. Now, this is evidently the philosophy of the GE, see, it's evidently the philosophy. At least it seems to work this way. All right.

- 6 Now, here we have, then, a stable datum which says a body, permitted to, will get well. *Ooo!* Now, do you see the gulf between that stable datum and the phenomena which will be observed? Get this. We have an incorrect stable datum or a half stable datum—it's not the whole thing—and we're going to get as a result of this a fantastic thing: we're going to get all manner of unpredictable phenomena. Things are going to occur which this chiropractor will have *no* explanation for *at all*. He goes doggedly on his way saying,

“The body will get well if it’s permitted to do so.” And he makes this old lady well as far as the physical body is concerned. She feels shakier, she feels rockier, she is less happy about life. Well, you say, “Look-a-here, doesn’t she feel better physically? Hm! She certainly should, then, feel happier.”

And we have the other structural error. There’s another error as a stable datum sitting there which will produce *more* unpredictable phenomena. And this is a very simple one. It simply says that the structure monitors the function or the thinkingness of the person. Now, that isn’t really understood by the chiropractor. It’s really not a stable datum. It is just something which is in the environment around him. In this (quote) “modern world” (unquote), we have decided that structure monitors function. And if we decide this, then we’re going to inject into the entire field of healing, just for one thing, to say nothing of politics and science—these things also inject into politics and science with a production of phenomena which is so far beyond the reach of the people who are trying to play that game that they muff it continually—structure monitors function.

Now, let us take this—and this is an unseen or an unfelt datum as far as the chiropractor is concerned—he hasn’t ever asked himself this question. And yet he has assumed it, hasn’t he, when he said, “Well, I’ll take the duress off the body and then the person should be happier.” Oh, no! Not only has he upset this one side of it—the body was on a succumb line, a decision to succumb is still extant and the person is trying to go by the boards—that choice is now upset, he has put this person on an enforced survival.

This person cannot, by the way, be responsible for throwing that mock-up under a train. He’s got to do it slowly and quietly and little by little and sort of say, “Well it’s actually the way life is.” You see, that’s what he’s got to say. He’s got to say, “Now, you see, it’s just old age and I’m just falling to pieces. I’m not tearing this body to pieces, because it’s not done, you see.” There already is an extant enforced survival in the society.

All right. We have this other thing: structure monitors function. Now, you take this chiropractor and he has come to believe this, he feels it, he has never articulated it—it's not to him an observable thing because it's just a "everybody knows," you see? This is one of those "everybody knows" stable data. And this is not just the chiropractor alone—there's a lot of other activities in the society. In politics today, they believe this and they make more stupid blunders, see?

7 But in the field of healing we would, by injecting this as a stable datum, only if it were not true, get this interesting resulting phenomenon: only if it were not true would we come up against unpredictable reaction to drugs. We give them drug A, drug B and drug C. And A, B and C are all being given to the same person. And on person one they produce this effect, that effect and other effects, see? And so we immediately say, "Well then, on person two they should produce these effects." Same structure, you understand—same biochemical structure. They're suffering from the same ill, therefore drugs A, B, C . . . And A produces a different reaction, B produces a different reaction than B on this person and C produces a slightly different reaction. *Oooooo!* See, this is a wild variable. Why? You see?

Now, we take a third person, and we may get the same reactions on A as in person one. But not B and C. Let me assure you, this is a biochemical nightmare—the administration of various drugs, antibiotics, opiates and so on, producing different results. People, eventually, will just say, "This is just too much confusion, see. There's entirely too much confusion. Opium *is*, you understand—*is*, you understand—opium *is* a soporific. Opium *does* put people to sleep, you see?" But on person one, two and three—opium is a stimulant to one, a depressant to two and has no effect on three. In other words, they get upset. People get upset about this.

And whereas they will find person one to five thousand in the society do receive a soporific effect, you might say, from opium, we may have the next thirteen or fourteen

people, you see, as a stimulant. We may find a whole strata of society which isn't affected at all, physiologically, by the administration of opium. When I say physiological effect, I mean that as we—because I'm not trying to use any medical terminology here because we're really not talking in the field of medicine. We're just talking in the field of stable data. All right.

We take all of these dockworkers in Hong Kong and we investigate them, (this experiment has been conducted) to discover what is the detrimental effects of opium. What is detrimental about opium? And we discover that about the only thing wrong with these fellows is that they're—some of them—are going without food because their stomachs are anesthised, you see? And we immediately conclude from this that opium, then, is not particularly harmful to a human being. And we give it to a great many white men and it caves a lot of them in and causes all kinds of oddities. It actually depresses a great many of them, physiologically, in other ways.

Well, this is a random data. We could say, "Well, then this is the difference between the Chinese and the white man." You see? Except as we carry on the experiment amongst various classes of white men, we get different reactions to opium.

Then we try to answer this question—this is all I'm getting toward—we say, "Is opium a dangerous drug or isn't it? [sigh]" And the classes of data which we have, the data on the classes which we have, and so on, is here and there contradictory. But a person has to make a decision. Maybe the government wants to know this. And here some medical doctors were being asked this question and they just have to solve this. They have to say, "It is not," or "It is." Well, what do they do? They make the statement which is least likely to be harmful to the race. And they say "It is." See? It probably is more harmful than otherwise and therefore should be regulated in some fashion. Maybe this is right and maybe it's wrong, but who would know? Where is the exact decision to be found? How could they make the exact decision? Is there a way they could do so? 8

Where does all this complexity stem? From where does it stem? Where do we discover the original—not error—but where do we discover the original stable datum which made some of this phenomena unpredictable? We discover it, interestingly enough, under this heading: structure monitors function. Now, nobody anywhere along the line has really come up and beat the drum for this datum. It is simply something that has grown. We see that by mending arms, legs, regulating blood flow in some fashion, giving people rest and so on, we do things for them mentally—they feel better, in other words. And so we fall into this just as practice goes on along the years, we just fall into this datum.

No villain has ever come up and stated this stable datum, see? He's never really stated it. I don't think you could find anywhere on the track a healing authority who stated originally, you see, that structure monitors function and therefore in order to make people sane or in order to make people happy or better off or more cheerful—all you have to do is change their structure and make them feel better or more well and they will then be saner, see? No authority anywhere along the line has said this. Nobody has come up and beat the drum for this fact. It is something which has grown up through the years. It's one of these untraceable stable data which is accepted without much question, you see? It's perfectly true. You see, it's true that structure monitors function. Perfectly true. Nothing wrong with it at all except that it is an incomplete statement. See, it's an incomplete datum, therefore is not sufficiently basic a datum.

9 We could say this: structure monitors function except in those cases where function or mind interrupts the normal reaction of structure, you see? We'd have to say the whole statement "except in those cases."

Now, the oddity is that modern medicine, other practices, chiropractic and so on—these gentlemen are already saying this. They're saying, "There is such an illness as psychosomatic ills." Now, they must have smelled this one out in a very interestingly, intuitive fashion, because not even Freud could predictably release a psychic block and thereby put structure

into a better shape predictably. It was a guess, so it couldn't have been a stable datum and is not widely accepted as an entirely truthful datum, you see, until such time as we could then produce evidence that whenever you had this type of an interruption (mental interruption), function would not be monitored by structure. Whenever type A, you might say, of mental block exists, then hormones administered to the individual will not produce a resurgence in his outlook on life, see? Type mental block A, see?

When this type B is present then, again, you cannot administer a drug or hormone to structure in order to change function, see? Now we're starting to get a predictability. Why? Why? We're operating from a more basically pervasive stable datum. And that stable datum is more—it's truer, you see? Structure does monitor function and thinkingness and the mental outlook—when we say, function, let's take thinkingness, mental outlook and throw it in there, too—when mental outlook and thinkingness (or function) is not suppressing a particular resurgence of structure. So that we could go about this any time we didn't have a block on that particular line.

Now, the funny part of it is that medical men have come to realize this. This is not news to medicine, see, not news. But the odd part of it is, it is not articulated. It's not an articulated statement. It isn't broadly held because it has not been demonstrable. They know of psychosomatic medicine. They can suspect this. They can even accept it as a stable datum. But where's the proof? Where's the proof?

The proof could only occur when we had some psychotherapeutic practice which permitted the individual to be relieved of a certain type of block whenever it was present. And if every individual who came up could be relieved of this particular block, why, then we would have a real trustworthy datum, you see? It would be very trustworthy then. We could then say, "Structure monitors function except in this case when mental block A is present." In other words, hormones will work on an individual so long as

he himself is not impeded thoroughly on the Second Dynamic. See, we could say that. Hormones will work so long as this is not the case.

But the only way we could prove it would be to take something like Creative Processing, which is relatively easy—it's fast to use on an assist—and we assist the individual in changing his mind on the subject of sex. We change his mind on the subject of sex, we bring him up into a sane look on the subject of sex. And then what do we do? We give him some hormones and we find out they react. Before they didn't react—now they do react.

Now, we take fifty cases right in a row all of whom have been discovered to be proof against the administration, let us say, of estrogen or testosterone, and we remove the psychic impasse, the experiences or the mental conditioning which has resulted in a debarment of use of hormones. And we take these fifty cases one right after the other and we give them an assist to knock out this block and then we go right down the line and we find that we are now able to administer the drug effectively. And then we could accept, then, this new stable datum: structure monitors function except in those cases where a psychic block impedes the use of structure for certain purposes, you see? All right.

10 Therefore, we would have a more predictable result. Therefore, our chiropractor, for instance, recognizing this, would understand that he could have predicted what would have happened to some of his people. And he would know, that by simply adjusting their spines or something of the sort, that they would get well if two things were not present: One, that the individual had decided to succumb and had never again decided to survive thereafter, see? Then the person would not get well except in those cases where the present time problem all by itself was only this structural disability. You see, when just that was present and we adjust that, why, the fellow says, "*Haaaab*, maybe I can live without all this pain and stress," you see? All right.

So therefore, we have that degree of predictability. And now, let's go over on the other one—and he would then realize that the person would get well as long as the person did

not have an allergy, let us say, to straight spines. He should be able to realize that there could be just this: a mental block against a straight spine or a mental block against an anesthosed body area. See, he should be able to realize this—that a person could have that block selectively.

Now, are we making a little more sense on what I'm talking about on stable data? These are very, very basic—extremely basic data in a field of healing. And they are not really stated from the standpoint—or trying to make a case for these fields. I'm trying to show you this as an auditor so that you will take a good look at your preclear. All right.

Your preclear is running on the fact that horses sleep in beds. This makes all kinds of unpredictability. His expectancy of what's going to happen now is shot full of holes. Whenever he sees a horse asleep that is not in a bed, he has not predicted it and he will get upset. See that? Life will be a chaos on this one little point.

Well, if we shove in a new datum on the preclear, it had better not be bluntly against the existing stable data. See, if it's bluntly against it, watch out! Because you will confuse the entire subject around that point. Anything related to it around that point will get confused.

Now, let us say—let us say that you moved in solidly on a medical doctor and proved to him conclusively, without any discussion of the alignment of his data at all, that structure did not monitor function. You gave him no further rationale; you never joined hands with him at all, see. And you just move this in and you prove to him that he was dead wrong on this subject. Do you know what would happen to him? You'd cave in and bring about a confusion, whether you wanted to or not, on the entire field of healing, see? **11**

I'm not saying that this individual would permit you to touch his stable datum. I'm not saying that he would permit you to talk to him along this way. I'm not saying he would accept this proof. But I am saying that if you did charge through and produce sufficiently convincing evidence that function actually monitored structure, even though he himself

never had articulated this matter, he has nevertheless been educated with all of his data aligned to that stable datum and he would just go, "*Yehrrromb!*" He would not only be blocked off from Scientology, he would be as well a trifle confused about healing. In other words, you would have harmed him and harmed healing to some degree and unstabilized a certain area of the world. This man has responsibilities. Now, if you did that, then, you've done it wrong, see? That's wrong. That would be dead wrong. All right.

But just now as I was explaining this to you, the amplification of the existing stable datum showing that it became more useful as a stable datum if we added to it its proper modifications, suddenly explains to him why he has gotten a number of unpredicted results, bad or good, see? He adds these up and a lot of unknowns in the bank go click, click, click, click, click, click, whir, whir, whir, click, click, see? Now his command of medicine is stronger, you see? Because these unknowns are sitting right there and they are like vacuums. They pull in all kinds of things on them: speculation, speculation, figure-figure, maybe Abbott has it, maybe Parke-Davis, maybe if I fed him Bovril, you know? This is a very uncomfortable frame of mind.

A man walks out of the house, his little kid is ill, he says . . . (these men have conscience), he walks up out of the house and he—*wooo*, the kid is sick, he isn't making him well. Maybe if he did this, maybe if he did that, but there's something wrong here. And he himself, tired or upset or something like that, cannot put his finger on what is wrong. He's too (quote) "confused" (unquote).

Why is he confused? Well, he's only confused in this particular wise because the kid is sick and he can't do anything for him. But this adds up to the unknown data in the bank. He could not get confused about that child's illness if he understood completely that little Johnny Jones was getting sick because little Johnny Jones was damn well determined not to survive in this life.

Yet he will articulate this occasionally. He doesn't completely believe it, see? Once in a while, "Well, he didn't want to get well," he'll say. "He just didn't want to live." He doesn't really believe it because he has no supportive evidence. He has never investigated this phenomenon, although he has no reason why somebody would want to succumb. If he goes along on the stable datum of one life all the time, he will run into all this unpredictable information. So little Johnny Jones kicks the bucket, little Johnny Jones is done, he thinks. Anything connected with Johnny Jones is done. Not so. Johnny Jones evidently just goes up the track and makes another mock-up, see, and as a thetan goes up and picks up another mock-up. In other words, he splits up this unity known as Johnny Jones, but he gets a more workable existence going. Fascinating.

If you knew that and knew that 100 percent, you'd sure stop worrying about Johnny Jones. You'd start worrying about his parents, see, and the effect this would have on them. But you would know something else: Function monitors structure. A disease must have an invitation. There must be an invitation card to a disease. It must be that the life of little Johnny Jones is not quite optimum. There must be a number of psychic blocks, you might say, on the subject of going on living. Just on that broad subject, there must be some. And they come from someplace and it may be the way his parents treat him and it may be the way he's doing in school or not doing in school, it may be some Second Dynamic peccadillo that has been foisted off on him outside the home. You see, there could be enormous numbers of things involved here. But whatever it is, he doesn't care to live and so he has issued, just to that tiny degree, this invitation to death.

And we get some of the factors cleared up about why diseases strike some and don't strike others. It's fantastic. A lot of the people didn't send out invitation cards, that's all. It's not that they're not afraid of it; it's just that they want to go on living, you see? And it may be that these diseases which turn up are real, factual. They have virus, have bacteria, they're all stretched out along the line, *but-but* it may be that a person has to be

anfully bad off before he catches one. A person might have to be in terrible condition to get poliomyelitis.

- 12 · Now, let me give you a comparable datum—a very comparable, just fantastic datum—but I have never treated a poliomyelitis case unless it had attempted abortion underlying the poliomyelitis. Now, I've treated an awful lot of poliomyelitis. And in this age—in this age of—almost the poliomyelitis age in the United States—their cases are up 5 to 700 percent over last year thanks to the publicity in the Salk vaccine. In other words, they're being assisted in the issuance of an invitation. But I have never treated one of these cases without revealing—not, you know, telling the preclear anything—but without discovering, in processing, an attempted abortion underlying the polio. And I've never had a poliomyelitis case improve unless the relationships with the mother or the father have been improved. It's an interesting series because there's an awful lot of cases there.

In other words, this poliomyelitis may be simply the handy-jim-dandy little kid assister. This kid can't live unless he's a sympathetic object. Let's take that much succumb. If he's a sympathetic object, his parents will leave him alone. This kid is living in terror of his parents. The GE is in terror. He doesn't know what his parents may do to him again. Every accident he has—his father falls over him, his mother drops a plate on his head or something like this—is just another symptom to him of his approaching Armageddon. He is going to be slaughtered after a fight to the death with his parents. He's always more or less preparing for this. But he knows he can't stand up to it. You get the state of mind he's in. This kid gets sick. It may be that poliomyelitis is so weak an illness, it may be that it is so difficult for it to make any real effect, that a little kid has to be in near-psychotic condition to get it. This is just hazarding the situation, see. That's just a guess.

What you'd have to do is conduct a survey out here. You'd have to go across a huge number of kids and you'd have to find those kids in the lower sanity brackets. And then you'd have to tabulate these kids carefully as to their liability to polio, without ever

mentioning polio to them or their parents or anything else or telling anybody why you were doing the survey. You would just have to chalk it down—the least sane would be the most likely. Well, what would we mean by the least sane? Those that had the worst relationships with their fathers and mothers we would chalk up as possibilities on polio. And then we would wait for four or five years and find out if we were right. My guess on this, with the experience we've already had, that we would discover that these were the polio victims.

Well, we take a new look here at disease prevention. But remember, we have done this, really, without upsetting anybody's basic data. Nobody is defending these basic data against additive or monitoring data, see? Nobody is defending the stable datum just as I've shown you here—these—various stable datum I've mentioned: structure monitors function, see? The body will get well if left to its own devices. Nobody is defending them. They are not being defended because they are not under attack—unless you attack them, at which time they will be defended. A person has to defend those particular data or have the whole bank collapse on him. And by defending them, he weakens them. Now, do you see this?

Female voice: Mm-hm.

Well, let's take this "horses sleep in beds" in the preclear. You attack that stable datum and you wind him up in some stable in the spinbin, you see? We attack it and we unstabilize the whole sphere and throw it into confusion. Well, all right.

How, then, could you, on a purely educational level, process a preclear? Now, you know all about engrams. You know you could run these things in and run them out. You know about locks. You know about overt act-motivator sequences. You know all the various mechanical contrivances. You know about exteriorization and yo-yo effects. And you know all of this tremendously important phenomena which we have racked up over these last five years. And how would you go about handling, "Horses sleep in beds?"

Well, there is one, you might say, master method which sits above all other methods as the most permissive and gentle method. No, now, Frank actually has boiled down on processing to a point of where he gets people to study the Axioms. Well, he's certainly hitting at commonly held stable data. But this stable data will jar up and go back into place again and jar up and reorient and get back into place and get upset and back into place and finally will stabilize again itself. It's the underlying pins of life. If you studied them calmly and rationally out of your own desire to know them or something, that's all right.

How would you go at it a little more gently? Let's take the fellow, "Horses all sleep in beds." You would ask him to look over some of the principles—you would have a list of these, let us say—and you'd have him look over some of the principles or easier publications of Scientology and you would say, "Which of these data could you use? Which of these data seem useful to you? Here's a great deal of information. Which one of these data would seem useful to you?"

He'd pick the one that fitted in closest to his frame of reference. It would be a light one and he would rationalize it, see? He would take it apart and put it back together again and look it over.

Now, I threw out something to some gentlemen who know very little of Scientology. Most of what they know of Scientology is Para-Scientology. They've just heard it around. Now, I handed them this one: I said, "There is a principle in Scientology which is interesting, you might find it of interest, and that is that a stable datum is necessary to the alignment of data. And that if we do not have a stable datum, we're liable to have an area of confusion. But if an individual has held a stable datum and has aligned much of his life on it, he will become very upset if that stable datum is moved aside or invalidated." I didn't give them an example. These gentlemen, very bright gentlemen, each one of them gave me an example and all of them very interested. To each one it had

suddenly and quickly explained something. This mechanism had explained something. The mechanism itself had explained something.

Well, here I had chosen a datum. It did not invalidate any of their datum because they didn't have any data on the stable datum. It was a sort of a "felt" proposition. They had an instinct for it but no articulation, you see? And this, all by itself, suddenly explained, of all things, the current illness of the president of the United States to one—explained that illness to him. He said, "Here's a man with a military code. He's gone along all these years living by this code,"—this is a paraphrase of what he said—"and then he gets with all these politicians, I mean, politicians and the politicians playing their game this way and that and big business playing a rotten game this way and that, and he looks at all this and he feels that much of his life has been in vain. He's invalidated. That's why the man is sick. His stable data was a military code and the honor and so forth that went with it." And he said, "And therefore, the man is ill."

Now, he really knew by now, you see? He really knew that—it was conviction in his voice. He was telling me. See, he informed me about this. And he really knew now why President Eisenhower was ill. That was for his benefit.

Now, we don't know why President Eisenhower is ill, see. But this might be the explanation, very possibly is the explanation. But for him, it definitely *was* the explanation. And he had talked about this two or three times and it was something that had been going kind of round and round in his mind. This whole situation was going around and around in his mind. He evidently couldn't quite understand how a man in that position could get ill. *Voilà!* He now had it. He didn't mention it again. It cleared the computation. He stopped worrying about it.

Now, completely aside from running engrams, completely aside from handling the mechanics, you then have in your possession a modus operandi and information which will align itself, if you permit power of choice, with almost anything that exists. It should

become interesting to you. You have the most permissive way to do it—would simply be to list the simple truths and so forth of Scientology and just these various things one way or the other—state from the Axioms certain simplified statements, you know, and just make a list of them and say, “Now, you’re a chiropractor. You’ve had a lot of experience in healing and so forth. Would you please look over—” (this is not to trap the man, this is to help him) “—would you please look over this data and tell me which of it you feel from your experience is true?”

He would pick out one point and align that. He’d pick out another point and align that. He would reject another point, reject another point, reject another point and pick out another point and align that. Then, after he’d accepted several other points and got this rationalized as a few days went by, he would probably come back to the first rejected point and receive that. Get the idea? You wouldn’t be teaching him Scientology. You’d be making him sane.

Here’s an entirely different therapy—an entirely different therapy. It simply as-ises confusion by letting people align their understandings with factors which bring order out of confusion. As simple as this, you see? This doesn’t put the auditor there in an auditor’s chair. It puts him as a consultant or a teacher or an educator, you see? It puts him there in a different role. It really is not the role of the auditor. Only it certainly is the role of an auditor: he is clearing the bank. See, there’s another method.

Now, engrams, mechanics, producing these various things are all very interesting. But remember that right at their same level of magnitude—this is, by the way, a process of comparable magnitude. You have this whole system of permissive selection. You let the individual receive data out of lists of data—not out of text, not out of written text because he’ll get them confused—which he finds acceptable to him. And at the end of that you would get a “Data Clear,” see? That’s a different thing too, by the way. You’d get a “Data Clear.” He would have thought his way through practically every problem

he'd faced, see, and it's a fabulous thing. He would be very, very well aligned then. Now, that is a comparable therapy.

We all know that therapy. But it is something that just rides along with us—good roads, good weather—the acceptance by medicine of the idea that structure monitors function. It's an observable, see. I mean, it's not anything we articulate or have articulated before, yet we all knew that this therapy existed.

Now, I'm articulating it for this reason: I have conceived a newer, more permissive way of making a "Data Clear." See, it's a very gentle sort of a way. It's a very quiet sort of a way. And that is the only way you are ever going to clear anybody in the field of healing. Because they conceive their data to be of comparable magnitude to your data, and your data and their data are not of the same order. They are not data on the same subject, but they believe that it is.

Well, if this data on Scientology is not data on the field of healing, then what is it? If it's really not healing data, then what is it? Well, I wish to point out to you that we're doing something very peculiar with it if we can let somebody align his data on it. I'm not saying that we have every last stable datum in the entire universe, but we certainly have more than anybody else does. Well, all right.

If we're to align stable data in this fashion, if we're to align data on existing stable data, we will never do it by presenting some center stable data to the individual and letting him build a new house. It'll simply invalidate the old house, see? There will be a conflict between these two houses. We had then better integrate the old house. If you're ever going to make any progress in the world of healing, I'm afraid it'll have to be done in that fashion: What data in this list would be acceptable to you in the realm of your experience?

Remember this individual does have experience; remember this experience is valuable. It's got holes in it simply because it hasn't completely aligned. And you might learn a whole

new sphere of healing out of this very thing, this very fact. You might create a brand-new healer. Not a Scientologist, you see? He's not a Scientologist. He is, let us say—we don't care what—but he nevertheless is a new thing. He has this tremendous backlog of experience. He has abilities in this way and that. He has tremendous educational background. He's got all these things. And now, all of a sudden, he gets all that data aligned. You've got a formidable person and he's very well worth having in the society.

Well, if this is the case, then what happens to the auditor? If you just outright created this new healer, what would happen to the auditor? What does this have to do with it?

Well, it has an awful lot to do with it. Because I'm not sure that Scientology is a therapy and never was sure that it was. But I knew that it was therapeutic. It is a better therapy than things exist on a non-emergency basis. It is a therapy superior to any existing therapy that I know about on a non-emergency basis. Remember, Scientology will not at this time stop a person from bleeding to death in three minutes. If a person's arteries are pumping, you don't sit around down alongside of him and run an engram. You stop that artery, see? Which tells you immediately that we're monitoring function by handling structure. And we fall right straight back onto the medical stable datum, see? We have to do that—until the Scientologist can take an artery pumping away and say, "Stop!" and it stops, I'm afraid on an emergency basis that he has something to learn, right? See, we've still got something to learn, but the chap who is interested and intimate in that particular work may learn that datum for us.

What, then, would Scientology be? Scientology by its own name is a science of sciences or a study of science, an aligner and articulator of science itself.

And here we have a thing called science going rather mad-dog in a modern world, completely advanced from the humanities. We find sciences completely out of pace one with another. We find them in a fantastic state of confusion with relationship to each other. We find chemistry and physics dealing with the same thing—basic matter—at

wild disagreement with each other. We have enormous numbers of things which are antipathetic to each other in the world of science. And it may be that the mission of Scientology is to remove science from a causative factor in barbarism—its causation of barbarism—and change its mission entirely, and for the first time make science *cause* a civilization, not a bunch of gadgets run by madmen.

And it very well may be that our mission is far higher than we have conceived it to be and far more pervasive as far as the world is concerned. It does not take us out of the field of ability, behavior, improvement and so on—doesn't take us out of that field at all—it leaves us in that field. But it gives us, actually, a brand-new field. It gives us coordinator and the function of coordination and bringing into good ARC all that Man knows.

Now, if everything Man knew was at the service of civilization and not at the service of war, if everything that Man knew was understandable, if these high specializations were not at all times busy trying to wipe Man out—Man gets so specialized in the atomic bomb, he never looks at anything else—why, it might be that Scientology is in the fortuitous position, and the world is fortuitous to that degree, of being able to coordinate and regulate the study of science in various ways and to stand as a crossroads. And maybe it would be the crossroads at which Man would start to go up and stop going down if we did just this one fact: start to monitor the study of science itself, rather than to regulate or relegate all of our activities solely to one sphere, that of increasing ability or healing. Because we'd increase the ability of the whole world if we did that. And I think that's a worthwhile goal.

Thank you.



SOLVING ENGRAMS WITH STABLE DATUM, COMMUNICATION TERMINALS

LECTURE 36

A LECTURE GIVEN ON 26 OCTOBER 1955

61 MINUTES

Okay and we have the second morning lecture, October 25, 1955, 4th London ACC. We have, probably from your viewpoint, been dodging around this whole idea of processing, you know. It's obvious that in the last three lectures I've given you that we just were dodging around, you know, avoiding the whole issue. I keep telling you I'm talking about engrams and we don't talk about engrams. I'm keeping you on suspense. That's a mechanism which one uses as a writer. It's a very good mechanism, but that isn't why I'm using it. 2

How do you suppose you'd solve engrams on the basis of a stable datum? How do you suppose you'd do this? Could you solve all the engrams out of the bank without ever running one?

Hm?

Female voice: Yeab.

It'd be very interesting wouldn't it, to do this? Now, I've just told you a method by which we could go on and probably get a "Data Clear" with considerable ease. He'd be quite a smart cookie, by the way. He wouldn't have any big confusions. He never did really get any individual auditing, but he did have the chance of inspecting and integrating the data with his own livingness. See, he did have that chance merely by finding out which datum in Scientology could work along with what he already knew. Now that would give you a "Data Clear."

Now, I wonder if a comparable system could be used with regard to the engram. Remember, an engram is a very beefy thing—very, very tough to most people. This is tough to some and it's not tough to others. But we have in the engram, just as in the field of pain itself, a terrific difference of opinion.

Now, difference of opinion in the engram is as wide as: Engram comes into restimulation—the person, lock, stock and barrel, regresses back on the track, winds up into the engram totally and entirely and does not escape from it in any way whatsoever—he is at once in another life, another beingness. See that? You return him to present time and he doesn't remember that he's run the engram. Do you know that that engram can have that much of an effect?

- 3 All right. An engram could have a worse effect than that. It could simply wind the individual up where it is and be so totally effective upon him that he would be the total engram. He would simply go right on being nothing but the engram. And mechanically this could be an explanation of insanity. An individual gets wound up in an insane engram and the engram has overcome him and he is now the engram. And where is he? Well, it's the question of the thetan in the theta trap.

We run on somebody who's having a rough time exteriorizing: "Be a theta trap. Be a thetan. Be a theta trap. Be a thetan." And the first thing you know he goes through the horrible feelings of degradation you ever wanted to watch in anyone. Because the

thetan is way, way, way, way below death and he is being the trap, you see? The preclear was living as the trap. It didn't even suspect there was a thetan in there with him. See, he's entirely—he's entirely out of the idea of being the thetan, so he didn't even suspect the thetan. He begins to suspect the thetan. He'll tell you, "You know, I think there's a thetan in here too, you know? There's some living thing in here." And then was asked to be the thetan, be the trap, be the thetan, be the trap. He comes up, and all of a sudden, through these terrific depths of degradation, may come into a circumstance whereby he is himself and the trap is a trap. And up to that time he was the trap, wasn't he? Well, now, that's what you might call a total devourment of the individual by a picture or an experience or a series of pictures or experiences, see? He is totally devoured by these.

Now, how would a thetan get into a situation where he would be so totally devoured? He would get into that by having the consideration that he could. He should have the consideration then or he would have the consideration in order to get himself into these remarkable circumstances—that he was incapable of withstanding or doing anything with or about the engram or the energy mass.

And so we get immediately to intolerance of confusion. We arrive at once at this fact: It must be that he is intolerant of confusion, intolerant of confusion in time, intolerant of other confusions. Somehow or another, he must be so intolerant of it that he thinks the confusion is *senior* to himself. Have we got that now?

Look that over. The individual who would be the trap, in addition or above being himself, must think, then, that the trap is senior to himself. Now, why is the trap senior to himself, hm? Why is it? Because a confusion, such as the trap, must be greater than himself. It's just as simple as that. That's really all there is to it.

The confusion has so often won that he believes it is a superior method of existence. See this? In other words, it's superior livingness. Being this confusion called a trap or being this trap called a trap is better livingness, more powerful livingness than—according

to his opinion—than being himself. That is *never* true, never has been true, never will be true—but he thinks it's true. His intolerance for confusion, then, has become a desire not just *for* confusion but to *be* confusion.

Now, there is a further one than this. The individual has been a confusion and now decides to confuse others. And if you've ever watched the activity of a psychotic, it will be just this: the dramatization of confusion in others, see. He wishes to create the confusion for others. You follow me?

He not only—he not only is himself the victim of confusion, but he himself has become confusion. And then he can get worse than that. He can then deal only with confusion; he becomes a confusion merchant—a Merchant of Chaos. We used to call him a merchant of fear, see? Well, you can amplify that and make it just a little bit rougher. You can say he's a merchant of confusion—confusion could be any kind of emotional interaction or reaction.

Do you know that this can get so bad that we could take an entire nation and have it desire to give the rest of the world only confusion? See, it could get that bad. And we have had instances of this time and time again. They just want to throw the rest of the world in confusion. They say, "Conquer." They don't know what they're talking about, they just want everything confused.

Now, I've had young men in offices and on board ships that thought about—their finest possible activity could be going through a department and making everything in it confused. They excuse this by saying, "We're getting it all into action. We're making it look more alive." They just tear everything up and throw it away and mess everything up and get everybody all upset and contradict themselves one way or the other and give a whole series of orders and then check that with a whole other series of orders and then say, well, they're making the place look more alive.

Oh, no, they're not! They're *nuts* when they do that. Ding, ding, ding—cell 13. This is real nutty. And yet you probably have known people like that who passed for sane people.

Now if we want to see the mechanism of insanity result, we would simply debar them utterly from ever creating another confusion, see? We would just blunt them out on the subject. We would refuse to let them create a confusion. We would hold them in line with great duress. What would we do? We would back them into being the confusion all over again, wouldn't we, hm? They were not the makers of confusion, they became *the* confusion.

This is what would occur and what has generally occurred with these young men. Because I didn't have time to sit there and process them and I didn't want them tearing through the organization or the office or the ship or the bake shop or anything like this and suddenly just tearing up everybody's leave and liberty and enforcing this and giving a whole series of orders in case that—and yap-yap-yap-yap-yap-yap. And I say, "You go near that bake shop just one more time and interrupt those cooks and I'm not going to have your stripes, I'm going to have both of your ears!" And you can see the guy start to spin right in front of your eyes. He will. *Zzzzz!*

He evidently is dramatizing an engram, you see. And it is an engram of confusion. And you, by telling him he had to control the thing, made him recognize that he couldn't tolerate it. And it ate him up, just like that. He could just actually spin right straight in. I've never seen one go all the way in just on a little incident like this, but he could spin all the way in, theoretically.

That is the mechanical mechanism—the mechanical aspect of insanity. You got it? If you want any confirmation of this at all, we have two series of phenomena in progress. One is the considerations, data, alignment and so forth—that's one series of considerations, you see. And we have this other mechanical material, such as the reaction of the engram. And this we're really talking about now, see?

What happened to him? He was able to put this out on others, but in that wise he could apply it in some fashion or he could use this engram. People had made him confused in the past—now, on an overt act—motivator sequence he felt himself perfectly entitled to make everybody else confused. Understand, no matter what he said: “Well, I’m really doing this for their good” or “I’m doing this to produce more efficiency” or “I’m doing this to put them on the ball” or yap-yap-yap, see. Whatever he said he was doing, what he was really doing was dramatizing an engram of confusion.

And when you made it no longer possible for him to cause this much confusion, he ordinarily could be expected to get “et” up by the engram—unless you gave him along with it the other system, a better datum. Do you follow me now, see? Then we could actually smash this engram right back in his teeth, see, as long as it carried with it a stabilizing, reorganizing datum. We would have to give him a better method of doing things to people in order to cause him to be alert and happy about living in the midst of that engram, see. We didn’t have to rationalize the confusion itself or do anything, but we had to improve his ability somehow or another. We had to let him as-is or work out or take care of a lot of randomness in his own sphere. We had to give him a direction. We had to give him a cause, a goal or something. We had to get him to change his place on the track to some degree. We had to get him to reorganize his activities to some degree before we would get a change in his conduct.

Without, then, reorganizing his activities in any way, shape or form, we simply smash this confusion back on him again and say, “You cannot dramatize this. We’re not going to permit you to dramatize this any longer.” We would simply watch the guy spin, *bing!*

- 6 What we’ve got to do is give him a new direction—a new direction for action. We’ve got to let him help people or do things for people or we’ve got to let him react toward the environment now and we’ve got to give him a better reason for doing so. And if we wanted to really be optimum, we would have to give him a datum that would orient

a bunch of the data he had. And if we did all these things, we would have done what? We would have effectively processed him so that he wasn't bound and determined to dramatize the confusion. And if we did all these things (and, by the way, don't try to make long lists of them), all we did, very simply, was bring a better organization of life into his existence, a better order in some fashion. We gave him the engram, but to compensate for it we brought a better order into his life, either by giving him a new datum or by giving him new directions, new goals, something of the sort. We say, "There's no need to go on knocking the bake shop to pieces."

The real trouble on the whole line is the insufficiency of personnel up in the personnel office. Now, this would be the shabbiest way of going about it: "The inefficiency of the personnel officer in the cooks and bakers that they send us. And that personnel office—now, if you want to raise hell with somebody, why don't you go up to the personnel office?" And he'll stop raising hell inside the ship and start raising hell outside the ship, see? That's a sort of a shabby way of going about it, but in a moment of emergency you can patch it up that way—you can transfer the area of confusion.

Now, if he's the kind of a guy that's going to do this, the oddity is, is you would be put in a very astonished frame of mind to see how fast he will transfer the direction of the confusion or the new area of confusion. He's almost in trance—he's almost in trance. You say to him, "Transfer area of confusion." He transfer—then, there—area of confusion, *bing!* See? He does it with great ease. Because you start speaking to him about anything bordering on this confusion and you'll find this individual hypnotically inclined. He's under your control or anybody's control. He's not in good shape if he's doing this, see. It's very easy for you to direct him around.

One of the oddities is if you wake him up a little bit by giving him a new goal or a new datum, let him reorient or reorganize his existence a little bit better, well, what do

we find? We find we have made him a little saner. We have made him proof against the confusion just to this degree—by bringing in new order into his life.

Now, the funny part of it is, there's an entirely *new* sphere of action occurs here. We bring the individual himself—not into a better order. We don't bring him better order or better organization—this is another method now, you see—we don't bring him better order or better organization. We bring him, very bluntly, a better tolerance of confusion itself. And when his tolerance of confusion is sufficiently taken care of, when he himself can tolerate confusion, he will drop that engram. The engram, at that moment, is not the winning valence. He himself is, because he himself can now handle confusion. Now, do you see these things as two different things?

One is order the guy's data. In other words, give him less confusion to match his, you might say (quote), very improperly, “native tolerance” (unquote) for confusion, see. You give him more orderly data. Therefore, the individual is less confused, although he himself is just as susceptible to confusion as ever. A new situation comes along which is just the same and he spins, see?

Or we can do this great oddity, see—simply improve his tolerance for confusion itself. And he comes right off of this kick, he no longer goes down to the bake shop, he no longer tears everything up, he no longer has any impulse to go up to the personnel office and do this and that. He can do other things concerning confusion. See? He can handle it. He can do something about it. Therefore, the sight of confusion in his vicinity doesn't make him make it more confused. In other words, he stops being a confusion merchant. He stops buying and selling confusion as his sole activity in existence. There are a lot of other games. And he can make confusion or unmake it at will only because of one thing—he has come to tolerate confusion a little better.

7

Now, if we look at this, that his tolerance of confusion can be altered, then once more we are actually handling the mechanical aspect of the engram bank. Because believe me,

it's there for just two reasons—and one of them is confusion and the other one is stillness (the complete antipathy of confusion). Stillness could be characterized on its highest echelon as no game. Confusion is too much game. Optimum game lies somewhere between stillness and confusion. But an utter stillness or an utter motionlessness—a complete continuous stationariness is as intolerable as too-fast confusion.

So what do you know? The individual would have to be improved on another thing if he was going to be in his optimum game band, wouldn't he? He'd have to be able to tolerate complete motionlessness better and to be able to tolerate tremendous confusion better. And if he tolerated both of them, then he himself could handle a game in between. If he cannot tolerate motionlessness, he will fixate on it.

Now, I just talked to you about confusion. Do you see, then, that complete motionlessness of objects and locations and spaces and so forth could do the same thing? The individual has too much confusion. Confusion, then, has mastered him. He is now in hectic, agitated motion or he is bringing hectic, agitated motion to his vicinity. This is not a game with him, he is simply dramatizing—no choice exists and choice must continue to exist in all games.

Therefore, the same principles can occur in motionlessness. The individual has too little motion. And this too little motion can cause him to fixate on too little motion. And having too little motion, he now will interiorize into it and become it and become motionless. And we have the fellow—the extreme case is the catatonic schiz. But we have the fellow who just sits around and says someday he's going to get around to it. We have all kinds of things.

We're liable to make mistakes about both of these. On one side of it we have the—as a public, you know, we're liable to make vast mistakes on both these. We have this fellow who's tearing around and getting this done and getting that done and *urrrumm*, and creating confusion and doing this and doing that and doing something else and boy,

there's motion, motion, motion, motion, motion! And we say, "There's a go-getter! There's a young man who's really got the show on the road!" Nuts! [laughter]

All right. Now, let's take this motionless fellow and we say, "Well he's a very conservative fellow. He is very thoughtful. He thinks things over very carefully before he does them. He is a *solid* character." Nuts!

The public makes these two mistakes continually. So that you see this "log" sitting at the desk in the bank manager's office. It's just a log. And you walk in and you say, "Log, give me permission to do this and that."

And log doesn't say. He says, "Well, I have to think this over, I have to remain motionless, have to stay still." You get the idea? That's all he's saying to you: "You have to stay still, you mustn't move around, you mustn't put anything through." And we sometimes interpret this as everything must stop. But everything must stop is not as bad off as this fellow is. That's 1.5. This fellow can still deal in a bit of confusion, he can still deal in a bit of motionlessness, you know, and he can still exert some power of choice as to who he kills, when. You know, he's still got that sort of choice. But not this motionless fellow—he actually is in a trance. And if we see these fellows spotted around through governments and industries and so forth and—the industry doesn't know something very interesting.

Just as I told you that the young or old man who is in this terrific agitation—it isn't necessarily just young men that are in this agitation. I've seen old women in this agitation the like of which you never saw. Flutter, flutter, flap, flap, flap, flap, flap, flap, spin, spin, spin, spin, spin, spin, wipe your nose, put on your hat, take off your rubbers.

And you say, "But you just wiped my nose. I have no hat on and I haven't had any rubbers for a month."

"It doesn't make a bit of difference. It doesn't make a bit of difference." You know, *thrrrrr-zzzrrr-zzzrrrr*. And then there's the person who just sits and looks at the newspaper—that drives the kid nuts too. Just sits, you know, and looks at the newspaper.

Both of these people are hypnotically governable. You can handle either of them. If a bank had, in any of its directors' posts, a log—they don't realize it but they have a fellow (if he had the authority, as he usually would have because he's so conservative and therefore safe), he never does anything, so therefore no wrong action ever occurs in his vicinity. He's always thinking it over, something of the sort. If he had the power to write a hundred thousand pound check or transfer a billion dollars in gold or something of the sort, this man is the complete victim, he is right straight at the mercy of anybody who knows hypnosis because the guy is in a trance.

Such people are very commonly garbed in authority and they're very commonly garbed in conservatism. But this is your reactionary gone completely sour. This is your super-conservative. His activities are so hypnotically inclined, his power of choice is so small and so narrow that people will sit around in the society and think there's a plot on from powers on high to actively do in things, you know. There's no plot on!

We look at the heads of certain committees or something like that scattered around the world doing this or that and we think these people must be acting directly in the direction of some mysterious movement. There must be somebody around giving them orders to cause the demise of nations. I've even heard it said—this, for centuries—there's been this myth of the international clique, you know, that really handle all the countries from afar and so on. It's this guy! See? It's this guy, because he's really on a succumb level just as the super-agitated person is on the succumb level, see? And he makes any decision he makes—if he's really pressed to make a decision, he'll get even with you by giving you a death decision, see? So their decisions are death decisions. And we have

large institutions surviving only because they themselves are too hard to push around, see? But they do succumb on a slow decline.

Now these are, then, two interesting fellows. The oddity is, is they happen to fit themselves into two political spheres—two different political spheres. But I don't know why they should fit themselves into two political spheres, because the oddity is that they're both crazy. The extreme rightist and the extreme leftist are usually—on the rightist side, a log, when you get this extreme case (nonrational), “got to hold the status quo, and that's the way it is, we'll always be here, nobody need make a decision,” see? And this other fellow way over on the leftist side is going, “*Nab-ab-ab-ab-ab-dub-dub-dub* go to tear it all up, tear it all up, confuse industry, strike, do this, do that, *dub-dub-dub-ab-dub-dub.*” The funny part of it is, is you'd no more than get a new government in that was flying the flag that he was okaying before, than he would say, “Down with that flag. Now we've got to tear up this!” You know? To let either of these boys have very much control is a severe mistake on the part of a nation, because neither of them will keep a game going. Both of them at the opposite poles of the game.

Now, they are two different fixations, but the same mechanical fact is true. It just happens that one of them is fixed on a motionless one and another one is fixed on a moving one—an engram, see? It just is by almost *luck* which one is in restimulation.

- 9 Now, one who is raised in a rather motionless environment will, of course, if he's already got a low tolerance for motionlessness and motion too—they have low tolerances for both at the same time—he just happened to have more locks which were motionless and so he became more fixed on motionlessness. And this other fellow happened to be in a more agitated atmosphere just by a fluke and so he's got more fixation—he's got more locks, you might say, on his confusion, and locks on the confusion is the way he fixes on that series of engrams. They just fix on whatever seems to be the most of. If the mostest thing there is around is confusion, they get fixed on, interiorized into

and start to cause confusion in varying degrees. And if the mostest that is around is motionlessness, then they'll get the mostest fixed on motionlessness, see?

You look at this and you say, "Oh, my, an ion banging around inside of a tube, a marble shaken up in a box, a die in a cup, these things are highly determined organisms compared to the all-out, flat-out thing." Because nobody expects the die in the cup to do anything but bounce around. But we expect this, these two cases on opposite sides of the spectrum, on the one hand to actually accomplish something by motionlessness and on the other hand to accomplish something by motion. We don't expect the die to do anything, but these two cases upset our expectancy or our prediction, which is an important thing. Our rightness depends on how accurately we predict, you see, and they have upset our rightness. We expect these people to do something.

So we were always outraged about capital and labor. We're always saying to ourselves, "Well, gee whiz, now we're in the middle of a depression, now what do we do?" or "Now, it's a big strike, I'm not getting to work on time" or, you know—individually and personally, we get mixed up with these people, whether we like it or not. See, they're in the society. We start falling across the log. The darnedest thing—here is this super-motion trying to make a contract with no-motion and neither one of them with the power of choice! Don't you see? And you come along perfectly able to play a game and find out that all the lines of the game are all wound up in a ball—it's a mess, see? All right.

Now, we could run out all these motionless engrams out of the log or we could run out a lot of motion engrams out of the agitator—one or the other, see? We could do either one of these things and change his power of action or change his conduct. But we wouldn't have changed his mind. We wouldn't have improved the log's tolerance for motionlessness, particularly. And we wouldn't have particularly improved the agitator's tolerance for motion. See, neither one would we have improved. But we would have improved, simply, their surface conduct.

10 Now, it may be that as they handle a motionless engram or two, they see they can handle motionlessness and so they change their minds. But unless you know that datum is there, it sometimes doesn't occur, leaving you high and dry. They never change their minds about their ability to handle that motionlessness, see, never change their minds about it. They just simply handle it and their conduct is better and they don't know they're any better and you get confused as an auditor, because you know the guy is better, you know his conduct is better. No, but what's better? What's better is the material he's handling all the time. That's the lump in his hand, so to speak, as a thetan. That's what's better.

When you didn't improve his consideration, he won't say he's better, either, because basically the thing that's wrong with him—his inability to change his consideration about motion or motionlessness—is not bettered. And not having changed that ability or his ability to consider at all we, of course, then don't get a result satisfactory to ourselves.

So we must look carefully at this fact, that we're working with these two things—tolerance for and the picture of. See, we're working with two things. We could handle picture *of* without getting any increased tolerance *for*. And there the individual's behavior would be better, but he wouldn't be any more able, really, as a person at all. He'd hit another agitation and away he'd go!

Now, this is the lady that you process, and she's just fine while she's being audited by you and you flattened a lot of kickback engrams. And she goes home into the same environment again and spins all over again. See? This is that person—couldn't tolerate the environment. Then that means that raising or changing her tolerance for motion or motionlessness, either one, has not been accomplished.

Well, this is the spook factor in auditing. This is the upsetting factor. This is the factor which must be changed if you're going to succeed with the session—the ability

to increase—of increased tolerance. We've got to change his mind. He has to be able to change his mind. You get the idea?

Now, we can force a man to change his mind by holding a gun on him. But we haven't improved *his* ability to change his mind, see? See the difference between those two points?

So an individual could change his mind as energy ran through and so forth and not really be any better either. But he'll explain this on a—kind of halfway get the idea, you know. There'll be no spark or flash there at all. He'll just kind of halfway get the idea about the whole thing, you know. He really doesn't cognite at all, he just kind of knows a little bit better. And sometimes he will tell you this. And you should know what's going on. The individual's ability to change his mind is not improving. The person's mind is changing. You get the idea?

Well now, you could have him change his mind, but if you didn't improve his ability to change his mind, then somebody else can come along and change his mind back again too. And again you haven't won. So no matter whether the engram is one of motionlessness or one of motion or whether the engram is one or a billion, in either case we must improve the individual's ability to consider motionlessness or motion.

On a higher gradient, motionlessness becomes not-knowingness. On a higher gradient, motion—too much—becomes don't-knowness or not-knowness. In either case, we have an unknownness above two levels. **11**

So that we also have to improve his consideration not only about confusion and motionlessness, but a little bit higher, since both of these factors of motion and motionlessness add up to a higher echelon of one factor—not-knowingness—we have to improve his ability to consider stupidity. And unless we improve his ability to tolerate stupidity, unless we improve or enlarge his tolerance of stupidity or unless we improve his ability to create stupidity and do other things with stupidity, we, again, will have a limited result.

We let the individual change his mind back and forth on the subject of toleration of motionlessness. Not only that but he got into a position, finally, where he himself could make up his own mind. See, he could make up his own mind. All right.

This fellow over here who is utterly "thud," we still got him so that he could change—we were changing his mind on the subject and, finally, he got so he could change his mind on the subject of motionlessness.

Both of these guys are now in a situation where they both have to be able to change their mind on stupidity. And what do you know? Tolerance of brightness and tolerance of stupidity are both, to a marked degree, tolerance of not-knowness. You got it? Gradient scale. A lot of people are antipathetic to somebody who is bright—people get antipathetic toward somebody who is bright. They're upset, they feel they have to have just so much not-knowness. And this guy is liable to do something horrible to it. Not-knowness is not in their power of control. All you have to do is put not-knowness in their power of control and they change their minds on brightness and stupidity both.

Well, this is interesting then. But the oddity is that it doesn't automatically occur that an individual will change his mind, or raise or have an increased tolerance of—change his mind about or have an increased tolerance of—motionlessness or motion just because you've changed his mind about not-knowingness. Got that?

- 12 So, actually, there's three things here we have to restore his ability about—we have to restore his ability about. He has to be able to handle motionlessness, motion and not-knowingness. And he has to handle these three things. And if he doesn't handle those things, well, you haven't brought him up. So your processing should be in the direction of bringing about an ability to handle those things.

Why does he want to handle them at all? Because he wants communication. Communication is his pay.

What if you gave him every avenue open to increase his ability to tolerate motionlessness, to tolerate motion, to tolerate not-knowingness? And, my, he just got into the most wonderful tolerant state of mind and got able about the whole thing and he could press on down the line toward various goals, you know, and he just got along fine and he didn't seem to be much better as a case. He just kind of told you his tolerances were this way, but it didn't seem to be much better as a case and he relapses rather rapidly. What's wrong?

This law is at work: *An individual will not raise his communication above a level that he can trust to be communication.* That's a sneaky little law. He will not raise his level of communication above the level that he can trust communication to exist. He's sitting with a solid-iron hat on as far as you're concerned, see? If he doesn't trust that a higher level of communication can exist—more terminals, better intentions and all that sort of thing—if he doesn't trust that these things can exist, he won't go toward them. Sounds absolutely fantastic.

It sounds like, now, that we could increase his tolerance, you know, of motionlessness; increase his tolerance of motion; increase his tolerance of stupidity—and still have a guy the same as before. That's what it sounds like. Because this last one sounds terrible. It's horrible. Because it says, "Willie can't go swimming till he learns how." It's one of these dead-end streets—"No Through Street." If you go up, you're going to come down again.

If you put him up into a level of communication that he suddenly believes is not a level of communication, he will come down to his old level of communication. If we were to clear this man and turn him out into the society and he discovered that fewer people were talking to him and he was making less money and all that sort of thing, he'd cut his tolerances right on down. He'd get problems all over again, do all kinds of things.

What is he doing? He's really not trying to have problems, he's not trying to do this and that. He's just trying to get into better communication with the society, see?

- 13 So we must raise his ability to communicate commensurate with his tolerance—we're raising his tolerance on three fronts. If we raise his tolerance on those three fronts, his betterment will be temporary. His tolerance on those three fronts is dependent upon his security of communication, his surety of communication, his certainty that communication will exist. And he won't raise his communication above a level that he feels is communication. You'll find him departing hence and—*nab-eb* [no]. Less communication! "They processed me and here I am and practically nobody talking to me at all."

Well, we didn't raise his ARC on his Third Dynamic, then, did we? It's a very unfortunate thing that if you process an individual a day without increasing his abilities on the Third Dynamic, he won't stay processed. You've got to be in better communication, that's all there is to it.

Well, he wouldn't be in better communication if he had the same R and the same A, would he? If he had the same level of affinity and reality as before and we—what's wrong with this statement?—and we just improved his communication. Something wrong with that statement, isn't it?

Audience: Yes.

Can't do it. If you really improve his communication, you will improve his affinity and reality, see?

Now, affinity and reality don't improve to any great extent processed as themselves. They improve on the basis of improved communication. But A and R in terms of consequences can do this interesting thing: They can make communication hang up on occasion. Communication would be there totally if it weren't for A and R. It's almost as if A and R are the constrictive points of the triangle and communication is the expansive side of the triangle. See, there's a slightly different behavior pattern here, isn't there? Slightly different behavior pattern.

Well, if A and R are the restrictive sides of the triangle, what is R? R is the terminal of communication. It is massive or not massive as the case may be. Therefore, we'll have to study the gradient scale of terminals in order to increase the man's communication.

We look over the terminals. What is as low as you will get to process? To be in any communication at all the individual has to be able to be in contact with energy sources. That's as low as you can get, see? He has to at least have some idea that energy sources can exist. He's either creating it or he's getting it. And so the lowest (quote) "terminal" (unquote) is energy sources. That's the lowest terminal.

Now, an individual can have a reality on energy sources without having a reality on terminals. So a person who has no reality on terminals can have good and ample reality on energy sources. So that's the bottom of R as far as we're concerned at this time—that's the bottom of R. The bottom of R is energy sources.

Now, it would be unfair not to accompany it just to the brief statement of how you'd handle that. You could have the individual find energy sources objectively. You could have him scout them in the environment through which you are walking with him as auditor and preclear—you could have him spot these energy sources. And he would increase his reality on these sources simply by finding out that they existed and he could go ahead and spot them.

Now on the next level of processing on the same thing, we could do it on mock-ups. We could have him mock-up energy sources of one kind or another. You see? And mocking-up the energy source, he will eventually get into terminals. We run a gradient scale from the energy source to the terminal. He at first looks on all terminals only as energy sources. The terminals are not anything for themselves. They are simply energy sources. They have a purpose; they have a significance. All terminals have the significance of furnishing energy one way or the other. They are good terminals or bad terminals

to the degree they furnish energy. This tells you this individual is awfully starved for energy if he has this consideration, you see? All right.

- 14 So we increase or improve by whatever means his tolerance of or reality on energy sources.

The next step up on reality is the terminal—the terminal itself. It *is* a terminal. Now, a terminal can be a terminal for its aesthetic value, it can be a terminal for its . . . You see, an aesthetic value is also a communication. You have to communicate with something to realize that it has an aesthetic value, or you say you do at least. It would have a value for its stability, one would say, or its amusingness or—you could have a number of values, you see. But the center of all these values: Is it real—whether aesthetic or otherwise—is it real? Does it exist? The oddity is that an individual too low on this line does not feel that it exists and that's why he's into power of sources. Of course, below that, he probably feels power doesn't exist either, but we won't bother with that.

Right there on terminals, terminals are—they're on gradients. Some terminals exist and some don't. Now that is a hopeful look. You can take the fellow who is fixed on energy sources only, apparently, and you'll find at least one or two terminals. He will be interpreting these, however, differently. He won't speak of these or think of these as terminals. He'll speak and think of them as things you get energy from.

Now, the reality of the terminal itself, then, can have many values, many reasons. But of course, the basic reason is communication. So how good is it as a communication terminal? He talks to it and it talks to him. See, how good is the terminal? Now he will spot in the environment, terminals.

Now, they are best as communication terminals when they're spotted. The variant reality on things depends on the realness with which he can feel that they are useful in communication. So we spot people. We spot objects. We spot people. Somebody is liable to start spotting a communication terminal as a telephone, radio and so on. Nearly all

of our communication terminals these days that are most reliable, we feel, are Sixth Dynamic terminals. All right.

He spots real terminals, terminals that are real to him. And he keeps spotting these until he gets a greater reality on terminals. And that would be your second level.

Now, the third level is recovering the ability to announce one's presence without the use of mass, really, or distance. The ability to announce one's presence without the use or [of] mass. In other words, terminal by postulate, reality by postulate, reality of terminal by postulate. You see? He says, "I'm here. That's good enough for everybody. I'm here, I'm talking, that's good enough," see? He'd have to feel that that was communication. He'd have to feel that communication was possible at this unthinkable height before he would be willing to abandon a body entirely and become an Operating Thetan. And the recovery of the ability of Operating Thetan would be communication terminal by postulate. By definition he would have to be able to do this—terminal without mass.

And what do you know, there's a Level Two and a Half which is below terminal by postulate and above the standard-type mass terminal, MEST universe style. There's one in between that is highly theoretical, probably completely impossible. It may not be demonstrable, may not exist in fact, may never be accomplishable at all, but every thetan seems to believe that it is—and that is terminal by mock-up.

Now, we know mock-ups is a subjective phenomenon. We know it's subjective, we mock things up in our own bank, so to speak. Well, this Level Two and a Half . . . You understand, power source is number one. Terminals—reality level is terminals. You could say his reality level is power source. His reality level is terminals—that's number two. And Two and a Half (with Three up here being terminal by postulate) would be terminal by objective mock-up. We'd simply mock a terminal up and it would talk and it would listen. And when we were through with the conversation, we would unmock it. I say, it's terrifically theoretical. Every thetan seems to believe it's possible though.

You start processing somebody and after a little while he says he feels funny, it's so bright to him you ought to see it too. Well, it couldn't possibly be that bright or you would see it, you see? But he feels disappointed or upset. And it's so easy to invalidate his reality on the mock-up and it makes him feel so bad that one suspects that this is probably the very best method—one suspects that this is optimum. You have the aesthetic of a visible terminal. You have the destructibility and an indestructibility—the appearance and disappearance of it—entirely under your control. You can have it effected or not effected at will. You can make it cause or not-cause at will, without any liability. You can have communication. But, man, would an individual's reality on this have to be good and would other people's reality on it have to be good! See, other people's reality on it would have to be good, otherwise it wouldn't be a good communication terminal, which is kind of what blows it up.

But remember this, then, that there is a Level Two and a Half which is a theoretical level and which at this time we don't much care about, although we process straight at it with Creative Processing. We don't care whether we ever attain this level, but we're just going to process in this direction. When we do subjective mock-ups of communication terminals, we're processing toward Level Two and a Half, not Level Three. We're not processing toward terminal by postulate, you know. The individual says, "I'm here; there's no mass." You know? We're not processing in that direction, we're processing toward Level Two and a Half. Evidently the individual assumes that if he can make enough mock-ups and square them all up, why, eventually he will get good enough at making mock-ups that he will simply say, "Communication terminal, start talking. All right, stop talking. Start talking. Look, I got communication going on, see."

So Creative Processing goes up toward Level Two and a Half, which must be there theoretically—by theory, it must be there if we're processing toward it, so you mustn't neglect its existence. And you mustn't foist off on the preclear that it exists because,

if he fails, you've got the worst invalidation you could hand him. And if it isn't possible at all, you have given people a (quote) "ability" (unquote) which they will never be able to accomplish and have pegged them on the time track with a big failure, see?

That's the nastiest trick of this universe is to insist people can do something which they can't do. Insist they can do something—that this something is being done—and they themselves can't do it. Now, this is so flagrant as a trick that when you tell somebody that he should be able to accomplish a certain result and he doesn't accomplish it, he thinks you're pulling this trick on him—he's very likely to blame this. He says, "Well, it's not an accomplishable result!" It might be a very simple result.

Little kid, you tell him to put his scooter in the garage or something of the sort, and he can't do it. And he'll come back in; he'll think you've tricked him. He'll have a betrayed look on his face. It's easy to put the scooter in the garage, but he hasn't been able to do it. So then he immediately assumes that you've tricked him. You have given him this trick: you have told him something was accomplishable in this universe which isn't accomplishable and therefore you knew, knowingly, maliciously, that you were perpetrating a trick upon him.

So that Level Two and a Half is an important one from the standpoint of don't you start giving people the idea that this is an accomplishable result, because were they to fail in that result, were they never to achieve it in any way, shape or form, they would really crash. You got the idea? And we do not, frankly—we do not know whether or not this is an accomplishable result. There's just no data on it as far as I'm concerned, from me to thee. Okay.

Therefore, the remedy of terminals is the remedy of reality. A is the particle flow, evidently. And the first particle, at the lowest level, is heavy MEST energy. And as we come upscale, we get lighter and lighter varieties of energy until we get up to high levels of affinity—it's by postulate. Particles by postulate. See, we had no particles there.

Communication—no, there's a higher level than that—communication without particles which would use, of course, a terminal by postulate. It would be a total sort of communication, wouldn't it? Be a nice thing to adjust. But on the reality band below that, we would assume that some particles would be employed at Level Two and a Half—particles by mock-up—objective mock-up. So the affinity at that level would be by objective mock-up.

Now, the oddity is we get higher and higher and tinier and tinier, rather, wavelengths as we go up that affinity line. We start out with practically no wavelength at all, just chunk! See? If a cannonball sitting still—pardon me, worse than that—if a rock sitting still has a wavelength, then the bottom of the A scale has a wavelength, you see? And we go right on up the line to the top.

Now, you see how these three things, then, interassociate? We've got the interchange of ideas and we've got the R corner, which is the contest of the terminals. And we've got the A corner, which is more or less the particle. Now, the A and R corner, though, are not a total statement. They require the consideration of existence, both of them. The A corner is the consideration of distances. There's a lot of other things, odds and ends, in the A corner and the R corner, which are there but which we don't need to consider at this time, so far as I know, in order to accomplish a rise in the Triangle of ARC. But we do need to consider, to some degree, the particle itself on the A corner; we do need, to some degree, to consider the terminal on the R corner in order to bring up the individual's reality and affinity for—you see, we're bringing up his reality on and his liking for C—communication. And we have made a clean statement of it when we have done this. And if we have done that, well, we've raised his ARC. And we had to do that—he had to really get communication by doing that. And he had to really find out that his communication with his environment was better.

The oddity is that the parts of the Communication Formula itself are all that need to be processed—his affinity kind of takes care of itself and so forth. But you have to look this over and you have to know what you're doing with this.

So we have to raise his *tolerance* for motion, his *tolerance* for motionlessness and his *tolerance* for not-knowingness. And we have to raise his *trust* level of, "Is it a communication? Am I in communication?" We have to give him *more* communication, not less, in order to make him get better.

And on the one side we have the basic considerations. We think these are very fine, his tolerances make him easier to live with, changes his personality and all that sort of thing, but the only pay he'll ever collect is communication. So he says to hell with all these tolerances if they don't bring him more communication that he can be sure is communication. Do you see that?

So we have these tolerances over here depressing the communication to some degree; we have the communication depressing the tolerances. And we have to audit all these factors in order to get a preclear up the line. We have to handle at once, really, the mechanics of banks and thetans and all the rest of it. And we have to handle considerations about these things; we have to handle tolerances, communication, and we get a clean sweep across the line. But the tolerances and the communication itself are the monitoring effects and if you don't improve those, you don't improve the preclear. If you do improve those, why, you do get your final result.

Thank you.

Thank you.



THE ROLE OF A SCIENTOLOGIST

LECTURE 37

A LECTURE GIVEN ON 27 OCTOBER 1955

60 MINUTES

Okay. The main difficulty in which the auditor is involved is a pc. Pcs often decide not to be solvable. 2

Thirty percent of the people that you run into will decide that they are so perfect, so entirely right, so thoroughly endowed with the gifts of the Lord and Allah, that they could not stand any slightest improvement of any kind. Or, if they could stand improvement, that it's too good for them.

And the situation then evolves that the fringe (the top most auditable, most—of this 30 percent) and the people who are—"Well, I'll be audited," you know, that aren't quite in the 30 percent—bring us to an interesting conclusion and that is that the auditor's chief difficulty is a pc. It's almost inevitably true.

But I wonder if you haven't put the postulate, about how unauditable they are, in before you really tried. If you were to start a session, you would start it by finding a pc and letting him find an auditor. If you did those two things properly, you would discover that the 30 percent would melt on down to a rather inconsiderable tiny number. Get the idea?

3 So the session really doesn't start when you find yourself an auditing room. The session starts when you try to find a pc and when you find a pc and then let him find an auditor. And when you have done that, you have started a session, really. You started an intensive but that's where it begins. Pc has got to be able to find an auditor.

Now, an auditor in this society at this time is not well known, but this really doesn't make too much difference since there are various labels which he can employ which are well known. In view of the fact that Scientology is the organization three feet back of the society's head (which is where it belongs), it really doesn't and shouldn't be hanging out large banners of advertising and all that sort of thing, you see? But there are many guises and identities which can be assumed.

Now, if we take Scientology and the organization itself, something on the order of a thetan, you see—we find out the thetan doesn't have any identity until he assumes one. You see, he is a thetan. He knows he's a life unit and then he assumes an identity in order to get into communication.

Now, this is the oldest trick on the track. You were sailing around and you decided to pick up a body so that you could have an identification. Somebody came along and christened it and went through a lot of rigmarole and you have lots of lineages and geneages and all kinds of things. And you, then, are in communication, aren't you? Hm?

Now, what is so adverse to using this trick, since it's the most native trick to the thetan to get into communication? What's wrong with using this trick as a Scientologist?

Let's consider the HASI, the organization and with a little brushing up here and there—well could be the organization three feet back of the society's head, see—not really doing anything to the society and not controlling the society, but simply giving it a hand. Now, that would be a bit more brightness than the society itself had.

And in view of the fact the purposes for this do not have anything to do with economic duresses or stresses put upon the social order, in view of the fact that the organization

itself isn't diving towards succumb and in view of the fact that all of this can be undone by the subject itself—Scientology being the only subject that can ever undo itself. And if you consider yourself as a part of that organization (or even as an individual three feet back of the society's head, as you please), you will find that you have to assume another identity than an auditor in order to get pcs.

Now, I'm not here to sell you the cross and I'm not here to sell you a caduceus and I'm not here to sell you any kind of symbolization at all. But these are identifications and identities, aren't they? 4

The minister is an understood symbol. You yourself may have antipathies toward a minister or the ministry. You yourself may feel that religion has not done the best it could for society. Well, similarly, you might have antipathies for bodies and you may feel that bodies have not done the best they could for society. You follow me? Same order of tech.

A minister hasn't been any good for a long time where it hasn't been any good (and in places, it has been good) simply because it is relatively uncoordinated—an entire disagreement, one section with another section—to such a degree that their ARC has been shot for an awfully long time.

Way back in the first centuries A.D. we find the Roman purges (this is very important to you and the organization in the HASI), we find Roman purges accounting for a great many Christians—over thirty, more than thirty Christians. Isn't that terrible? Just think that over for a moment. Since the Christians themselves in one year in the city of Alexandria accounted for dead (killed) one hundred thousand Christians. Interesting data.

I refer you to Edward Gibbon in *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, which book has been permitted to exist in the Christianized society, though I'm not sure why, because the book in its entirety is an effort to unmock the Christian Church and religion and

nobody ever suspects it. The sentences are too difficultly written for the people in religion to track the thought.

Look at that—one year. And do you know why they were fighting in Alexandria? Christians were fighting Christians in Alexandria and that factional battle, all by itself, accounted for one hundred thousand killed Christians. Roman Empire killed thirty in all of its purges, but the Christian Church doesn't talk about this other one and it would seem to me that that would be the important one. The greatest mortality rate would be the greater illness, wouldn't it? Hm? All right.

If that is the case, what were the Christians fighting about? Well, as Gibbon says, the Homoousians were fighting the Homoiousians and the difference between these two sects was scarcely discernible except for the *i* that was in one of the names and was missing in the other one—Homoousians and Homoiousians.

Very interesting—very interesting, isn't it, that an organization which started out to be "peace on Earth" would be that organization chiefly responsible for annihilating its own troops. And it's interesting—should be very fascinating to you because it's a phenomenon of no game. It's a phenomenon of introversion. It's a phenomenon of no-reach into the society.

Here we get these sects and they're all in groups and here they are, one and another of them, chewing up, not the society, but each other. Do you realize that at this time probably less than a tenth of the Roman world was Christian and yet we had the tenth that was Christian, self-devouring. Why? They couldn't conceive any game. They were introverting as an organization—not extroverting.

- 5 Now, the hundred thousand that were killed in Alexandria were nothing compared to the numbers slaughtered throughout the Christian world. And these people, lacking themselves an inner stability, were incapable of reaching further than the other sect of Christians.

And so Christianity has failed for two thousand years. It has never been a success. Why has it never been a success? I mean, organizationally it's never been a success—never has been. You know why? Because their motto is: "Peace on Earth; goodwill toward men." And during two thousand years there has been more war and less peace and less goodwill than I would hate to have to chalk up, but which you can trace very easily since all you have to do is pick up a modern history book and it does not talk of peace.

Therefore, the Christian movement did not settle the affairs of the world and therefore was a failure. You see this? That's a hard fact. And Christian organizations (one church or another) would contest this with violent words, I am very sure. The rhetoric which they would throw into the breach to controvert that statement would absolutely overpower and overawe you. But unless they had you on a rack or a cross, I'm afraid it wouldn't convince you, because we've just been through a war and I call to your attention that everyone in that war—except for one small section of the war which has now been magnified into a tremendous thing by party doctrine (Russia's)—everyone in that war with whom we were intimately involved were Christians.

Thou shalt not kill—bah! If they're going to put something up like that, let's follow it. Let's don't say, "Well, let's not kill except in times when our national honor is at stake." Pooh-bah!

Christianity actually died in World War I and that is why it is not an active force on Earth today. I know this sounds like a terribly sweeping, bigoted opinion. It happens to have some truth behind it.

Our boys in battle walked across dead enemy troops who had on their belt buckles, "*Gott mit uns*," and that was the death of the Christian religion. These boys came home and they had realized these fellows were on our side too in some fashion. What were we doing fighting these men? Christian was fighting Christian and that was the entirety of World War I since even the Russian nation at that time was Christian. Christianity

is so bad that it permits communism to take place in Russia. I couldn't make a more damning statement. That's pretty bad.

- 6 Things must have been pretty awful in Russia for anybody to come up and foist off dialectic materialism on people. Do you recognize that dialectic materialism is the philosophy that no idea is new, there is no hope, you're all machines, you're dogs to be kicked around by some holier-than-thou government which is, in itself, godless and that there's no further conscience than the conscience of some murderer sitting in a ruler's throne. Now, that is dialectic materialism and that is a shame. It's a shame for men to think this way. It's a shame for men to become animals.

And where this came in was the place where Christianity had been the most successful. Christianity had bled Russia to the last corpuscle. They were so monk-ridden and priest-ridden at every hand that nobody could turn without dropping a couple of quick rubles into the collection plate. They were so money-hungry and so extremely conscious of the sins of the world that they themselves never had time to be good. I'm sorry if this sounds blunt and I am not talking mildly and gently about it, but I am just trying to make a statement which is some shadow of the fact.

Must have been pretty awful for the Orthodox Church in Russia to have brought about a completely godless nation which absolutely rampages, goes mad right in front of your eyes at the moment that you try to show them the faith or soul or anything of the sort. It just goes mad.

I mean, right down here in Hyde Park, George Wichelow once asked of a crowd what they thought of religion. And there was a commie there and he just blew up and he says, "The dope of the people," you know. Well, maybe it is and maybe it isn't. Who cares about that?

Russia today keeps a bunch of Christians as trained apes to show foreign nations when they come in and say, "Look, we have religious freedom here." Curious, isn't it? Only they

don't have religious freedom there. Russia wouldn't stand for, on the main, any more Christian religion—should be fascinating. There is something bigoted has gone on here. There is something which has gone on here which evidently was not for the best of the most.

Something has gone on for two thousand years which did not entirely work to the benefit of Man. And that something did not work for the benefit of Man for the excellent reason that it did not follow its own tenets and ethics. And that's why Christianity has been bad for Man. It tried to make a slave out of him. It didn't keep on saying, "Thou shalt not kill." It didn't keep on saying, "Peace on Earth; goodwill to men." It didn't keep on saying, "Love thy neighbor"—a Buddhist doctrine which had drifted into the Middle East. It didn't keep on saying any of these things. It went out and made nothing out of any other sect that came up and fought mainly with Christians and not even vaguely with anyone else.

All right. If this was the conduct of a philosophy and the most powerful philosophy to date which the Western world has confronted and encountered—if this was the lot of that philosophy and if this was the lot of its organizations, then something was awfully wrong with the way the whole thing was hung together. And I would say there was some error in the basic structure of Christianity so great that we could learn a lesson from it written in words of atomic fission.

There *must* exist in a world a monitoring, civilizing influence! And if no civilizing influence exists in a society, it will sink to barbarism.

Perhaps something was trying to fulfill a role which it either didn't understand or didn't believe in. But certainly, the civilizing role of Christianity is fouled with the *autos-da-fé*. It's fouled with the Crusades. It's fouled with all the wars that have been fought amongst Christian nations. Its record is bad. Somehow or other it wasn't fulfilling this civilizing function, because war is something that makes a *beast* of Man. We know this.

Most of us have been there one way or the other. We've seen this. It makes an *animal*. It makes a human being that perhaps was raised in a gentle atmosphere—who perhaps would have given anything he had to anybody else to help them out, somebody who was in free concourse with Man—and makes him into such a fellow as I ran into once in a hospital: a chap who was awfully glad the fellow on the bed next to him was dead because now he could get his dinner which had been served just before the fellow died.

So therefore there's something here, something here I'm sure that we could learn. The first thing I would learn from all this would be the first thing that Christianity did to itself, and I'd learn from that not to do it: sect butchering sect.

We don't care whether the HASI is the banner that goes forward. This, after all, was put up that way because there were a great many squirrel organizations and any of them could call themselves anything in Dianetics and Scientology they wished and there was no way to nail down the name. So somebody persuaded me, at last, almost at the point of a gun, to put my name on it because it could be safeguarded, you see? Nobody would have the right to use my name, but they would have the right to use any of these other names.

And so we've cut back a great many pushes which were intended to do only one thing and that was to unmock the entirety of Dianetics and Scientology. So that's how we wound up with that name. And that's not particularly enjoyable to me or anybody else, but the name could be that or any other name.

But remember that we are people capable of certain agreements. We're capable of agreements with one another. We're capable also of disagreements with one another, but we only become capable of disagreements with one another when we have ceased to be capable of agreements.

7 Communication is the solvent of any problem or confusion. It's a terrific thing you should know, that communication is the solvent of any situation or confusion or enturbulation.

That is the solvent. It isn't sweetness and light. It isn't the amount of banana oil that can be poured on the troubled waters. It isn't the trickiness with which you can resolve the problem: why algebraic dihedrals, or something. It's communication. And it isn't communication when you've got bayonets, because the other terminal ceases to exist. But communication solves any problem.

And if you yourself are sufficiently adequate with communication, you should be able to obtain an agreement. You would only be able to fail in obtaining an agreement with communication if you did just one thing and that was—[speaking pompously] “have convictions of such magnitude that they could not be overthrown or forsworn, which could never at any time be monitored to meet a situation”—because you won't have communication then. The intention is all haywire. The intention goes bad. You see that?

The Christian stock in trade was *conviction*. I call that to your attention: his stock in trade was conviction. And every time somebody would get a little more and a little different conviction, he would go out of communication with all the rest of his fellows—all the rest of the sect. Here would be a little group and all of a sudden they'd have a conviction. That means a frozen intention. And this frozen intention, then, not being able to vary, would put them completely out of communication with any other part of Christianity because all *those* were frozen convictions.

So let's look at the mechanism of the frozen conviction and add up under it all the things we know and dislike about prejudice, all the things we dislike about intolerance and we will see at once why the Christian world went apart. It was founded on faith—only, the way it said “faith” was “conviction.” Do you see that? And where the faith itself became the communication intention, we, then, of course, had everybody going out of communication, one with another.

That it succeeded at all was because of just one thing and one thing only: It had a book. It had a book. It didn't pay too much attention to it. As years went along, it finally

collected seven or eight versions of it and threw them all together. But nevertheless, they had a common denominator and that's the only thing which kept them in conviction.

There's no comparison that's intended here on books. I'm just showing that a statement of goals roughly got them together and kept them in communication, one with another. But the statement was not very clear and had not been well agreed upon, one way or the other.

The Christian world, at any one time of turmoil inside of itself and within its own ranks, should simply have called people together and talked it all over and talked it all over until it was gone, you see? Talked it all over until we had a brand-new agreement on the situation. You see that? They should have beaten it out. If they had to sit there in Rome or some other place for two and a half years, if they had to sit there in Rome for two and a half years, they should have argued it all the way out. They should never have left their conclaves with bitterness and rancor in their hearts.

Because they did, they got splinter groups. And these splinter groups were protesting only one thing and one thing only: They were protesting an inability to communicate. And that's why you've got Methodism and Blankism and Xism. And that's why Homoiousianism and Homooousianism came into being in the first place: an inability to talk, one with another, and reach some sort of an agreement as to what was going forward and why it was going forward.

- 9 A great many policies were adopted in the Christian Church, not necessarily *adopted*, but *adapted to* the goals of one branch of it or another which were not necessarily good policies. And these, one after the other, were crammed down the throats of Christians.

I dare say the Christian tenet that, "We must all be ignorant," was not necessarily a good tenet for all of the people in Christianity and no one was ever consulted in it. And we didn't have a religious movement anymore. We had a fascism. And Christianity existed as a fascism from the earliest years and it became a big business under Alexander IV. It was

a big business, tremendously successful financially, and then got enormous numbers of splinter groups.

It has never been a potent force in the world. It has simply been the only force in the Western world which had a textbook on how to be civilized.

And apparently a bunch of boys without many brain cells to knock together got ahold of this textbook and says, "Let's make a racket out of it"—easy thing to do and they did it. And I don't think there's been a Christian Church all these years. Funny statement, isn't it? The funny part of it is, they have left a shell, an unfilled shell in the society that could be filled. And that's an oddity.

Oh, they've left a lousy reputation. The public thinks they're still around. If you believe they are still around, I invite you to take off a half an hour sometime and try to get a minister to minister to you. Just call up anyone in the phone book and tell them you want to be converted—you've suddenly gotten the faith and you're standing at the moment in Paddington Station. Hah, hah, hah.

Now, where the ministry, then, has erred is in not being the ministry—total statement. 10
And there are a great many conflicts and a great many arguments and a great deal of upset on the subject of religion because there hasn't been one.

A religion is perforce a method of worship and a civilizing influence having to do with the human spirit. And it isn't something to do with how many bank accounts we got. It hasn't got anything to do whatsoever with how many sides of the political pie can we cut. It hasn't anything to do at all about keeping a people in chains.

You see how a departure from its definition would bring about a chaos? If religion could have stayed the aloof, dedicated thing in which it was—with the details, the various tenets with which it was originally conceived—if it could have stayed that thing and if it could have stayed amongst its peoples in agreement with one of another, if it had

known a little bit more, if it had been a little less power-hungry and so on, you would have had two thousand years which would have been as smooth as a breeze.

You're looking at two thousand years of history—almost every bad point of which can be laid to the fact that when they first organized the church, they forgot to include God. They forgot to include Christ. It's not for nothing that they keep him at the end of those churches crucified, still. It's a joke on themselves they don't even know.

Let me ask you this: What is going to occupy that role in the society of maintaining the civilization of Man, of preventing his gradual descent into barbarism? What is going to occupy that position?

There is no organization on the face of Earth today possessed of sufficient information, of sufficient skills or with sufficient political disentanglements to even vaguely pose as that organization which can attend to Man's continued upgrade in civilization. There isn't one. It's a vacuum. It's like a body walking around with no thetan. It's a fabulous thing. Any moment one of the legs are going to fall off and there's nobody going to say, "Well, let's communicate with the leg and get it back on again." Now, this is an interesting thing. Who and what is going to occupy this position? Well, it's a position of very, very peculiar characteristics. And unless one understood its characteristics, he could never occupy the position.

A thetan who has no understanding or comprehension of exactly how to monitor a body and take care of it and get in and out of it and so forth doesn't stay behind it, he snaps into it. Let me call that to your attention.

So it tells you definitely that the Christian Church did not have enough know-how to keep from snapping into the body. And after it was organized and was all set, it snapped into the body. And although it kept going, its kept-goingness was on a MEST level and so we got it building huge edifices. That's a funny thing for a church to do, really, and yet we accept it as one of the primary things a church does. It builds a building.

Builds a building—what's it doing with all that mass of stone, huh? So it can interiorize into that, too? Or does it do the trick of interiorizing into the society? And the society doesn't like it very well so it has to put up those thick ramparts in order to keep the mob out. What's that all about?

Well, it's just that they evidently didn't have the know-how. Well, in the basic tenets of Christianity itself, it tells you they didn't have the know-how. First and foremost they didn't have the know-how. They kept sending people off to between-lives area, recruiting for it, see? when this is an odd thing to do, for a church to do.

Doesn't look to me like—trying to free anybody or send them to heaven. They kept talking about a specific heaven some place or another. They made everybody start looking for it and then the next thing you know, why, flip through the Gates of Mars, you know? I don't even think they knew it existed. See, they did some odd things, but it was just insufficient know-how.

They thought a man could go to hell, when a man *can* go to a body. See, these aren't scientific truths. They're just a bunch of stuff which people came along and then they took this stuff and they said, "Now, you'd better believe it and you'd better have a conviction on it and if you don't have a conviction on it, we have ways and means of fixing you up but good." Whether they said that in Latin or Greek or Spanish, they nevertheless said it: "You'd better believe."

Within the last couple of centuries, British seamen were being burned at the stake in Spain as well as imprisoned, grabbed off their ships and so forth. Guys much like the fellows that sail away from the ports of Britain now and they were—all this was done to them. Why? Because they wouldn't sign on the dotted line that Torquemada was the savior of Man or something. I don't know what they wanted them to believe, but if they didn't believe this, they were immediately guilty of a heresy. And an heresy was one thing of which we must not be guilty! And this was doubly difficult because nobody

could really define one. You read over these various texts on the subjects of heresy and you discover that it was awfully hard to find out *exactly* what a heresy was.

What, in essence, they intended it to be, "Believing differently than we do—except we don't completely define how we believe—we say, 'We are men of peace and that is why we kill.' So we're not really closely defining how we believe, but nevertheless *you're* guilty of an heresy," they would say to Bosun's Mate Jinks. "And therefore we gonna tack you up to that cross and we gonna put a match to you." And he didn't think this was quite the thing to do.

So the power of Spain went by the boards under the pounding of the guns of Nelson's fleet. Now, when I say, "the power of Spain," you probably are not remembering that Europe was a united affair. It was fighting France, according to the history books. It was fighting this and it was fighting that. The funny part of it was, it was fighting the totality of Europe—a totality of Europe. You've forgotten that as far back as 1525, Charles V had a united Europe. He was the Hitler of that day.

There was only one holdout and that was the British soldier and the British seaman—just one holdout. And they weren't holding out very hard, because they hadn't done a complete break with this insanity called Christianity. All right.

The world to a large degree has been held in a civilized state and a civilization has been improved by a very few peoples—there have been a few peoples. There have been peoples actually fulfilling their destiny in this direction and filling the role of keeping things pretty well civilized so that you didn't walk down the street and get shot, you know, just because somebody felt like shooting you. And you didn't land in jail just because somebody thought you had dirty fingernails.

And the oddity is that England itself has sort of been a country three feet in back of the continent's head, you know? Lord knows what Europe would have gone to if it hadn't had that damn, dumb bunch of bums that are up there on that island. And we

can all get into beautiful agreement that we all should die and then the next thing you know, they don't like it.

In other words, the least religious nation in the Western hemisphere today, oddly enough, has probably been the one most principally responsible for a continued European civilization. I think we'll agree to that rather easily—not any balm to the British pride or anything of the sort. It just seems to be kind of that way. No big stiff rising up and saying, “Well now, he rules the world,” (meaning by that, Europe) has been able to get away with it. It just seems to strike a discordant note in the Briton's character. He just doesn't quite like this idea for some reason or another, see? It's not something he enjoys.

So European civilization, one way or the other, has kept rocking along. It hasn't gone completely into the dungeon. It's been through many vicissitudes. But there have been civilizing influences around in the last two thousand years. But I don't know that very many of them have been Christian. It may have been just the decency of Man and maybe you, a thetan, working what you could and doing what you could, has been able to restrain the descent into the maelstrom.

You see, we have a number of factors here which could have restrained this, but there has certainly been no real Christian world, because it's been divided and fighting with itself. Its convictions are fixed. It has no real intention. Its goals are not agreed upon and so very little could be done.

Well, it tells us a great deal. It tells us a great deal looking at this picture. It tells us that the Christian was so definitely sold on the idea that he must be a Christian that Christianity itself assumed an identity. It assumed an advertised identity before the public eye and therefore became a body. Didn't then stay three feet back of the society's head, did it? A monk said, “I am a monk,” and—the fool—believed it.

So that an organization seeking to assist the civilization of the world today (not to handle and control it, but to bring it up into better communication and bring it up into

a better game, keep it from going by the boards and dropping out the bottom), rather has a plan cut out for it. It's a plan that's cut out for it on agreement on the track. I mean, it's a native basic agreement and that is that you're just fine as long as you're three feet back of the body's head and not particularly known to the body—known to yourself in your own elements, but not particularly known to the body—and perfectly willing to call yourself by the body's name and answer up to it. See? I mean it's all laid out. There's the pattern.

- 12 Now, a thetan is evidently without any compulsion to interiorize unless he decides to lay a hand in anger upon a body. That's the one thing he evidently mustn't do.

Lacking Scientology techniques, he can't get away with it. It's one of the things he does, is go inside—too little ARC. The ARC is so slight in such a regard that he is no longer able to push himself out. He says, "It's force. It's force that keeps me away from that body." No, it's not. It's ARC—a rather high echelon—the ability to postulate yourself from one place to another.

But there yet is a body and a system extant. A body, you understand, which is extant, which has been built, which breathes and functions all the way across the boards. There's a body and the thetan comes along and he says, "I'll take its identity. My name is now Joe. How are you, Bill?" Get the idea?

Until he lays a hand on that body in anger, he stays outside of it. He can do almost anything with it he wants to until he gets mad at it and starts to cut it to pieces.

And there isn't a person who is enforcedly interiorized who has *not* laid a hand on a body in anger. And that's why he's inside one! He's tried to handle them with force and in attempting to handle them with force, he didn't handle them at all because force never handled anything.

Things are handled by communication, by a good concept of reality and by good affinity. That's how things are handled. They're not handled by force. They never will be.

Well, supposing we looked around the society and we found some bodies that weren't occupied organizationally. That would be an interesting thing, wouldn't it? Providing we never forgot we were Scientologists ourselves, providing we never forgot any one moment what we were and what we were doing, and providing we never laid a hand in anger on the extant body we would occupy, we could occupy any body in the society we wished to occupy. And I'm talking now about organizations. Just as it's true on the First Dynamic, so could it be true on the Third Dynamic.

And let's look at, for instance, religion—sits there as a shell; it's a *shell*. It has certain definite intentions, it says. It has certain names. It has all kinds of things, but it is a body evidently without a thetan. The guy that's supposed to be three feet back of *one* of its organizational heads, for instance, knows or likes bodies so poorly that he keeps getting pneumonia and myopia and all kinds of things. I mean, this is a body at work, see? It's an organization, but it's a body.

Now, here we have, then, an actually habitable, usable body in the society which is already known. And although it's been getting a bad name for itself for two thousand years, it is not particularly in bad odor. And even if it were in bad odor, it isn't in such bad odor that that odor couldn't be improved considerably—practically up to at least a tiara of roses—from monk, unwashed, two years.

Now there, for instance, is an example of what I mean by letting the society find the auditor. A society will inevitably look around for a mass. "What is the auditor?" The society asks this question. It acts just—when you speak of a Scientologist—acts just like a body looking around thinking a thetan is batting at it. It can't see the thetan and it's very confused. And it says, "What is a Scientologist? Is he a medical doctor? Is he a

psychologist? Is he a psychiatrist? Is he a person who does education? Is he a quack? Is he a bum? Is he a guy who sells books? Just what is he? I don't know what he is."

Well, they never are going to know. That's what you guys got to accept. Until you stop banging your head against that particular unknown and give them a satisfactory answer to fit the moment, you always are going to find yourself unknown as an auditor. Quite interesting, isn't it? Very fascinating. The society will just keep looking around and saying, "Well, what is a Scientologist? What is a Scientologist? Where's that thetan? Where's that . . . ?" Where is . . . ? See?

Because by the very textual material of Scientology, you start to talk about Scientology, you very often get booted so that—you know, people say, "Nah! Ah, it doesn't seem right to me, you know." Argue, argue, argue. Why do they say this?

You're asking them to conceive a static. You're saying, "Well now, here you are, Mr. Low-Tone. Here you are, Mr. Low-Tone. Why don't you do this process?" This is what you're doing—you're talking to him about the basic tenets of Scientology. "Why don't you conceive this process, now—do this process: "Conceive a static." "Okay? That's good." "Now conceive another static." "Okay. That's fine."

You know, they haven't had any Opening Procedure. They don't know an auditor is present. They don't know a session is in progress and you say, "All right. Now conceive a static." "Well, that's fine." "Now conceive another static." "That's swell." "Now conceive another static." Of course, the way you're doing this is you're saying, "Well, it's a funny thing, but you actually are a spirit and you're doing this and you're doing that and life runs this way and it runs that way according to Scientology and it's all very interesting."

What you're doing, in essence, as far as effect is concerned, is saying "Conceive a static." "Conceive a static." And if you look up R2-40 in *Creation of Human Ability*, it says,

"A very heavy process; not to be lightly run," or words to that effect, you know. Don't run it on a low-tone case. *Zzzz!* Practically kills him!

It's the surest way to "murder" anybody I know of. If you really wanted to "murder" the society, if you really wanted to upset it and enturbulate it and confuse it, you would simply run this process on the society continually. You'd say, "Look-a-here, conceive a static." "That's fine." "Conceive a static." "That's fine." "Conceive a static." "Look, it doesn't have any identity, particularly, except we have put a name to it, but that name is not known, really, but why don't you conceive a static."

And a person who is fairly low on the scale actually starts losing mass to such a degree that he gets sick. I could practically "kill" somebody with this process. I'm not joking now—practically "kill" somebody with this process.

Well, are you so mad at the society, you're going to kill it? Are you in such a towering rage about the society at large in its individual parts and its collective whole and feel so hopeless about it that all you want to do is kill it? Well, if that is the fact, then you just keep on saying to it, "Conceive a static." "Conceive a static." "Conceive a static."

No. There are other things you could say to it—other things you could say to it. You could say, "I am an identity." You get the idea? "I am an identity."

Now, you would only cease to be a Scientologist and become that identity if you yourself did not stay in good communication with yourselves. To drop out entirely—to drop so far that you jump across a gap of communication means there's, again, nobody three feet back of the body's head. There's no organization three feet back of the society's head.

Here's an example: A bunch of guys find out they have tremendous success. They're—all of a sudden have decided they're going to be ministers. And they have a church and it looks just like a church and everything is going along fine. And they suddenly start

getting the congregations of the Methodists and Baptists and the MEST starts rolling in, see? And then they say, "Well, the dickens with the main organization and all. I mean, we don't need that. Look! We're rich!"

Oh, no they're not! Every single gold piece that rolls into that coffer makes a pauper out of them. Every single building that goes and fits itself around their skulls traps them. And yet, being men, they will often make this mistake: They'll say, "Look-a-here, we don't need any other Scientologists; we got it all corralled. It's all over here in the corner and we're just in fine shape now and we're getting cash in and we're getting this in and we're getting that in. We got all the preclears nailed down. We got these cong—" Oh man, see? They just committed suicide.

Now, to those people you should show a static. Follow me? That is the most you should do to them. Simply show them a static—good communication, good reality and good affinity. Reality depends on an exact recognition of what is going on and affinity depends on talking pleasantly about it, see?

But simply by talking about it, I think, they'd come off the pitch. They would learn in a relatively short space of time that every single gold piece that rolls in pins them down more (unless they roll it out again in a hurry), that every building they inhabit is just like getting inside a head. And if they're in it long enough, they'll stick. And they will lose their mobility and society will lose its static.

14 Now, we actually are building a world of broken straws—we are. We have a world today which could do some interesting things. It's all very well for a fellow to read in his newspaper and say, "Well, it'll all be all right and it's none of my responsibility." All right.

Maybe it isn't any of your responsibility. But if it's not your responsibility, then please, answer me this one question. You don't have to answer this question, but I will state it: What planet are you going to go to, to set things up on? You don't have to answer

that question, but it's one that you better have the answer to if you say you have no responsibility for this ball of mud.

You got a planet all picked out, you got a civilization all spotted and you've got yourself all set up so that you—when this one goes *splot*—you will be able then to pick up and go on very nicely with that. Or if you're through with this universe, you, of course, have a universe, I'm sure, all spotted, picked out, mapped and surveyed that you're going to pop into when this one goes by the boards. Do I make my point?

Audience: Yes.

It's a very funny thing, but all of us—particularly us—have a tremendous interest today in the affairs of this dot of mud and it's the affairs of the East and the affairs of the West. And we look at these characters in the positions of state and we realize we're not in any positions of state—we have no such identity with which to work.

And we look at these people and they're getting ill at the thought of trying to cope with this problem. It's so far beyond them as a problem that it's sickening them. And that is a fact since one of them today is very near death just trying to cope with this problem—he can't do it. Nobody is going to do it out of a fulsomeness of tremendous identity—only a thetan picking up a body, whatever that body is.

Picking up a body for an identity and using it, such as an organization, such as—I'm not offering you or insisting anything upon religion, I'm just using it as an example—picking up something and talking with it as an identity. I don't mean pick up an already inhabited body, but by calling yourself a minister, by doing this, by doing that, by putting an identity which *exists* already upon yourself, you will be able to speak into this world.

Or you could create a brand-new identity. You could always create a brand-new identity or take an existing one and you still could talk, because the funny part of it is, is you have in your hands today the exact weapons necessary to resolve the conflicts of Man on an international level. You have those weapons.

Do you realize that all you would have to do would be to communicate between the two contending countries which are most antipathetic toward each other today? Just communicate between them, facilitate the communication between them—in order to bring it about—a condition of *impossibility* for them to war with each other? Do you know that you could show to either one, those intentions in the other most native to the first, you see? We would show country A that B had many intentions similar to A's and we would show B that A had many intentions similar to B and we would keep that communication going.

If we did very much of that, we would unmock the intervening boundaries, see, if people would just pull off the border guards. You don't have to make them talk the same language, but they must understand the same things and they must be in communication, one with another.

You will find Man has very, very good intentions. But Man's good intentions are blunted with the hearsay-via "fact" that everybody "knows" he has bad intentions.

- 15 We know things in Scientology which can solve a lot of the situation. And if you don't have a planet all picked out that you're going to, then I bring to your attention that you, personally, as a being, as well as a Scientologist and a member of an organization have a vested interest in keeping this sphere spinning nicely and neatly on its axis—not in the spinbin or forevermore.

Now, where we err is in believing that somebody is going to do something about it. I assure you, if you can't name the person at once who is doing the effective thing about it, then you can assume that nobody has any responsibility for it. And it's just sort of wandering along on a group feeling that, "Well, it's all cared for." Listen, World War I was all cared for and then it happened. And World War II was all cared for and then it happened.

All right. As far as the state of the organization is concerned, this organization of Scientologists will be as successful as it communicates, one with another—and not necessarily into a central office—but as successful as it communicates, one with another about its problems and antipathies and demonstrates these into a reality and says what's going on and discusses it and keeps together, you might say, as an *understanding*.

And as long as it doesn't particularly advertise itself in the society or not advertise—either one—as long as it doesn't try to get up in big signposts all the time, but is willing and competent to take any existing identification, identity or mock-up—or make any identity or mock-up necessary to get into communication and stay into communication amongst the society, then the society will never get nervous about the organization. The organization will never get nervous with itself.

The thing that you have closest in terms of convictions and beliefs are the fact that certain basic Axioms are functional when applied to the mind. And these aren't really convictions because they've never been imparted to you as convictions. You can change your mind about any one of them the moment that you discover it is in error or doesn't apply.

So there is no barrier in Scientology to good communication. There are no fixed convictions across the boards, one way or the other. The only thing you're invited to do is just, please, understand what is going on. Don't make a wild guess at it and a fixed conviction and jump down somebody's throat.

I have, time after time, restrained the organization and parts of the organization from trying to unmock Scientologists and, just yesterday, restored the certificates of a fellow who's evidently been quite wronged by another organizational member in Australia. Why? They've both got good intentions. I sent them cables and told them to talk. It'll all work out.

27 OCTOBER 1955

There is no organizational trouble we can't solve. But there is a world situation that will remain unsolved right down to the last whimper unless we stay together, work together and do something about it.

Thank you.



THE ANATOMY OF TERMINALS

LECTURE 38

A LECTURE GIVEN ON 28 OCTOBER 1955

55 MINUTES

The materials of processing are important materials to the auditor. They are as good as they are understood, they are as good as their goals are understood and they are as workable as they are used with understanding. 2

It is very well to have a mechanical process which produces certain definite results with an individual. To a large degree, and an astonishing degree, the mechanisms of Scientology will produce, at this time, a result with an individual even when carried forward mechanically without much understanding.

However, the best part of Man is that part of Man which understands; the worst part of Man is that part of Man which won't understand. A psychosomatic illness is something that won't understand. If Man has a psychosomatic illness in his leg of some kind or another, remember that it is the illness that doesn't understand, not the leg.

We can throw communication at the area. We are, actually, more likely to unmock the leg than we are to unmock the illness. Why? The leg understands; the illness does not understand.

This should be very observable to you: that body parts disappear under the onslaught of psychosomatics and diseases. The individual, in trying to communicate with the disease, communicates with that which is more native to him and in closer agreement with him and with the body in general—which is the body part. He communicates with the body part and compounds or creates or carries forward the progress of the disease. This is an interesting principle. If you see this principle clearly, you will see a great deal about illness and its inability to surrender.

- 3 Let us say that we have an infection eating away at a person. This infection is foreign to the individual. It is caused by bacteria which are not in the frame of reference of the individual at all. Bacteria is insidious. It is so tiny that it is almost like a thetan and can be very easily, reactively confused with the progress of a thetan. It seems to have individuality, it seems to have a number of characteristics which are native to life itself and which seem to be more pertinent and more interesting than the actual body.

An individual seeking to communicate with this disease, as it touches some part of his body, discovers something very interesting if he cares to discover it. He unmocks the body just ahead of the disease and so accelerates its progress.

Remember communication as-is. That part of the anatomy will as-is which is more native to the individual. Therefore, the individual, in seeking to communicate with the pain of the disease, actually, too many times, communicates with the body itself just ahead of the disease and so unmocks the body at that point and permits the disease to make further progress. Look at that for a moment and I think you will understand a great deal more about healing.

If you understand healing, you will have understood one of the many things which Scientology could assist to clarify. If we conceive Man at large as something which is resisting the incursion of things antipathetic to Man, we will discover something quite interesting: that, if we insist on communicating into the area which is being hit and insist

only on communicating into that area hit or miss, willy-nilly, we will all too often only unmock that part of Man which is the front against the evil at that area. You see this?

Male voice: Yes, Sir.

The conduct of a general, when a battle is engaged, is fortunately inhibited by the fact that the battle itself cuts many communication lines.

One time, the chief of a squadron of bombers, very early in the war, at an outpost, was under duress to do this and to do that and to do something else—orders, orders, orders (not really communication)—orders, orders, orders, to do this, to do that, to send out a bunch more planes into an impossible place and to do this and to do that with them, so on. In order to get the war fought, this man piled a great many five-gallon cans of gasoline underneath his radio tower and set them off and destroyed his communication with central command.

He was doing what he could. He was doing a great deal with a very little. And the interference he was getting in the conduct of his job was so tremendous that he himself was being unmocked faster by the high command than by the enemy.

I myself, in the following months, was in the North Atlantic. And it was the practice every time some corvette officer or squadron leader sneezed for the high command to throw him out of command, pull him off the job, change officers. And when they finally got in a bunch of stuffed shirts, then the submarines really had a picnic.

What was this high command doing? It was unmocking the point of contact as the easiest point to communicate when the high command really thought it was trying to unmock the enemy. Do you see this? It was so easy to pull off the CO of a corvette or a squadron leader. It was so easy, because things weren't going exactly right, to knock out your own forces and to leave the enemy intact.

You see that as an insidious thing: high command sitting in a very safe locale, unable to influence the situation at all except through the communication lines to his

own people. No admiral or general there had his hands on a single gun, they didn't have any broad understanding of the situation. We even received dispatches which were fascinating—fascinating dispatches. As close as they came to contacting the enemy was issuing a Navy Department directive to the effect that submarines could not travel faster than eight knots under water—and we clocked them continually at sixteen and a half knots and reported the matter. But the submarines, unfortunately, did not receive that directive. We did.

Now, when we speak of communication, we must then speak of communication into the area of enturbulence, not to those things which we have the closest contact with. Sounds odd, doesn't it? But here we have an intimate problem which is easily seen on the First Dynamic in relationship to disease. The individual keeps contacting the point of infection and he keeps unmocking his own troops. He is compulsively and obsessively doing this. You understand?

He is putting his attention on that area and making it painful, and that pain and the electronic surges which are coming away from that pain are actually eroding and corroding the area in its vicinity. One of the things you can do is take his attention off of it entirely and leave the troops in the area—the cells—to combat the thing as best they can. You follow me? Might be kind of a new look to you, but it's actually the exact anatomy of how to communicate wrongly.

- 5 Now, individuals are always communicating wrongly. In comes a force, they brace their attention against this force and they lock it right there in place. And when they've compounded these bracings time after time, time after time, they, of course, have a ridge which carries in that ridge the pattern of the infection which was attacking at that time. And so we get a continuation of the illness.

Predisposition, actual attack (precipitation) and continuation (perpetuation) is the course of disease on a psychosomatic level—predisposition, precipitation, perpetuation. And how

is this done? Predisposition of the individual has considered and conceived a weakness in that area. You have that? He's conceived a weakness in that area. Precipitation is the actual contact of some hostile and alien force or entity in that area. Perpetuation: *his* activity in continuing to *resist* that force by communicating with his own most communicable point in the area and continuing to avoid the hostile ingress, which is now there in picture form. This is the cycle of a psychosomatic illness. This is the cycle of an illness in a society. This is a cycle of an illness on any of the dynamics.

Individual conceives a weakness and prepares to do something about it and braces people up about it and they get afraid, one way or the other. And all of a sudden something rises up and hits that area and then the society at large begins to resist that area at that point and all they do is unmock their own troops.

Why? It's because they have conceived the idea of a hostile force. That's the totality of the rationale. You could say their tolerance for action, motion or motionlessness has dropped to a point where they can consider something to be another identity. Do we follow this? In other words, their pan-determinism has dropped. As long as pan-determinism, to some degree, is capable of an understanding of an hostile force, that hostile force is being communicated with. When the hostile force to the organism is thoroughly understood, it is as easily communicated with as the troops at the point. And if an individual in command of anything had sufficient pan-determinism, all he would have to do is take enough understanding of the enemy itself, and enough determinism of the enemy itself, to stop the war. And the war would stop.

It is only a nation's continuance of orders to resist at certain points and along certain fronts which continues a war. The nation itself does not conceive that the best point of contact is the other point which is enforcing the force upon its own troops. The rightful line of conduct of a nation is for that nation to continue in communication with the head of the hostile nation and leave the troops out of it.

This was conceived in World War I to such a degree that, amongst British and American soldiers, a series of beautiful mock-ups were in circulation. They had this wonderful idea of how to finish the war. They were going to take their generals and the enemy generals and put them all in an arena—with the soldiers scattered through the stands—and give those two generals, dressed in loincloths, a couple of clubs. And the ones that won—that would have been the one that won.

They kept talking about this longingly. Actually, they weren't looking quite high enough. The governments involved should have stayed in communication with the heads of the governments involved and so the war would have been over.

There was a fellow one time who, according to German militarists—this is a very, very wonderful thing—I mean, the German militarist is the *very, very best* in the world. You understand this. You know this. The German militarist has *no peer* as a militarist. He has no peer whatsoever, there is none better. He says so himself. It must be true. And there's only one slight flaw in his militarism. He never wins wars. But of course, this is beside the point—he's a fine militarist though. But I am afraid that a fine militarist *never* wins wars. I think that's his fate—to never win. And so he keeps on being a militarist and makes a berth in the society for militarism. All right.

We get this interesting picture of the very fine militarist in Germany holding this odd belief: that a fellow by the name of Alexander, known still in India as Iskander of the Two Horns—women in India still frighten their babies to bed and to sleep by saying that Iskander of the Two Horns will get them. Well, nobody has really researched into who Iskander is, but it is Alexander—Alexander the Great, three hundred and something B.C. And they have said, these German militarists, that this man was no tactician, he was no strategist. He simply won all the battles he ever fought, but he was not a tactician or a strategist. It must have been the fine generals that were trained for him by Philip, his father, that brought him into this point of victory. No, I'm afraid that Alexander would

not be understood by the German militarist, because Alexander kept winning and the German militarist never has and never will win.

Alexander, I bring up here, has only one point of great interest for us. He never avoided or fell away from the theory that the best way to end a battle was to conceive that the battle was between himself and the enemy commander. He never conceived that it was between his troops and the enemy troops under his direction.

Now, do you see that that would be a via which would make a battle unwinnable—for a general to conceive that the battle was being fought by his troops under his direction against the enemy troops, you see? There's no point of end, then, in that battle at all. But Alexander never had this idea. He simply had the idea, rather bullheaded, that the thing to do, if his troops were engaged in action, was to immediately seek out the enemy general and kill him or capture him at once. And so some million and a quarter Persians—some such number—Persians were confronting a rather small handful of trained Greeks under Alexander's command and Alexander with his Companion Cavalry simply rode through the contesting lines and rode through the bodyguard of the enemy general and put Darius to flight. And that was the end of that battle. It stopped at once. That was also the end of the Persian empire. Bang! Sudden. Quick. Effective!

Now, Alexander was evidently no slouch about this sort of thing, because he made immediate political peace with the Persians by marrying all of Darius' wives. This man was no slouch. He had tremendous instincts. His pan-determinism was very great. We don't know whether Alexander really intended to rule the world or not, but he certainly did intend to do something. You know, he intended to have action and he intended that he should remain in the action—he intended this. It was only the eventual failure of his troops to walk that far that kept him from going all the way around, I guess, or we probably would have had a Greek government in Central America, because *he* wasn't getting tired.

Now, maybe the troops were upset because he never let them fight long enough. The turning point in his career, by the way, is he and two other soldiers captured a town by having somebody in the deepest India—by having himself and a couple of other soldiers thrown over the wall. And he landed in the midst of the hostile soldiery and opened the gates from within and that was that. And they captured the town. His troops, by this time, felt pretty bad. He was kind of cut up a little bit and they took advantage of him and decided they'd all go home. And they went home to something that was not very beloved by Alexander, which was total political factionalism. He was obviously a good soldier. He won wars—but he might have had many other drawbacks.

Nevertheless, when we speak of disease and so forth, it would be very interesting to look at that pattern of strategy. He never bothered around where the pain was pressing against the body. See, he would immediately attack the hostile force itself. In other words, he did not continue to communicate with the point of pain. Very important! Because continued communication with the point of pain simply unmocks your own troops at that point à la the Northeast Sea Frontier Command of early antisubmarine warfare days in the Atlantic and as per any other military situation—like the bomber captain that finally blows up his radio tower so he can get a war fought.

Nobody in this last war, evidently, ever thought of getting into close communication or in trying to communicate thoroughly with the enemy powers involved. I don't think a war could have existed if we'd really gone into communication as governments with the governments involved in the thing. People would say, "Well, you couldn't do business with Hitler." Well, that's true enough. But they were saying at the same time, you couldn't talk to him. That's kind of a fatal statement, isn't it?

I think the man could be talked to—I think he could've been talked to. I think any swami with the right-sized turban could have walked in and unswamied him from his whole empire—I mean, the man was a punk. See, I mean—just nobody tried. All right.

Where you have an hostile force confronting you which is liable to overwhelm you and you feel that this is a battle you cannot afford—completely aside from the game—the place to be is three feet back of the enemy's head, changing his mind.

Well, we say, "This thing called disease has no head. How can you be three feet back of it? How do you know that? How are you so sure of that?"

No, I'm afraid the efficient thing to do is done by preventive medicine which goes out and puts—very efficient—goes out and damps out the ingress of the germ itself. It prevents the epidemic from spreading; it takes the rats off the ships and doesn't let them bring in bubonic plague. You see, that's a very, very forward look at the thing.

Now, we evidently have open to us, to be explored, this interesting fact: that it may be that there is a head three feet to get in back of, for diseases of one kind or another.

Now, I have run some experiments on this and they are fascinating experiments; they belong in Para-Scientology.

Had a fellow one time that was very sick from bad fish. So I went and contacted the spirit of all fish and found out that he loved bad fish, because people who ate fish then got sick. And we ran out the rancor by the person who had eaten the bad fish (ran out the rancor of the spirit of fish, the spirit of herring it was) toward him, and his stomach got well, immediately.

That's curiosa isn't it—almost mystic mumbo jumbo. Maybe it is and maybe it isn't. But I'm just showing you there, there's a door open for exploration into a field which hasn't been well looked at. Instead of making a big political issue out of chalk or palk or malk polio vaccine, maybe somebody ought to try to find the head to get three feet in back of that creates this thing called polio, see? There might be such things.

Experimentally there is, evidently, such a thing as the spirit of man, the spirit of woman. These, evidently, to some slight degree, can be contacted by individuals. There seem to be some communication lines here. But let me show you the fact that a nation at war

does not really believe that it is possible to communicate with the nation's head with which it is at war.

You see, nations at war have the same idea that we have with relationship to disease. There may be no head to get three feet in back of, you see? Some mild effort is made by the heads of nations now and then, misguidedly, to get into better communication during war and they have parleys and all kinds of things and conferences. But usually, these conferences are to be found at a low level. They're at the level of contending troops and there—very seldom in history has there been a conference between the heads of nations which are actively at war. They even break off their diplomatic relations. That's the *last* thing they ought to do.

If the Laplanders were to suddenly declare war on any nation I had anything to do with, I would insist that its embassy be immediately invested and posted and that the Lapland ambassador be retained at his post. I would just insist on this. I wouldn't let him out of there alive. I'd insist that he had a good solid telephone line and a good cable system that went right straight through to the head of the Lapland Government and we would start keeping it busy and we'd keep it real busy and I think the war would probably unmock.

But the style used is the same style used by the individual combating disease. What we do is give the ambassador his passports and tell him to shove off. The last thing we should do is cut the communication line to the head, or other control, of the disturbance.

Well, actually, we have fought through this so often and we have so seldom discovered the head of the contending force that we, 90 percent of the time, believe that it is not to be located and we merely speculate on it on a figure-figure basis. We don't actively go out and look for it.

Now the oddity is, today we have a process which locates it. And if it exists, it exists, and if it doesn't exist, it doesn't exist.

This process, sooner or later, would tell us where it was, what it was, that headed up the forces behind a disease, that headed up the forces behind a nation—what were the actual central communication points of the contender. There is such a process.

In the national level, we'd get some fairly able preclear and we'd keep telling him, "Now what don't you know . . . ?" or "Tell me something you can not-know about the head of the Lapland nation." And we would just plow right up the line through that unknowingness until we had it and that would be the end of that war.

I wonder if the same type of exploration could not be conducted against some of the diseases which make human life rather miserable, because let me assure you that a disease is not really any great asset.

Disease was so bad a few decades ago—it's almost that bad now—but it was so bad a few decades ago that we find most of the mock-ups knocking off about the time they started to get in stride. Very young! We go up to some of these old cemeteries and we find some of the tombstones and we look through these tombstones, why, we find—if we add up the dates on them—we find he was dead at twenty-six and somebody else was dead at twenty-eight and so on. It's quite interesting. And you figure out what you did between the times you were twenty-eight and thirty-five, you'll see there was quite a little span of livingness there that was very interesting and was kind of young livingness too, you know? Of course, none of the ladies present will be able to do that. [laughter]

But the difficulty of disease is that it makes this game with bodies almost unplayable—almost unplayable. And we've lived with that fact for so long, so constantly, that we avoid it. And we say, "Well, death is inevitable. It's all inevitable." People are beginning to think that about A- and H-bombs. "A- and H-bombs are inevitable. We all die." Got a real apathy going on this subject of disease.

But you would be utterly flabbergasted to realize what a role illness plays in human energy and activity as a suppression of the immediate game. It's a fantastically large role!

Here are these bodies trying to walk forward against hostile forces, which forces are not playing the same game that the bodies are playing. You see, this is one of these weirdies.

Those people who, with considerable heroism, have confronted up this enemy, have usually fought pretty much alone. Their organizations are not large. They do not occupy a great deal of Man's interest or attention, mainly because Man conceives the whole problem to be kind of unsolvable anyhow. There isn't really—nothing much can be done about it.

Half the time he'd just as soon lie in bed as call for a healer because he feels apathetic about it. You know, he'd just as soon lie there—he'd get well anyhow—no reason to send for a doctor. He could be well in twenty-four hours. He's very surprised sometimes to find out that he—with a little assistance on the line, why, he recovers rather rapidly. But this is quite a thing: the tiredness which comes over people, the accumulation of various attitudes toward others, the feeling that you mustn't let somebody breathe on you—just that, that you mustn't be touched by somebody else. All of these things really stem from disease.

- 10 It's the communication breaker and it's the principal communication breaker in this society. They used to talk about the Four Horsemen—Four Horsemen. And of those Four Horsemen, the two that are most important in a society—that break down communications and, therefore, the society itself—are of course, disease and war. And these two things are real *bad* communication breakers.

We see national governments going out of communication with their people today on the basis of security. They don't even know what security is. I asked a security officer one day, I said, "Define security." (Dirty trick on my part to take a Level Three process, you know, and just chuck it at him.) I said, "Define security for me." And he said, "*Herr-hum,*" yap-yap, nonsense, junk, via and so on. I left him in complete apathy; I'd just unmocked his whole game. He was a security officer. He was supposed to be in charge of the security

of a very important government department and he didn't know what it was and he had never known that he didn't know. All he thought you did was make sure that nobody present had been members of this antipathetic or subversive organization or not. He thought that was what you did and that was that and that was his job. As a consequence, of course, there was no security.

Security is an effort to safeguard the future for an individual or group. It's an activity or an effort for the goal of safeguarding the future for an individual or group—that's what security is. But it's interpreted today to mean a cut communication line. You cut all lines, you have security.

My, my, that's a succumb vector. If you cut all lines, you have death. And the goal of security is supposedly, life. Fascinating how we could get a reverse on this.

Government departments start falling out of communication with each other because of security—this is security and that is security. What security means to them is a cut communication. It means a classification. It says, "top secret, secret, confidential, restricted, can be read only by the maids in this corridor" sort of thing, you know? But the odd part of it is, is that's *intradepartmentally*. But *interdepartmentally*, we have another thing entirely. We have the department itself unable to maintain communication with itself because its security lines are so rigid. There, they can enforce them because they are all in good communication, you see? So they can enforce the communication. You get the idea?

So the communication—the last communication that it gets enforced is absolute security. 11
After that there's no communication. We have silence.

But remember, from a standpoint of communication, we can always enforce a little less communication. It's hard to enforce *more* communication. And that's the anatomy of a dwindling spiral. You get this?

We conceive a department head of the Biscuit Examination Service—an important government department, something called the Biscuit Examination Service. And we

have the head of this department saying to the remainder of the department, you know, "No further messages on the subject of red biscuits will be circulated."

So they say, "Okay, no further messages on the subject of red biscuits. That's an easy one." And they all receive this, you know?

Now the next one, he says, "No further messages on the subject of yellow biscuits will be circulated."

And they say, "Well, that's a little bit harder to do because yellow biscuits—there are quite a lot of yellow biscuits around." And then, all gets enforced. You see, he was able to enforce it. Why? He still had a communication line, didn't he?

Now, he says, "Now, no further communication about various colored biscuits will be circulated."

Everybody says, "All right."

And then he finally says, "No further information about biscuits will be circulated."

Information cannot be forwarded through the department—it's got the word *biscuits* in it. You follow me? That order isn't even received, is it? And this is the exact anatomy of cutting communication.

One is always able to cut a communication line which exists. But once having cut it, it has not been so easy to build a new communication line to uncut it. So cut communication lines do not get uncut, because there's no communication line there by which to uncut them. You finally get this idiocy, huh? It's a fantastic thing.

But when a government starts to say, "Security is the process of cutting communications and selecting out personnel from the organization," they are then cutting communication lines and they are gradually leaving less and less communication lines with which to finally mock-up new communication lines. And they finally go down the drain all the way. Any order, which comes from the chief of the bureau, is considered immediately top secret and there's only one person in the bureau who is permitted to read a top

secret message and that is the chief of the bureau. You know this situation actually exists throughout governments? It's a real situation.

One of the very important organizations in the United States has enforced security to such an extent that it is now having fantastic difficulties in trying to get through any orders to its personnel in some areas and has left personnel in some areas without orders for two and a half years—no existing communication line by which to build a communication line. The difficulty is getting a communication line going. After that, it's easy.

You get a communication line going and then you say more and more things will be communicated on the line and you can communicate more and more things on the line. You're building a communication line. Well now, our job is to understand how communication lines are cut and to understand how you build them.

Now, if the communication lines to disease have been cut, as they obviously have been, to a point where there's no further cognition or understanding with those things—the origin points of disease—then how could we go about building a new communication line. The pain and violence of disease, all by itself, is sufficient to cut the communication lines. But maybe the pain and violence of the disease is merely a physical manifestation of cut communication lines? And so how do you build a new line? 12

Now, when you're working with an individual, you're also working with the entire society. That's fantastically true: you work with an individual, you're working with the entire society. That doesn't mean, if you made one person superlatively Clear, you would have cleared the whole society—you don't get that idea, see? But you're working with this individual and he's on the communication lines of the society and the communication lines of the society are cut in some way. So you clear him all the way up on the First Dynamic and you find him cut to pieces on the Third. Well, you can't make a whole individual, then, can you? He comes up just so far and then *glumn*. Hm?

So, therefore, your interest has to be a Third Dynamic interest. You have no other choice. If you're going to achieve the goals for yourself or others, you have no choice but to assume that the Third Dynamic must be included. And because the Third Dynamic can be cut to pieces by atomic fission (which was originally thought of as giving Man more power than he had before and is now the source of most of his cut communication lines in governments), you can't stop being interested on the Third Dynamic. You've got to be interested on the Fourth.

See, if you start stringing communication lines, you've got to string them on eight dynamics, unfortunately, or you will never make an entirely whole individual anywhere and you will never, yourself, be entirely whole as far as your ability to communicate is concerned.

Now, you say, "Is there any finite goal in processing at all or do you just get processed forever?" Well, I suppose, if you just ran on mechanical processes, I guess that you could get processed forever. Processed with some understanding of where you're going and what you're doing, there's a finite end to it. You might say, "The infinity of the finite end of the Eighth Dynamic"—universes. You go across and be able to disagree with and agree with other universes.

By the way, I wonder if any of you have caught up with the fact that the processes of "not-knowingness" are the processes of how to fall out of agreement with a time continuum. Hm? Any of you connected that up? Not-knowingness is how to get out of agreement with a time continuum with which you're in agreement, you see?

You can postulate that you don't know it and, to that degree—or you are then, out of its agreement and time—so you're not on its time continuum. Therefore, you can flip universes with this process. So it's a very necessary thing for an individual to rehabilitate. He has to be able to break off time continuum.

I told you the clairvoyant went by the boards only because she never came off of her client's bank—you know, reading the bank—clairvoyance, reading the bank, reading the future, so forth. She gets all mauled up with somebody else's time track and then she can't unknow it, see? So she can't come off the time continuum.

Well that, in essence, you'd say would be a broken communication. No, it's not a broken communication because it isn't in the Formula of Communication. It isn't part of communication, it's above it. By unknowingness, by Not-Knowingness as a process, we can recall, remember, reconceive, sense or feel the further ramifications of communication which are possible. It becomes very, very important. Therefore, this principle lets you make a whole individual.

Now, as far as the suppression of disease is concerned, disease is a factor in the society which is chopping up, person to person, communications. The most flagrant thing that disease worked over, mauled and threw into the nearest ashcan was the Second Dynamic. And has gone to such an extent, now, that its creation of children is done with some forebodings, misgivings. You can't take down part of a dynamic without, to some degree, taking down all of it.

You'll think I am rabidly anti-Christian. It's not true. I am probably the only Christian alive. [laughter]

You—oh, you're Christians too.

The oddity of a cut communication line is that it takes knowingness to put it back. Now, this is a principle I am trying to deliver into your hands, see? If a communication line is cut, all you have to do is build up knowingness to then put another communication line back. You see this?

Well, what would you think of a church that forbade any education, experimentation or research or anything like that on the subject of sex—that was actively cutting to pieces

knowingness on the subject of the Second Dynamic? What would you think of a church that did this?

You'd say, "They were sure trying to keep a certain set of communication lines awfully cut and, therefore, they were trying to keep knowingness on the subject down. They're being very effective. They say, 'Keep down the knowingness on this subject of sex and you'll, of course, keep its communication lines cut. And, therefore, if we cut its communication lines thoroughly enough . . .'" Get the idea?

An enforced communication—again, without knowingness—is a good way to cut a communication line. It's a wonderful way to cut a communication line. It's an awfully wonderful way to unmock a terminal, too.

Now, where, where then, do we draw a line? We say an enforced communication, or a cut communication, then, have some parity of unworkability.

All right. We take a patient who is suffering from some disease, let us say, of the foot, and we say, "You've got to communicate with it. You must communicate with it." He has no choice, you see?

We take an individual and put electrodes on his head and say, "You, thetan, must communicate with this head and make it sane." You know, *zzzztt*. And he never gets better. We enforce his communication. We haven't solved the problem.

14 Therefore, communication must be a symptom of something else, because even an enforced communication is a communication, remember. And a cut communication, by definition, is still a communication that has been cut. So neither one of these things seem to be the answer and that's because communication itself is the game.

One must improve his ability to play the game. And communication can solve a great many things. It can do a great many things. It can produce communication lines only as long as its various parts are followed and it is in agreement with and it follows some of the intentions and self-determinisms of the terminals involved in the communication.

But above communication there is knowingness. An enforced communication is only enforced to the degree that it is done unknowingly, without knowingness, you see? If the people on both sides of the enforced communication line actually knew about the other terminal, well, the line couldn't have been called "enforced." They would probably communicate on some basis of understanding, low or great.

So the factor to be repaired is knowingness or not-knowingness, as the case may be. These are the factors to be repaired. This is the self-determinism to be rehabilitated. The power of choice over to know or not-know, the ability to know, a knowingness sufficient to discover the proper terminals in use, an ability to know before a line is joined whether or not it is possible to join the line.

And this sounds an almost imponderable impossibility to someone who knew of communication only and didn't know about knowingness standing above the ARC Triangle—didn't know that we have ARC and then just above that understanding and just above that knowingness. Understanding is only a form of knowingness, remember. Knowingness is superior to that.

An individual who thinks that only communication could exist and that no knowingness is ever assumed would not, then, be able to solve this interesting problem on any dynamic (and a problem which is probably the central problem of problems) which is: How can you tell whether or not two terminals should be put in communication with each other unless you know they can communicate or that they are connectable?

Until you have them communicate with each other, you could not possibly know—these people think—whether or not it's possible to communicate, and this you have experimentation and experience and these other factors coming in. That's all a game in itself.

But with our processes and abilities, our technologies, we can do this interesting thing today: We can know—before they are joined—whether two communication terminals can be joined. And thus, knowing whether or not they can be joined before we join them,

we can smooth out the understandings of both sides so that they could be joined and that would, then, not be an enforced enjoining of communication terminals, wouldn't it?

So it is possible for Man, perhaps, to scout for, locate the founts of disease or upset in the society. It is possible for Man to locate these things and it is possible for Man to discover extant terminals, which he probably never knew existed. Just as he won't look at death, maybe he hasn't been looking at an awful lot of terminals. It's possible for Man to do an awful lot of things he's not been able to do before if we know, now, that we can know whether or not we should join terminals before we join them. And know sufficiently, so that the game "communication" can be engaged in with benefit and profit to all.

The suppressive factor of disease I have used here as an example of a terrific unknownness as far as Man is concerned, about which he has mocked-up considerable knowingness—but that doesn't slight the fact that the depression and inactivity of most physical bodies does stem from the threat of or the consequences of illness—pain, illness, duress, one kind or another. Terrifically suppressive factor.

A few decades ago a little child could expect to be sick at rather regular intervals. There were all sorts of diseases around. A few of these have been blocked out but not all of them, by a long way.

Now, we could know more, then, on this frontier. We could know more about other suppressive factors. The most suppressive factor, however, that we meet at once and immediately is the factor of Man's hopelessness in the face of the problem. This is our most suppressive factor. Our technologies would all go in vain if Man continued to believe forever that there was no possibility of doing anything about it at all. This is one of our chief worries in Scientology: how to set a sufficient example to do this.

15 We have originated an idea which is quite interesting. We intend to experiment with and publish a little book which gives a bunch of the central data of Scientology and

we've got to experiment with this before we know its exact form. We're going to ask the individual to discover which one of these data he could have used or could use in various spheres of knowledge in life to orient them and do better with them.

And this in itself, without an auditor, would bring about a considerable amount of knowingness on various sciences by bringing about an alignment of data. If we think of the tremendous bodies of data which we have gone across and which we have never digested and oriented and which are not aligned in themselves, such as grammar school, we see that Man's memory may be shut off just because he just won't tolerate that tremendous unalignment of data and its lack of system. And that the memory between lives itself may be cut off entirely because he cannot reconcile one life with another, or the bodies of data in one decade with the bodies of the data in another decade. And so we may have a brand-new system of memory—a brand-new system of memory, which makes it possible for an individual to remember through these tremendous confused bodies of unaligned data.

We have a system now—looking at pictures as an effort to remember. It's not a very good system. Maybe this other system would be far superior, but it is a brand-new system. All we would do would be to take the data of Scientology and ask an individual to pick out which one would better some sphere of knowledge we know him to have been through. And of course, he would eventually pick them all out and align them all up and he would feel much better about the whole thing. And maybe, in this wise, we have invented a new system.

And if our knowingness, if our knowingness, just to this degree, has become sufficiently great so that we can evolve a new, hitherto unknown or unused system, which would obviate the poor communication system called the engram or the picture or the facsimile, why, then you have some idea of how far we could go with this.

I just want you to look at that—that some of our knowingness—knowingness about terminals, about communication, knowingness about cut and enforced communications, knowing how this could be done or is being done or is not being done, and using knowingness itself as the thin span which goes across to find if a bridge will stand—if it might not do a great deal more than what I have just said.

I've given you a couple of interesting problems—the problem of disease. Maybe this data about, "You can know before you communicate," maybe this data I've just given you about a brand-new system by which an individual could sweep back through the confusions of his past and so remember clearly and be willing to remember clearly without the penalty of tremendous confusion. It's already brought about these two things. Maybe it could bring about a lot more. And to a large degree, I leave that up to you.

Thank you.



SIX BASIC LEVELS OF PROCESSES

LECTURE 39

A LECTURE GIVEN ON 28 OCTOBER 1955

60 MINUTES

I want to talk to you, on the 28th of October, 1955, 4th London ACC, about the Six Basic Steps versus the Six Levels of Processing, but mostly and in particular, the Six Levels of Processing. 2

In the first place, this battery of six is empirically derived. This should be clearly understood. There is no system underlying them. That's the first thing you're going to look for and that's the first thing you're going to be disappointed in: there's no underlying system. They were derived empirically—which is to say, a vast number of cases were polled and the processes which had done them the most good were then put down in a list. And then some sort of arrangement was made of the list to get an approximate position of where the process was. But it was not even plotted originally against the Tone Scale. And we had six processes, each one of which had improved the majority of cases to which they were addressed.

Now, some had been improved by one or two and some had been improved by others. But each case that reported would report one of these and then some offbeat process or something of that order. And he'd say, "My case got the most improvement from this"

and then he'd name an offbeat process. And all these offbeat processes, of course, were wild variables, one kind or another. And so we took the ones that were not wild variables—the ones that were constant—and these became the Six Basic Steps.

You should understand that, because I imagine you could look and look and look and try to find the system on which these were derived. And they were *not* theoretically or intuitively derived. They were derived, crunch! What processes are working? And these are the processes that are working. Put them on a list, run everybody on all of them. You'll get a result there on everybody then. That's the way it was.

After a while, observing these at work, I spiked them on the Tone Scale. And one of the PABs, I don't know which issue, probably about 49 or something like that—some little time ago, maybe earlier than that—carried these things plotted on the Tone Scale. And that was a theoretical plot. But it seemed like cases improved and used these processes in that order. And that was intuitively done. So that, of course, became subject to rearrangement.

- 3 Now, we came into this quandary. Out of this and out of experience in using these specific processes, we discovered this fantastic thing: I found that underlying each one of them was a principal factor in a case. Well, that was very easy to find since each of those processes was originally derived independently from some basic factor, you see? Now, it's very curious that there could have been many other basic factors, but these happened to be the most basic, basic factors.

So each one of these steps had a theory underlying it of one kind or another, independent of the other steps, and we discovered that it was necessary to work at this theory in two or three different ways in order to get a good run at the process itself. In other words, each one of these six basic steps was based on a theory and then we expanded the underlying theory into some other processes and now we evolved forward toward

Six Levels of Processing. It is still not a neat package because its workability has never been overlooked in favor of the theoretical simplicity and grandeur of the system.

Had I been a German, you could be very sure that the workability of these would have been disarranged or displaced in favor of a better system. We've never done that. So don't get upset when they don't fit the exact concept that you think they ought to be working on. They are worked as they are given because they work and not because they better fit Ron's theories. Get the idea?

There's a very important thing about research and investigation. You have to be productive enough of ideas and have enough ideas so that when you get one, you don't protect it with barbed wire, electrified fences. You must be willing to throw your ideas away. And if you can throw them away, you can get research done.

The usual course of research is quite another way. A fellow sitting in a desert of ideas suddenly clomps onto one idea, gives it a fast pass, finds out that there's a—this is the way Abbott and Parke and Davis and Lilly and so forth, evidently research, because they're always getting flubs on their drugs. They are! I mean, they put out this wonderful literature and it just doesn't work. See, so you take this and then you spend all of your time being enthusiastic about and protecting this one idea. You spend all of your time going around selling it to people, not finding out whether or not it worked.

I give you an exact case history. Engram scanning was evidently done by two auditors. They got this idea that you could run the whole bank out by scanning all the engrams in it. This was way back when. And two auditors got this, they ran it on three, what we eventually called, Step I's—took the very best cases they could find, you see, and they scanned them through some engrams—and then spent the rest of their time convincing everybody how wonderful engram scanning was. Entirety of their effort thereafter was salesmanship on the subject of engram scanning—with resultant chaos. They never evidently took another look at engram scanning. See that?

Well, that's not the right way to do research. So I'm not here to tell you that the Six Levels of Processing are even vaguely perfect. But I'm here to tell you that each one of those levels is responsible for breaking a very large number of cases and can be fairly well counted upon to crack the case to which you address them—one level or another will, certainly, just by its basic extrapolation, which was that each one of them had brought about a marked change in a great many cases. When we surveyed all cases processed that we could lay our hands on, one of these processes had been run on the case that produced a good result, see? So we sort of had the field covered and we have it covered now in these Six Levels of Processing.

- 5 But these six levels have this slight difference is, they more clearly state the theory underlying the level and then add additional processes on the system of that theory, which may or may not be as good as the original, but which, in application, work out, usually, to be more beneficial than the original. Now, you're looking in your Six Levels of Processing at perfection in evolution—with the perfection only five or six million light-years out in front. You get the idea?

So let's not get the idea that these six levels will never be changed. The fantastic thing is that Six Basic Processes remain stable for over a year. That's fantastic. There was no real need for quite a while to change them around because no new theory had appeared over the horizon. I hadn't dreamed up anything that was significant enough to mess up these basics. There just wasn't any reason to until the system of native state, first postulate, second postulate, third postulate and fourth postulate suddenly explained why psychoanalysis had had such a bad time of it. This suddenly explained also why it was more beneficial to get a preclear to forget than to remember. This explained why an individual had his knowledge in such an occluded state. It explained so many of the principles with which we daily work that it, of course, required a revolution in the Six Basic Steps. And so such a revolution we have.

Now, in its crudest state, the first application of this was intensely workable—something you must not lose sight of. Whatever the theory on top of it, the first was intensely workable. I'd invented a process called Union Station using simply Other People. Now, the Other People theory was that an individual simply looked at other people and discovered that there were other people. It was no more complicated than that.

In short, the methods applied in the Six Basic Processes have not been too much deranged. But Union Station was evolved as simply a method of working the R2 step, which is just Other People.

Now, in evolving it, I noticed a great peculiarity. "What did you know about the other person?" and "What did the other person know about you?" was producing a faster result on tougher cases than would normally have been suspected. Hm! It was an interesting thing that this actually was doing things to cases which were hitherto untouchable by the earlier six basic steps—Six Basic Processes, six levels, the originals of this.

Well, I worked with this for some little time and then I got the strange idea that there was something here that wasn't quite right. And you know why? Because day after day I checked with the auditors who were running it and *I didn't find anybody exteriorizing*. Wow! Nobody exteriorizing on this process! Well, you were remedying their havingness of people, you were doing this and you were doing that, but nobody was exteriorizing on the process! Aha! There is something wrong here! Well, I had it in the back of the head already that there was something going on here that needed a little further investigation. So we simply flipped the process: "Something don't know about people." See?

Well, actually, I'd done a theoretical lineup on this and had been speculating and fooling around with "don't know" and "do know" and first postulate and second postulate. And I—forgotten what it was, but I had some original theory on just exactly why it would be "I don't know" is the first postulate. I think it's something on the order of a thetan knew everything so he'd have to say he didn't know something or something like that,

but I don't think it was that plain. There was some kind of a proof underlying it which I, at this time, have forgotten. And it's not strange that I would forget it because look at the subject it's on. I'm not going to stand here and scan it and do so forth with it to pick it up, because it's not that important—probably be found on an earlier US lecture.

But here we had a process that should have exteriorized people and it didn't. So there was something wrong with knowingness. And, man, Scientology is a science of knowing how to know. And if there's something odd or peculiar or random about the subject of knowingness itself, let's get busy! So I did, and put into the lineup with great speed some cases running on, "Tell me something you don't know about that person." Nothing more specific than this, you see. And, man, did we start to crack up cases!

Now, the funny part of it is, as long as I was shepherding these cases and as long as I was doing something with these cases, this command never came into question. It was the darnedest thing you ever heard of. It was very relaxed, the whole thing—very relaxed, believe me. Just, "Tell me something you don't know about that person." "Tell me something that person doesn't know about you." See, this was all. And it was sufficiently good and sufficiently without bugs—worked that way—that we found people popping out of their heads and so forth, who had never exteriorized before. And we were off to the races.

7 Now, that was put in as—you can shudder about it a little bit now—but that was put in as the first level down around Locational Processing. You merely got the session started, got him oriented in where you were auditing him and blasted him right straight into what we called the First Postulate Union Station. Well, it was working and it was working well.

It was turned over to the HAA Class in the United States to discover what the optimum command would be and I don't know how these guys managed it, but they managed to spin each other neatly on the original . . . Now, whether or not they were

just dumb, whether or not they couldn't maintain enough ARC to keep a semblance of a triangle—whatever they were doing, I don't know, but they couldn't run: "Don't know about that person." And the result was—the further look—is what we were doing was not-knowing. We were unknowing, you know, or not-knowing and, evidently, the sense or meaning of this was never being delivered. It just never was being delivered.

Now, whether or not they put the misinterpretation onto "don't-know" or interjected a new postulate into the process or what—it simply didn't work. But we must not lose sight of this fact: Regardless of whether they spun the whole population of the United States, the point was that a group of HGC auditors and myself ran the process successfully and cleaned up every case that was outstanding for the HASI in the United States. We cleaned up every case that had not received proper benefit on "Something you don't know about that person." Don't lose sight of that. We put these guys on top of the world. We exteriorized them and sent them away. Now, I take my fingers off of it and something else happened.

We mustn't lose sight of, you might say, the generic step or the next thing you know, it's whether or not we hold the scalpel with the little finger out or something that "counts." We mustn't lose sight of that process. You hear me now? It was run with no further instructions than that. It was run with good ARC.

The auditors who were running this, remember, were hot auditors. They were good auditors. They'd handled an awful lot of cases. They'd had a tremendous amount of training. I worked with them an awful lot. It may be that it simply requires a very fine auditor to run the process, see? That may be all that is in error because, let me assure you, you wouldn't think that anybody could get in trouble with Separateness—"Somebody from whom you're separate," "Somebody who is separate from you." You wouldn't think in spotting people and getting Separateness that anybody could get in trouble.

But let me assure you that a very short time ago some auditors that I've always looked on as good auditors got into serious trouble with this process. They ran their preclears out through the bottom of the barrel on it, cut their havingness to pieces and that was that. "Well," you say, offhand of course, "Separateness probably would reduce somebody's havingness." No, it won't. It won't.

A guy can't have as long as he's sitting in the middle of something. He can't have a pie if he's sitting in the middle of pie. He's got to have a little tiny bit of observational power to find out about the pie, otherwise he's going on intuitive or speculative knowingness. Have I got a pie or haven't I got a pie? Am I in the middle of Earth or am I in the middle of a pie? You know? You get that idea?

So it would be almost impossible for somebody to shoot his havingness to pieces by running Separateness. But three auditors did so. So much so that they knew, positively, that the process was in error. Now, that's something, isn't it? Now, you and I know that we might chip off havingness a little bit. We'd know that we shouldn't run Separateness without flattening, at least, Spotting People, see—preferably by flattening both Spotting Objects and People.

I don't think even a session was open. I think the havingness was shot to pieces by something else—just lousy ARC with the preclear or something like this. See the accidental factors that can come in?

- 8 Well now, you wouldn't think then that this process, Separateness, could reduce somebody's havingness. But in somebody's hands it did. You wouldn't think, and I never dreamed, that First Postulate Union Station would land somebody in a confusion. And yet in auditors' hands who were operating without close supervision (remember they were student auditors), it nevertheless had things going at sixes and sevens. See that?

Therefore, we had to evolve a safe process. And do you know that that has happened almost every time in Dianetics and Scientology? I've evolved one that worked and then

I've had to evolve one that was safe. This is fantastic when you come to think about it—one that worked. So myself and a half a dozen other guys sitting around would run this and just do fine with it, you know? And you know, how to run an engram—how to run an engram—originally, it never occurred to me to give anybody any technology on how to run an engram. I showed them the engram and told them it had to be gone through a lot of times in a regressed state and you flattened it real good and you watched the tones come up. And if you didn't watch the tones come up, you'd dive for the earlier engram on the chain. And you ran that till the tones came up and then you got the guy into present time.

Of course, you can understand that if you cut down ARC sufficiently on an individual while you're auditing him, that nothing will work. You understand that? If you just do the rudiments of auditing well, if you'll just acknowledge what the preclear says, if you will just listen to him when he says something, if you'll just find out what he's doing, if you'll just be interested in him—you'll find out that the damndest processes will work. You can do almost anything to him and he'll come out of it somehow or another.

So when a preclear comes back out of present time, there is just a little question mark. You know how in the comic strips they have a question mark sitting above your comic strip character's head? You know? Well, there's a little question mark made out of solid brass sitting immediately above my head when I see somebody come back from a session—running the processes we're running—out of key with the rest of the world, you see? Boy, you can't kid me about these things. Boy, this must have been bad, see, this must have been stinking—this must have been: "Well, let's—well, Ron used to talk about basic-basic a lot. I don't know, do you have any idea of basic-basic? Just a moment while I run over and get some peanuts off the vending stand there." You know, it must have been bad. See?

I know what I'm talking about because I've had poor auditors running things under supervision to this degree. I've taken two patients (in 1947 when the US Government inadvertently or accidentally financed the original office of Dianetics in Hollywood—gave me all my back pay as a disabled veteran at one fell swoop and I promptly fitted out an office and went to work) and I took two patients every time I didn't have enough time to run engrams or patch them up one way or the other. I'd take two patients and I'd shove them into a little side room and I'd tell one to finish running the engram I had found in the other, out. And they would and everything would be fine. Oh, I mean, did no more instruction than that. Of course, the guy could always open the door and say, "Hey! He's just curled up in a small ball. What do I do now?" See? But the funny part of it was, it never happened. It has to be *bad* auditing to have anything like this happen. Don't kid yourself otherwise. And don't try to kid me.

- 9 Now, of course, a lot of preclears will come in and tell you how bad the auditor was. They're sitting there—I try to go into communication with them one way or the other; I find out I can't get in communication with them or give them an acknowledgment or drive an idea home, you know. So I usually wind up by snidely saying to them (they never notice I have), "Just how would you know whether it was good auditing or bad auditing? How would you know there was an auditor there?" I think your report is, to say the least, based on a poor observation by a very bad observer. [laughing]

So I seldom listen to the public on how bad an auditor is. But when I see a process which I know runs well—when I see a process which I know runs well, not under careful supervision but under careless supervision—producing bad results on people, the ideas which I have about the character of the auditing would not be printed. See? They just would not be printable. I don't have them revengefully, I just have them factually. See? I say, "Oh, my God, no!" Person must have been standing in the middle of the street

spotting things and the auditor went over to the curb and left him in the road of the tram and . . . You know. *Dabbb!* Must have been terrific.

So we mustn't depart from what we really know. In research and investigation, you mustn't falsify what you know just because somebody dubbed the flub, see? Just because there was some moperly and doperly on the high station is no reason we would shift all of our gears and throw away all of our information. Each process, practically, on the track has gone through this evolution: it's workable and then it's been made safe. And these processes have very often lost their workability in being made safe. Got that? But I didn't have any other choice but to make them safe, because people could seem to be able to handle these things poorly enough, here and there, to produce havoc with them. And if only 50 percent of the people handling it were still producing havoc with it, we had to make it safe, you see?

But because this happened is no reason you and I should forget what the original process was, see? Because that was the one that must have been closest to workability. And even though that one maybe had to be run by a good skill and a high interest on the part of the auditor, it was, nevertheless, the workable process.

So First Postulate Union Station is still the process which I would run, myself, on a pc. Why? Because I have a nice battery of results on it. And I haven't got any battery of results on later material. I've got a lot of hearsay. But I myself have, with my own two prefrontal lobes, taken the preclear out and chewed him up on this subject. Now, I know that it's a beefy process and I know definitely that it is, to say the least, impossible to self-audit, see? That I know is impossible because a couple of guys have tried it. *Dzzzz!* That's horrible. They get into a little bit of trouble and they say, "Well now, let's see, what don't I know about this picture I see sitting in front of me here," you know, and all of a sudden—spin, spin, spin.

10 So I know the process is capable of and susceptible of misinterpretation. I know that the wording on the process is possibly more closely allied to or more closely associated with the first postulate when you say, "I don't know." Because that is what the thetan said. See, that is what he said. He didn't say, "I am now going to not-know this in front of me so that I can have a game about it." That wasn't what he said. He said, "I don't know anything about it. Boy, am I nice and stupid. Now I can get into trouble." See?

But you evidently run that without good, tight supervision, and we got woe and grief, see? That is, for my money, a hot audit of this with an understanding of what we're doing—the fellow was making a postulate, you see, that he doesn't know this and he doesn't know that—so it doesn't matter what he makes the postulate about; it's all right if he makes the postulate about things he really doesn't know. You understand? See, it's perfectly all right for him to make a postulate about something he doesn't know. But people will evidently do this and drain the bank of "don't-knows" or something of the sort. They do something peculiar when they are not closely supervised.

So the safe process is, "Something you wouldn't mind not-knowing." And the process that I know intimately works is, "Something you don't know about that person, wall, picture, room," or anything else. But never self-audit it, see?

All right. We've got to be honest about this because we're doing what we're doing. We're not doing a fancy dress ball where we hide all of the stuff that was swept off the ballroom handily in a closet or under the rug, see? We're not trying to make a big show of a brilliant, well-advertised scale of processes. See? That's not what we're doing. And if we don't leave the dirt in the ballroom or at least tell people where we swept it to, the very funny part of it is we're liable to find the only thing of value in the ballroom was a small diamond earring that got dropped in the dirt and swept into the closet. If we never tell anybody where we swept the dirt to, see, we're in a mess.

You got to be honest when you're doing research and investigation. And I've tried to be honest these five years, but it's been very difficult because you get too honest or you get too factual or you try to tell people exactly where it comes from and it often unsteadies them. They feel unsettled. They feel "Well, if Ron was that hazy about it, gee, how do we know anyhow?" You know, just a Q and A. It's a reactive mechanism.

But I'm telling you, here and now, that this is a tremendous amount of the difference between the field workability of a process and its original opinion was simply this—and I perhaps didn't clearly understand this until recently. I myself didn't clearly understand it till recently, see—and that was that the process was in one form when it was working and tested and then was made safe, see? Some little ramifications were put on it, a few little descriptions were put on it, one way or the other, cautions and so forth, which might have taken out of it its life. So, on the six basics, you'd certainly better know what the original wording was. Get it? All right.

It's all right for a thetan to say, "I don't know," even if he says it about something he doesn't know. He doesn't have to know it first in the original version and then say that he doesn't know it, although this seems to be for most people the more workable version, see? It seems to be the more workable version. "Something you wouldn't mind not-knowing about that person." This seems to be safe. And the other one seems to be winding people up—I get on hearsay evidence, three or four times removed—into terrible confusions. **11**

I tell a preclear, "Now listen, you know what a postulate is?"

And he says, "Oh, no. Oh, no. I don't know what a postulate is. You know, postulate—postulate—pos—."

"Well, can you say you're standing here?"

And he says, "Oh, yeah. I can say—I can say I'm standing here."

I mean, the guy is real bad off, see? You're not—any elevated intellectual discourse, you know. I say, "Well, can you say you're not standing here?"

[mumble] ". . .but that'd be a lie."

"Well, all right. Can you tell that lie? Can you say you're not standing here?"

"I don't know. All right. All right. All right."

And kind of work him back and forward until he says he's not standing here and he'll say, "I'm not there," or something.

"That streetcar that went by, say it didn't go by."

And he'll say, "*Aubbbb*. Yeah, I can say that."

And then I tell him, "Now listen, I want you to say you don't know anything about this room, see? Just make the statement, you don't know anything about this room."

"But I do," he says.

"No, just say you don't."

"Well, all right. I don't know anything about this room."

Ceiling going to fall in? Lightning? Anything like that?

And I'd say, "Now, you got it? You got what we're doing? Don't know anything about this room. Now, I tell you to tell me something you don't know about that person. Can you tell me something you do know about that person?"

"*Nyabbb. Ummm*. Well, let's see. They've got a hat on. I can tell you I didn't know they had a hat on. That'd be a lie, though. You know that'd be a lie."

"Well, all right. Okay. Well, you tell me they don't have a hat on—that you don't know they have a hat on."

"Well, all right. That'd make me pretty stupid, wouldn't it? Bright fellow like me shouldn't be made stupid. *Habb*."

"Well, all right. Now, you see, I just want you to say about that person you don't know they've got a hat on."

“All right. That’s fine. Now, that’s swell. Now, let’s find—tell me something you don’t know about that person.”

“Well now, what do you mean? There’s a lot I don’t know about them. I don’t know their name. I don’t know their rank or serial number or anything.”

“Well now, do you see them there? Are they there?”

“Yeah, they’re there, all right.”

“Well, say you don’t know they’re there.”

“Oh, I get it. I get it. Hah. Hah. I get it. Yeah. I don’t know they’re there. Hah. I don’t know.”

“All right. Now, that’s fine. Now, let’s take another person. And now, tell me something that you don’t know about that person.” (See? No further explanation.)

“Well,” he says, “there’s some things I really don’t know about him.”

“All right. Say you don’t. I don’t care, just as long as you say that you don’t know something about that person.”

Now we run it the other way: “Something that person doesn’t know about you.”

“Well, he doesn’t know anything about me.”

“All right. Say so.”

And off we go, see? And that’s the way it was being run originally. See? And I’m sure in many of these cases it never even vaguely got across the idea—never got across the idea at all that it was a postulate. A person just looked at them and said, “Well, I don’t know whether she’s got any underclothes on or not. Ha, ha, ha, ha, ha! Ha, ha! Yeah, I don’t know that. Ha, ha! Well, I wouldn’t know that either, would I? Yeah. That’s right.” [laughter] And the guy’s stupidity started to run out. It’s quite remarkable. His knowingness began to improve, and after he’d been run on it for a few hours, he blew out of his head. And that’s the way it ran.

12 And you have my license across the boards to run it that way. You have my license that if you really know how to audit and keep a preclear along and listen to him and acknowledge him and so forth, simply take him out and say, "See that person over there? Tell me something you don't know about him." Get the idea? So he gets confused, so patch him up. So what?

There must be something you're doing if he's getting too confused. And there must be an unclear basis where he is. There must be something wrong.

Now, the safer process is, "Tell me something you wouldn't mind not-knowing about that person." That is the safer process. That evidently gets nobody in trouble and evidently unspins them and so forth and does practically everything but work fast. Hah. That should be an oddity. The reason it doesn't work so fast is because it's got more restrictions on it than the other process, see? The guy goes through more vias to arrive at the same point. See that? But it's the safe process.

And I would say, offhand, if you were handing this process out to a bunch of people that audit, you know—you got a group and you're going to give them some co-auditing and have them tow each other around and do this—I would say the safe process to give them would be: "Something you wouldn't mind not-knowing about the person," making a big speciality out of not-knowing. Something you know and then have them not-know it. Remember, it puts a via on the line. Remember, it's a slower process. You got it?

Now, there are always people around who are going to run it bad. *Tsch!* This for sure. But at this stage of this Unit, we do not have to assume that you're going to run it badly. With only one or two exceptions, this Unit is in very, very top class on auditing.

Now, where we have the first level, then, we have this: we have Locational Processing as the keynote and basic not-knowingness. And we have those two things underlying it. But location when not-known is lostness. And we're processing the lostness out of the preclear. We're letting him find himself and then we're showing he can lose himself.

We're letting him find himself and lose himself, see? "Something you don't know about that person," we got him found, haven't we? Because we said that person over there, didn't we? So he's found. And now he says, "Not-know," and he's lost.

All location is, is knowing. If you know you're not lost, you're not lost.

13

I wonder if . . . There are a great many Indian woods tales which are very, very amusing and many Asian tales are equally amusing. The sense of humor is almost identical in these things. And I remember a standard joke that was told to me one time by a trapper up in Montana when I was a kid. And I have heard this joke told about fifty times since. It's a statement that the Indian makes. He's out in the woods and he's walking around in circles and the trapper comes up to him and says, "Are you lost?"

And he says, "No," he says, "Me not lost; wigwam lost." Just one of these old wheezes. But there's something endearing about that joke. There must be, for the good reason that it's been told now, to my recollection, about two hundred years—just been current for an awful long time. "Me not lost; wigwam lost."

Well, if the preclear knows he's not lost, why, that's fine. But if he's worried about the wigwam and he has no high level of knowingness and not-knowingness and no tolerance for not-knowingness at all, the lostness of the wigwam will upset him. He will become emotionally disturbed because of the lostness of the wigwam.

But if his knowingness is very high, of course, he'd know where the wigwam was anyhow. And if his tolerance of losing things was very high, he wouldn't give a damn and he would be able to look at both the body and the wigwam and move the two together, thus snapping terminals with the wigwam. You can do what you don't give a damn about. It's almost as if this is the—it's almost as if this is the central pivot on which ability swings. It's almost the hub of ability. You can do whatever you don't give a damn about.

I recall the feeling of expendability on various expeditions. An emergency would come up of such magnitude that one got the idea of self-expendability, see? I mean, you get a couple of boys on an ice floe and it's cracking up and trying to put a boat over the side in a roaring gale and pick them up off of that cracking-up ice floe—everybody gets the idea of their own expendability, but gets no idea of the expendability of the two men on the ice floe. You get the idea? And the ship—everything else becomes expendable. I've done some of the doggonedest feats of seamanship. And I look at them afterwards and say, "Gee whiz, what do you know! Couldn't possibly have put a ship in there and gotten it out again in one piece. That's an impossibility. That just couldn't have happened."

Particularly think of this when you're coming alongside of some mooring buoy or something like this in a broad, wide harbor and you're very carefully, you know, giving your commands to the wheel and giving your commands on the sheets. Putting big sailing ships in this place and that is awfully amusing anyhow because it's a very complicated operation. And the wind doesn't turn on and off with the throttle. The way you turn it on and off is with sheets and canvas and stuff, you see? Your horsepower is a little bit out of control and can go further out of control at any instant.

Well, putting this ship into this mooring buoy in the middle of a huge harbor, all the room in the world, a gentle breeze to maneuver in, everybody working fine, you know, and taking the gravest care doing this, very smart, you know, overrun the thing and put her on a reach and then stab her up into the wind and make her stand with her sails fluttering with the buoy under her bowsprits, you know, and drop a line on. Great care! Roaring gale, everything going to hell, put her helm hard down, let the sheets run, snub the sheet in the block, you know, and then stab her on up to the wind, laying her alongside of something that isn't going to be there for about five seconds, see, it's going to be gone! Grab somebody out of it and go, see? *Dubbb!* You say, "Couldn't have done that. It was impossible. There wasn't room enough to turn a ship. There was too

much wind to sail a ship. And as far as the sheets and everything else connected with the ship were concerned, they were totally unmanageable at the time.”

If you’ve ever had an idea of a jib sheet, for instance, coming loose and trying to secure the thing—it’s flogging harder than any master-at-arms in the British Navy ever flogged anybody, you know. You get under that thing or around it and it just knocks you silly. Here’s a huge sail with a piece of line hanging on it and it’s just floundering and flying in the wind, see? Crash, crash, crash! You get under it, darn near kill you. You know you can’t handle things like that in a roaring gale. Well, these things will get handled.

But what was the state of mind in which they were handled? Expendable! Yeah, the emergency was high enough so that an individual himself became expendable.

So I would say that an auditor who was sitting there worrying about his own case, worrying about the case of the preclear and didn’t consider the preclear terrifically—he considered the preclear a little bit expendable but himself not so—get the reverse on this, something like that—might be able to run even the most elementary process on the Six Levels very, very destructively. I imagine he could do this. He’d have to work at it, though, you know? He’d have to omit every acknowledgment, he would have to disregard every originated communication, he’d have to upset the ashtray every few minutes. You see, I mean, he’d have to work at it to get this bad. But he would only get that bad by considering himself so terribly valuable. There’s something there about protectiveness. And I suppose you could even get sufficiently protective of the preclear’s case so that you’d start doing things wrong. Get the idea? There has to be a certain expendability. It can’t be quite as grim as that in order to run the process.

Well, we start looking around the environment at people all over the place and we get the idea that “You know, there’s enough world so that maybe we could expend some—so that there’s enough knowingness around so that maybe we could not-know some.” Get the idea? And that these people are going off and getting lost all the time anyhow, but there’s

more people, so maybe the tolerance of lostness could rise, too. "I haven't got to stick with this body forever because there might be other bodies in the world." All of these considerations are there. That's Locational Processing, whether it's run on objects or people.

Now, we've discovered something new in Locational Processing: that there's a whole category lying below the solid terminal. The basic purpose, evidently, in having people and objects is to have communication terminals and playing fields. All right.

The facts of the case are that an individual gets so lost on the subject of energy flow and particles that it doesn't flow anymore and therefore he can't even see or believe with any reality that any terminals exist. And evidently what has to be patched up first is his consideration that energy can exist and is obtainable. Now, that seems to be important.

So we could put it in like this: We could run Locational Processing on objects or people just to orient somebody, see, just to get him in session and squared around and then we could have him start spotting power sources or energy sources. And we could nag him a little bit, you know, about, "Do they emit energy?" and we'd talk about it a little bit with him, not nag him—since when I say nag, I've seen an auditor, too, take me literally. Wow! And we could get this oriented, you see, very nicely and smoothly.

- 15 And do you know we could run another process at that point? Which, again, is adventurous—it's an adventurous process, but it could be run at that point. And you could get in this place and he's spotted all these energy sources and you could then have him run an entirety of first postulate on the energy and the sources, see? Just, "Something you don't know." The way I would run the command and the way you would, if you never have any difficulty with the pcs and ARC, "Something you don't know about that energy source," or "Something you don't know about that energy over there." Got that? It's an adventurous process. It could get beefy. But you would run this all the way around.

And, of course, it would seem impossible that you would run, “Something that energy doesn’t know about you.” And I haven’t ever tested it. But just by the system that evolves, one would seem to believe that this would be the case—that you would run, “What that energy source doesn’t know about you.” “Something you wouldn’t mind that energy source not-knowing about you,” would be the safe command. “Something you don’t want it to know about you—it doesn’t know about you,” would be one which we still know to be a workable command, if likely to throw the preclear into a spinny and confused state occasionally.

By the way, if a preclear ever gets into a spinny or confused state on “Something you don’t know about that,” you understand, why, it’s evidently only necessary to ask him to not-know a few things that he does know and he seems to come out of the spin rather easily. And we can unconfuse the other process. What we’re trying to do is get him to make postulates, in agreement or not with the physical universe—we don’t care. We’re not making him practice lying. We’re not making him reverse things and we’re not doing a lot of things. All we’re doing is making him practice running the first postulate so he should be able to run it on energy.

Now, certainly, this would change his energy manifestations. Now, if you were doing that, then you would go on and you would spot objects. You’d spot objects and then you would spot people with him. And then, if you really wanted to get the show on the road, you would get objects he was separate from and objects that were separate from him, and people he was separate from and people who were separate from him. And you’d run those things until there was no comm lag at all. And then you would cut loose on “Something you wouldn’t mind not-knowing about that person,”—the safe command. Or “Something you don’t know about that person,” which would be the command which

could be supported, undoubtedly, by this time by the pc. And that would finish off Locational Processing.

Now, you'd take up the first and foremost tenets on the subject of terminals. The energy is the thing that comes from the terminal, but the energy, at length, becomes all-important to the preclear. And, having become all-important to the preclear, he neglects the fact that he requires a terminal and after that he can go into an "only one" classification and so forth. He said, "It isn't necessary for me to have other terminals. I am a sufficient terminal."

- 16 I want to give you something just in connection with that, which I just dreamed up yesterday and then all of a sudden hit like a bolt of lightning. It was fabulous. I suddenly realized that granting of beingness was permitting other terminals to exist. See that? And the failure to grant beingness would, of course, just be an unwillingness to let other terminals exist. That's all. I mean, you can just take it out of the realm of the mystic. It's just simply, evidently, that. The ability to grant beingness consists of the willingness to let other terminals exist.

So that you could possibly rehabilitate the ability to grant beingness on an individual simply by asking him, "What other terminals would you permit to exist?" you know? And have him build up his tolerance on this and all of a sudden he'd be granting beingness. Quite interesting.

All right. So here we have in the first step, what started out to be merely an orientation and drills orientation—getting a preclear in session—and became something far more significant than that and finally moved up into the echelon of rehabilitating both his desire for energy and terminals, see? And it rehabilitated that to a very marked degree and rehabilitated his not-knowingness and so on. So we put an awful lot into that first level. It has a tremendous number of things in it now. But remember, its first evolution

was simply, "Spot some things or notice some things in the environment." You got that? That was its first command and was workable and which did call it to notice.

And the first underlying Other People thing was simply, "Something you know about that person and something that person knows about you" or "could know about you." You know? That was the first command of the knowingness part of that basic. And it was discovered with that, that people didn't exteriorize—but by saying, "Something you didn't know about the person," or "Something that person didn't know about you," we started to get exteriorizations. And from these two basics, we have developed the entirety of this first level.

Now, we would interweave people and objects and Separatenesses and so forth into that. Now, as far as Separateness is concerned, the basic test on Separateness was this: "Things you're separate from in this room." And it was run for about fifteen minutes with a gain. That was the first test—when I first thought of it.

And the next test that was run is "Something you could associate with in this room?" which ran the preclear right down into the ground. Togetherness Processes are apparently never workable. You say, "Things you're together with," or so on. There's such a process as, "Things you wouldn't mind occupying the same space with." But this is a very, very high level process. That just tells a person that actually we don't have space—it's a consideration. That's what it tells him. But Togetherness Processes, "Things you wouldn't mind occupying," (which we were using for a short time and so forth) will eventually run a preclear into the ground. But you run Separateness forever and it keeps on improving the preclear because it runs toward the native state at a great rate of speed. All right.

Now, so much for that first level. I've given you quite a bit about the consideration which went into its construction. I've told you something about all six levels. Each one of them has a set of considerations of one kind or another or discoveries underlying it

now. But it didn't have originally. They were just put there because it was a workable process. Before it became a workable process, of course, it had a theory behind it. I had a theory and invented the process. Then we tested this whole battery of processes and we racked them up and then after that put them on the Tone Scale and then after that, I remembered the theory that originated the process and began to work with it more. And we now have Six Levels of Processing.

If you are bemused or amazed because these levels are in a state of flux, you shouldn't be. You shouldn't be, really, because we're doing the same things that we're doing with the Six Basic Steps except we're just doing it a lot better, that's all.

Now, we haven't changed things too much. But we're trying to more clearly understand and we're trying to progress cases faster. Now remember, the Six Levels of Processing, by the introduction of First Postulate Union Station, started to crack up all the cases around that were hanging fire. That was done by very good auditing, by very sensitive auditors, who were really on the ball, who followed the rudiments exactly and who did a good job of doing what they were doing.

But when First Postulate Union Station was run, then and there and at that moment, I decided and we decided on discussion with auditors around, that we had certainly better make Six Levels of Processing. Now, these are evolving probably toward twenty-seven levels of processing. That is the usual direction. You simplify and then things become more complicated. And then you simplify and they become more complicated again. Your only loss is if your simplification is not more simple than the original idea you had. And we're certainly backed up now into a very high level of simplification on these things.

There's no use to speculate on the workability. If you feel not at home with the material, simply use the auditing commands and use them smoothly, obeying the rudiments very carefully. And if you're still very doubtful and you want to get gains on a preclear, just

go back and use your old Six Basic Processes. They're still very workable. They will miss a few preclears.

We're trying to make a grand slam out of preclears and clean up the whole works with one set of processes. And that's our regular gain. So you see a little more advance is usually in the direction of running the tougher case, that couldn't be run before easily, and running, then perforce, the easier case, easily and well.

Thank you.



INTOLERANCE

LECTURE 40

A LECTURE GIVEN ON 28 OCTOBER 1955

61 MINUTES

All right. This second morning lecture of October 28th, 1955, 4th London ACC. I've 2
been very frank, now, on the subject of the evolution of processes and the actuality of
these processes in action and what monitors them in their operation.

I'd better tell you, now, about the remaining processes and the underlying principles
of them. The first level we have covered to a very definite degree, the commands as
given and as they are workable, are discoverable on written material. We needn't go into that.

But the second level of process is to some slight degree displaced. It is there to point
up the fact that an individual must be in darn good two-way communication before you
run Level Three, which is subjective processes. That's why it's there.

Now, at this level, I could say offhand that we should take up this and we should take
up that and so forth, but this would not be true. I would just be dressing up the picture
to make it look good. The fact of the matter is the pc has got to be in a point of origin,
very good, and at a point of acknowledgment, very good—and not because he's been
educated to be but just because he is. All right.

Therefore, we take this second level and we find out at once that there is a lower harmonic on the second level and that the second level probably should lie below the first level too.

We start the session, of course, with communication. But it's not two-way communication. Usually it's kind of one-way and bogged up and so forth. So it'd be a misnomer to call it that way. But the auditor is talking and the preclear is answering and the preclear is originating. Or the preclear is talking compulsively and the auditor is trying to get in some of his material one way or the other.

And we couldn't run, of course, the present time problem or start the rudiments of the session at all unless we paid some attention to two-way communication. Right?

- 3 So let us go into the theory of two-way communication and discover at once that two-way communication as-is. It as-is. It knocks out of existence, it unmocks, various somatics and materials and is therefore intensely useful. And there are many methods of using two-way communication.

The first way is simply to let somebody talk about something, confide in you. This is about the oldest, creakiest, down at the heels, misunderstood psychotherapy that Man has had. Somebody could come in and confess. Well, what's the difference between confess and pay? Just the coin is more solid when you pay. So anybody who is terribly interested in having somebody confess is actually merely dramatizing the lower echelon of having to make somebody pay. Do you understand?

The police are underpaid. Therefore they have to make people confess. Probably confession has nothing whatsoever to do with crime detection. In this modern age, a lie detector can much more efficiently determine the facts of the case, for failure to use the lie detector victimizes every decent citizen in the world. I mean, it's as simple as this.

A failure to understand completely the activities of lie detectors has thrown them a little bit into disuse. A lie detector works because of Ownership Processing, that's all. You get

the fellow to make some statements or think about something and if he's misowning on the subject, you get a read on the lie detector. That's the totality of lie detectors and E-Meters.

Anything that is misowned is then capable of registering an electrical charge. Follow me? Anything which is misowned is capable of an electric charge. Confessed guilt or admission when the action has not been taken, will register equally with stated innocence when guilt is present. You follow me?

A failure to understand the principles of ownership has put the entire lie detector industry into a little bit of a question. It's quite an industry. There are tremendous numbers of these things built. They use the most fantastic apparatus to establish these simple facts: blood pressure and respiration and all kinds of things are measured on these very intricate machines.

The lie detector, by the way, is much more efficient than the electroencephalograph. An electroencephalograph which is used in some diagnostic work by the way, is—just diverging there for a moment—electroencephalograph is so unreliable and so stupid a mechanism that the fellow who invented it and the companies that are selling it could be sued for fraud. I mean, it's really for the birds. I know. I'm an electronics man. I speak with authority.

An engineer looks at this and looks at these graphs and finds out that you could interpret anything off of these graphs. Nobody has ever been able to convince me that these graphs were interpretable. Because they have taken somebody they knew had a brain tumor because of X-ray and then they've gotten a pattern. And then they haven't gone out and found fifteen or twenty guys and run them all through the machine to see whether or not they got the same pattern. I have. They do.

They don't have brain tumors and they get brain tumor patterns. In other words, this is not a good mechanism. It would appear to be a good mechanism to somebody who did not know electronics, but an electroencephalograph is so poor that it has to be totally

shielded and you have to put the patient in a wire cage, 100 percent, before you could depend upon its graphs.

Any radio wave, any static, any light switch turning on and off anywhere in the vicinity of an electroencephalograph will disturb the graph which is in making.

I talked to an engineer about this one time from Westinghouse and he and I had quite a confabulation about this and he was being very, very learned. He was an expert on this. He was being very, very learned until, all of a sudden he said, "Hubbard, Hubbard, Hubbard. *Uh-ebb*. Are you so-and-so? Oh, so-and-so, you're so-and-so's friend. Oh, yeah. You're an engineer." And he just changed his tune—*krrrvhmp*. He could go and tell all the lies he wanted to, to customers. But in this particular wise, it was not wise.

Now, the behavior of electrical energy is a specialized subject when you're conduiting it through wires and so forth. Anybody knows something about energy, you know—anybody present knows practically all there is to know about energy if you ran him so that he would know. But it's a specialized subject, see?

And as a specialized subject, then, you must take into account all of the various factors in the specialized subject which could influence the graph, see?

- 4 The mind is a specialized subject. Scientologists know about it. They have to take into account all of the various items—which could influence a graph—of any kind in order for the graph to be useful, see? So a lie detector has relatively small usefulness to somebody who doesn't know very much about the behavior of the mind. A police detective running a lie detector who knows nothing about the mind—he's not a Dianeticist, Scientologist—is sufficiently unreliable that no jury in the world to date will take the evidence of a lie detector.

Yet, the use of a lie detector, used with intelligence, could actually save the average citizen from endless suspicion, interrogation and could clear up at once the subject of guilt.

All the court is there to do is establish the subject of guilt or innocence on the crimes before it. It is there to uphold the mores of the society. And therefore, it is—in order to

uphold these and to act with justice—it must act within the realm of truth. And as long as the court itself cannot, by its rules of evidence, establish accurately the justice or injustice of a case, it therefore cannot itself act with justice and there will be no justice.

Now, let's look at this thing—this electroencephalograph. Practically nobody uses one of these things, by the way. It is relatively unused, because an X-ray will tell a brain tumor and so forth. The people who use this at all, themselves, are upset by the machine. You would have to be a fine electronics man in order to use one. You should have had a couple of years of electronics and engineering before you began to work with the machine, because the tiniest little thing could upset the reading. You follow me?

So that anything that requires that much specialized education must itself be suspect. And let us ask ourselves at once what it is measuring. It is very pertinent to auditing. What is it measuring? It is measuring the ebb and flow and change of electrical energies of various potentials which are present in or absent from the human anatomical structure. And that's what an electroencephalograph is measuring. And that's what a lie detector is measuring.

It's not measuring the sweat on the palm. I have talked to a phrenologist—I think that's what they call them—endlessly on this subject, trying to demonstrate to him that there was such a thing as an electronic standing wave or ridge in connection with a human being, see?

And this escapes his understanding. He can feel the sweat on somebody's palm. He can count, beneath a microscope, somebody's pores. Why? He has been trained to look at palms and sweat as a nervous symptom and he has been equally well trained in the idea that an individual has nervous reactions which are quivers of one kind or another. And so he is trying to explain the electrical phenomena of the lie detector through the interpretation of a physiological thing since he is a physiologist. A psychologist is a physiologist, basically. That's something that you must never overlook in talking to them.

5 The whole structure of psychology, by the way, came to being when Wundt joined physiology with studies of the mind. And that's something you mustn't overlook. It's a physiological study. It's not a study of the mind—and today is getting honest enough to admit that it's not a study of the mind, since its latest definitions are that it does not study the mind—does not study the soul or even the mind anymore, in spite of the fact that it's called *psychology*, see? All right.

This man would have to be, again, an electronics man, but he'd have to be more than an electronics man to understand this lie detector. He would have to be—to understand it 100 percent—he would have to be (1) an electronics man and (2) a Scientologist. And then he could understand exactly what it was saying and, oddly enough, interpret it perfectly.

It would take a Scientologist, then, to read these things. Now, you should understand that 17 percent or something like that of the readings on a lie detector are thought to be erroneous by a police detective using one. You see this? Seventeen percent are supposed to be erroneous. Nine or ten percent of the cases he gets do not register at all on this.

Why? They are the same cases that do not register on your E-Meter. They get a stuck needle. The person is so stuck in some sort of a standing ridge that no matter how many questions you ask him, you get no disturbance of the electrical condition of his body.

Now, that's important to you as an auditor. We have objective phenomena here. We have meters that measure this fact: that there's about 9 percent of the people who are walking on the streets right now who would not disturb a lie detector one single bit because nothing they think influences anything physiological about them. And nothing they hear influences any physiological thing about them.

They are unable to make a postulate stick to such a degree that there is no influence between the mind and the body. The body is totally on stimulus-response. It is running without any monitoring. These people do, then, comprise the bulk of the criminal population.

So we get this fascinating thing: the lie detector used in the field of crime is unable to work on the greatest criminals. We expect, educationally, *conscience* to be a check on these people. Conscience can only be a check on somebody if it restimulates a somatic.

If these people can act without any pattern of restimulation whatsoever, they can then act to do anything and *do*—because they act without direction, without moral guidance. And one of them—and I have investigated these people, by the way, with *great fascination*, you know. I'm not afraid to get my hands dirty in life. I never really have the idea that you *can* get your hands dirty in life.

And I've gone down into the smelliest jails you ever wanted to see and talked to criminals and so forth, and it would just *fascinate* you. They will argue on the very central points on which they will be condemned.

Now, the law says that sanity is the ability to tell right from wrong, but they don't say what crime is beyond it's something "agin" the law. An individual will only commit a crime when he cannot differentiate between right and wrong. I mean, that's the long and short of this, see? If he could really tell right from wrong, he wouldn't commit a crime on the various dynamics, see?

He wouldn't act violently against one or another of these dynamics if he could tell right from wrong. He would act more or less instinctively right, you see?

Now, when we depress him to a point of where his mind cannot influence his energy banks, he is then unable to influence his own motions and actions and he becomes a thing of the moment. Somebody says, "Rob," he robs. Somebody says, "Spit," he spits. Somebody says, "Spin," he spins.

The romantic criminal, the Robin Hood of the public eye—who's very, very often deified by the William Randolph Hearst because they give him more space than anybody else—is not even a wound-up doll. The real criminal is so nuts that he doesn't even have enough direction to be nutty. This is fascinating.

And lie detectors do not work on the real criminal. If a lie detector or an E-Meter were sitting there, *nonfunctional* on somebody, we consider then he is either stuck completely in a standing ridge or that nothing he thinks can influence any energy pattern of his body. In other words, no postulates stick, no postulates unfix. He is, therefore, a stimulus-response mechanism. And what do you know? These are both the same thing.

If a person's postulates will or will not stick, a person can or cannot influence any ridge in which he's interiorized. So we have this thing. This is fantastic. We have, then, a *test* which is one of the most interesting tests and which would clear out of the way, at once, the people who are put on lie detectors and let loose—because there was no registry of guilt or innocence—are people who probably ought to be in the clink anyhow, see? So therefore, the lie detector fails.

7 Now, why am I talking to you about lie detectors? Because it is an electronic mechanism by which the actions of an individual can, by and large, be determined. It works on the electronic structure of the body. The electronic structure is disturbed whenever ownership is miscalled.

We get more ridge whenever we miscall the ownership of the ridge. We get an electronic manifestation of the act when we get a misownership of the act. And that is why a lie detector works. Now, that is the basic background facts of a lie detector.

And where it does not act at all, we can assume, no matter how rational he sometimes sounds, that the individual is unable to influence electrical energy in any way by thinking.

Now, that would be fantastic. How can a guy be that bad off, you know? You know, he thinks and nothing happens. There's no interaction between mind and body at all. Why? Because the mind does not have sufficient force or power to cause an interaction to take place.

He has lost to motionlessness. He has lost to motion. He has lost to not-knowingness and to knowingness to such a degree that he's simply backed off almost entirely. And you're looking at a wound-up GE which is acting on a stimulus-response basis.

Now, do you know that a person in a deep trance can be banged out of his head regardless of what kind of condition he's in? Did you know that? If you got a person in a deep enough trance, you would simply say, "You will now appear in Afghanistan. And lying there in a deep trance, you will report back to me the hot dope," or, "You will now jump over and pick up a body in India."

Well, a funny thing will occur. He will become to some degree detached from the ridges in which he has been fixed, on your determinism. And he sort of gets charged up on your determinism and carries forward on that basis. Do you know that's how they make the between-lives switches, the body switches—the old space opera whole track mechanism was to knock somebody flat and keep him in incarceration for a long time, having sent *him* away to inhabit somebody and influence him politically. Were you aware of that?

This is one of the old wheezes of the line. Therefore, there are people that you would walk into that you would say, "Be three feet back of your head" and they would at once—at once. And you would say, "Be ten feet above the roof" and he would be at once. But he probably wouldn't be able to tell you about it. Got it? His basic recognition would be so determined by your determinism and so on that you would merely have to assume these things were taking place. We got it?

So you can go down to a sanitarium occasionally and bang people out of their heads with no gain of case. You could also bang them into somebody else's body if you wanted to.

To these people, no force or postulate can hold; no opinion can hold contrary to yours. See, they're unable to establish their own whereabouts on their own determinism. And that is the bottom of the ledger and that is a criminal.

Now, not all people who do that are criminals. But people who are in that condition can simply come up against a bad influence and become criminal. Why? Stimulus-response, you see?

- 8 The study of stimulus-response would result in the study of the lowest order of *Homo sapiens*. If you only studied stimulus-response, you would find yourself continually scraping elbows with the lowest order of cat. You see that?

Well, why would you do that? It's because stimulus-response would only work 100 percent on people who themselves could not confront or combat stimulus-response. See, a stimuli appears in the environment, a response occurs in the body. And when you've got this neatly going, there mustn't be—there probably isn't—any intervention.

But where you have an individual who is just barely able to monitor the stimulus-response a little bit, you see, he's able to monitor it a little bit, we get a manifestation which Freud mistook for censor—what he called the censor. That was a thetan in *lousy* condition who could sometimes interrupt the stimulus-response mechanism. But we were still studying, basically, stimulus-response, you see?

Now, we had to study a very low order of being in order to study these two things. What is the common denominator between these two things? Actually the fellow who can barely, now and then, interrupt one of his impulses or actions and the fellow who cannot interrupt any of his impulses or actions but just acts—these two together are suffering from (1) intolerance of motion, (2) intolerance of no-motion—that's stationariness, (3) intolerance of stupidity and (4) of course, intolerance of all phenomena to such a degree that they've simply given up. If you could conceive apathy to be a total intolerance, you have the picture.

Intolerance, you believe, perhaps, is something that is expressed. A fellow says, "I don't like that," so you think you're looking at intolerance. No, I'm afraid that's not—not true. The total intolerance is apathy. If you're totally intolerant, you would take *no* action of *any* kind.

- 9 Now, somehow or other we've got to take this preclear and we've got to fish him up the scale. If he isn't reacting rapidly on Level One, we must conceive at once that

our preclear is intolerant on all of these points. He is not expressing himself, but he is intolerant, see?

Now, without lie detector, without encephalograph, without mechanical means of any kind, the auditor can establish characteristics of this nature. And this is very important. The phenomena is there to be observed. I am not now talking about a handful of air. I am not now talking about a theory that has its authority from having been published in 1825, see? I'm not.

I'm talking about materials which you yourself, if you wanted to go out into the society, could look over very carefully and find that they were holding true all the way along the line. You would find out, if you wished to do so, that on the finest lie detector or the worst home-built E-Meter, that you would get the mechanisms of ownership as the fundamental behind the behavior of the instrument.

He owns the act that he didn't do—you get a reaction on the meter. He says he didn't do the act that he did do and you get a reaction on the meter. In other words, he misowns the act he owns—he really owns—and you get a meter reaction. He misowns the act somebody else did and you get a reaction on the E-Meter or the lie detector—either one.

You also get respiratory reactions and you also get blood pressure reactions. And this is true except in those cases which cannot influence energy or anything. And that's not true, then, that you would get any action because of misownership on the E-Meter. But the only thing that you would get there—you'd get no action on anything on an E-Meter.

So, similarly, you very often have a preclear sitting in front of you who gets no reaction on anything. Well, the very funny thing, you know—you've told him to think this and think that and he got a little tiny somatic, finally, after you work for about eighteen hours.

What's the matter with this guy? Well, you better know here and now what's the matter with him. He might be talking to you, one way or the other, sort of at random. But two-way communication is a better E-Meter than an E-Meter.

There's something wrong with his origin, his acknowledgment, his receipt of your acknowledgment or the receipt of your communication. There is something non sequitur about the answers he gives you. There are long time spaces. There are compulsive outflows. There are all kinds of bugs in the straight Two-way Communication Formula which you find in the book *Dianetics 1955!* There are bugs in this.

Well, there are bugs in the whole Communication Formula. And those bugs consist of no recognition of the fact that energy sources exist, no recognition of any other terminal and maybe not himself, either. See, there are bugs in the whole thing.

There's also the bug of no interest. There's also the bug of no duplication. There's also the bug of no attention or fixated attention, unable to handle or shift attention. And all these things add up to is the fact that you ran him for eighteen hours and he was not getting any better in any way, shape or form, you see?

And he told you that he was getting no action or reaction. You know what you assume? You haven't got an E-Meter now. You're just sitting talking to this boy and there's something offbeat about him. But the main thing you notice offbeat about him—that no matter what he runs, he does not get a reaction in his bank, in his body, in his environment.

And you know what you assume at that point? Something very simple. You assume that he is so intolerant of everything and anything—and especially stupidity, motion and not-motion—that he himself is incapable, in the state he is in, of influencing electrical energy, space or his body in any way, shape or form.

Now, that man is a criminal or not a criminal, is sane or insane with this *accident* (it's just an accident that he isn't): the stimulus-response mechanism of his training has not been in the pattern of sanity or insanity, criminality or incriminality—but he's not one of those, you see? It's just missing from the stimulus-response pattern. My Lord, will you please look at what an accident this society depends on for the good behavior of an enormous percentage of its citizens. Isn't that fantastic?

Huh, did he have a criminal around him? Well, he fortunately didn't have a criminal around him so he went through school all right and he got there somehow.

The society that operates on the basis of building in gimmicks into individuals so that they'll then run on them will eventually fail. It'll eventually come into crime. It'll eventually come into criminal politics. It will do all sorts of wild and incredible things, because the society and Mama and Papa, the best interests in the society—the highest and most moral parts of the society, and Mama and Papa, are not the person's total influence, see?

If we could raise this person in a hothouse, if we could make sure that he never came in contact with anybody but a good mama and a good papa and a good moral level in education and the government, we could then be sure that our boy would come out of it scot-free, doing well, bungling along, operating as a camouflaged hole in some factory.

11

One day the machines start breaking down and we find out we have nothing but camouflaged holes in the whole flam-damn factory. The whole factory closes down. What an accident!

We assume, with a stimulus-response mechanism, that a great many people in the society simply will not accidentally come in the influence of a criminal or an insane person. We just assume this. So we won't have any stimulus-response mechanisms in the bank accordingly.

Now, a person who can run an engram is a person who can influence energy. A person who cannot run an engram is a person who cannot influence energy. A person who is immediately swamped by an engram is a person who is totally swamped by the energy manifestation. His intolerance has gotten to such a point that he himself is powerless in the face of the threat.

Maybe we use the word *tolerance* inadvisedly and yet we can detect visibly the decay of tolerance in the individual up to a certain point. But we must remember that it's

tolerance from there on down that is suffering. He's getting more and more intolerant until he just quits.

When you look at this game called life that way—that a person becomes more and more intolerant of life—first he wants to play it, he guesses, and then he becomes intolerant and critical, and then he becomes more and more critical, and then he becomes more and more critical, and then he becomes more and more critical. And as he becomes more and more critical, he starts to quit on more and more fronts, he starts to influence less and less and finally he influences nothing, which is total intolerance of the whole works. He wants to quit the game, but he's still there.

He leaves this body running on a stimulus-response mechanism. An engram comes up, the training pattern goes into gear and he, like a little wound-up doll, goes in that direction. I would hate to live in a society which depended, absolutely and utterly, upon a stimulus-response characteristic to carry it forward, because someday the bottom is going to fall out, see?

So therefore, your study is stimulus-response mechanism only to this degree—*only* to this degree: to the degree that it establishes for you the intolerance or tolerance of the individual. Somebody is totally stimulus-response—*voilà*, he's completely intolerant. Therefore he's a complete mechanism. He would be incapable of differentiation between right and wrong. And you could run him and run him and run him and run him and run him and run him and run him without his influencing energy at all, unless you raised his tolerances. See that?

- 12 So this is the first thing we face. We have to show the individual there is something he can do to something by thinking. And we say "This reality on Scientology," we mean this: not a reality of data, not a reality of workability, but because we were sitting there and talking to him, he discovered strangely and peculiarly enough, that he, by thinking about something, could influence it.

And there is the case entrance. And there's the first entrance point of a case. Regardless of how many rules we lay down, there is the entrance point of a case right there. We have brought the individual to realize that by thinking about something, he *could* influence it—that thought *could* monitor structure.

Now, I'll give you this: You are dealing with a society which has been educated quite in the reverse—not reverse that structure monitors function, but that the body just kind of keeps on running somehow and there's nothing you can do with thought about any part of it. And you will find even young people, who should be able to work very well under auditing, going through this manifestation: They will think, "Well, we can't do anything by *thinking* about it."

This has been made part of their stimulus-response pattern. A more vicious thing could never happen to a youth of any land than to teach them that they could not influence anything by thinking about it. You see this?

Therefore, we are fortunate indeed in a preclear who has an early presentation of a present time problem to the auditor and who then solves it by the auditor's direction. We're just lucky. He had a little problem, we solved it. And he will sit there and he will say, "Well, well, well!"

If we ask this fellow one way or the other by doing what we say, if we coax him into influencing, one way or another, some aspect of his body or his beingness and he says, "Well, well, well! By thinking about something, I could influence it." See this?

Well now, most of the preclears you get have not dropped to a total intolerance. They're still playing the game. They're not leaving a wound-up doll there to play the game for them. They're still playing the game to some degree.

As a matter of fact, 90 percent of them are still playing the game to some degree. But the odd part of it is, is some of the remaining 9 or 10 percent will do this great oddity: they will get an engram into restimulation which tells them that they need auditing.

And you, you chump, beat your brains in on an engram and the case hangs up and it won't move and it won't do anything. And the preclear one day skids a little bit or eats some yeast or something and it moves the engram on the track a little bit and they start to cry or they start to scream or they start to get sad and they tell you, "Look what you did to me as an auditor! Look what Scientology has done to me! Look how horrible it all is!"

Just as they say to a medical doctor—who was foolish enough to be in his office when this person first came to call—is then victimized, see? Because they've got another engram that says, "Blame, blame, blame, blame. Not me, not me, not me."

Boy, they certainly are summing their case all the time. They're saying, "Not me, not me, not me." There's not a "me" there. See this? You see how this could work then? All right.

- 13 You must recognize this clearly if you're going to be a successful auditor all the way across the boards. You must recognize this person by his communication, by his ability to influence or not to influence the energy in his bank. Because sometimes people are so obliging that they seem to do everything possible for you and they just don't get any better. What they've got is an obliging engram at work. See this?

We had a girl whose name added up to—I won't tell you her exact name—her name added up to—well, let's say her name added up to "It's wonderful." It did, almost. Her name added up to "It's wonderful."

And every time the auditor would audit her, she would say, "It's wonderful." Her psychosomatic ills were not getting any better at all. You see this? She was dramatizing her name 100 percent of the time. Fantastic, hm? All she'd do is just tell the auditor how grand it was.

And the individual, oddly enough, had a couple of fantastic things wrong with them anatomically. See, the body was really quitting. And yet the session did them "so much good" and these characteristics never changed session to session.

And I finally tapped this auditor on the shoulder and I said, "Look, I don't mean to be peeking through your head or anything like this, but I think that you would be better off if you found out if this person could, at any time, do anything about anything."

Well, of course, this person could do anything about anything. He'd been running all kinds of terrific high-echelon processes and so on. So he remembered a lecture and he said to the preclear—he said, being very sneaky—he said to the preclear, "Tell me a decision that you could make" and threw her into a fourteen-day comm lag. You get this?

When he told me this and told me he had spent the rest of the session on just this one thing and she hadn't answered it yet, I then had him just kick it along for as many days as it would be necessary for her to finally come up with an answer.

Her case began to mend when she first answered that question. What decision could she make? She was so intolerant of life that she couldn't even tolerate her own decisions. You see this? This was a rough beef.

Power of choice. Power of choice—zero. If you cannot rehabilitate their power of choice, these people cannot be rehabilitated regardless of what you do to them. This you've got to work on.

And if this is true of the worst case there is, then this is certainly true of all the rest of the cases there are—an improvement of tolerance, an improvement of their power of choice.

What are the differences between tolerances and power of choice? An individual who makes his power of choice because of relative intolerance is not making a power of choice. Got it? It's very, very simple. It's so simple that I can see a possibility of a tremendous comm lag on this in some guys. It's too simple, really.

Stimulus-response is a study of relative intolerances, in choosing the least intolerance—making a choice because of the least intolerance. That's it, see. Now, that's stimulus-response.

An individual goes out here and he doesn't care, really, whether he eats steak or chops. But he sits there deciding on steak or chops, don't you see? And he sits there and he sits there, trying to decide between steak or chops. And he finally finds out that chops have little white pants on them, you know? And he finds out that makes him less tolerant because they're more visible, so he orders steak. Get the idea?

That's environmental decision based on intolerance and that is stimulus-response. And this stimulus-response goes right on downhill and gets into energy and solid masses and everything else. Things don't become energy and solid masses because of intolerances; they become energy and solid masses because of terminals in the game called "communication."

But a person goes out of communication on his own determinism and into communication because of relative intolerances simply to the degree that he has lost his ability to tolerate motion, no-motion and stupidity. He has to be able to tolerate those three things—motion, no-motion, stupidity. Those are the principal ones.

There could be some others, but from these you get tremendous ramifications. Oh, you can draw out the whole plot and pattern of life from these intolerances.

A little bit below these you find a whole new flock of them. There are a bunch more. There's intolerances for separateness and togethernesses. Just look at that on the Second Dynamic. Some preclear, I'm sure, at some time or another has said to you in so many words, "I just can't stand the idea of men and women standing together talking to each other—just drives me mad."

Well, don't consider this preclear is therefore nuts. You may have a preclear that couldn't stand it a long time ago. Get the idea? He couldn't stand it a long time ago, but since that time, is so intolerant that he has abandoned the entire project. And he doesn't even know that men and women stand together. You see?

Well now, you've got to understand, when you process somebody, actually, the basis of *ability*—you got to understand the basis of ability because that's what you're trying to *increase*. You're not trying to polish up his engrams. You're not trying to move around his whirligigs. You're not trying to adjust the way he handles his fork. All you're trying to do is increase his tolerance and his power of choice.

And to do this, you, to a marked extent, take over his power of choice and his intolerances and then you let him have them back as fast as you are sure that *he* is the one who is getting them back. You got that? It's real simple.

Now, we have him spotting objects. The optimum way to run a regimen of this character would be to select the object for the preclear and then get up to a point of where you'd let *him* select the objects, you see? That would be the optimum way to run it.

As a matter of fact, power of choice usually doesn't enter in that low on the scale as Level One. It would actually come in most markedly, in the most regimented step of all, 8-C—Opening Procedure of 8-C. Now you take over his *total* power of choice, except the choice to be there and have something done for him, see, and then restore it to him in three steps, (a), (b) and (c), see? And you'll restore it to him as fast as he's sure that it's his. You see this? All right.

There's where we really handle it and that's why 8-C is still staying there. Now, whenever you have a designed regimen, the theory underlying this regimen is to restore to the individual, first, his First Dynamic determinism and then, as you go on, the remainder of his determinism. So we get into a condition of Pan-determinism for the fellow, as much as we possibly can—the willingness to assume all viewpoints. That is the theoretical height—the willingness to make any and all choices.

Now, it would seem rather peculiar to you that if a cannonball were flying through the air, that you could change the course of the cannonball by thinking it was to go

off at a divergence. Now, that would seem rather peculiar to you, right? Hm? Here's a cannonball. It's traveling at a vast rate of speed. It has tremendous mass. And it's traveling straight north. And you think at it and it travels northwest.

Would you please tell me the difference (the essential difference) between doing that and having a body which—remember, wasn't yours in the first place—experiences sensation or to turn a corner because you told it to. What's the difference? You're not a body part any more than you're part of the cannonball.

Well, I'll tell you the main difference between them is that darn few people can change the course of a cannonball with a postulate. That's the main difference.

But handle mass with a postulate—that is the *ne plus ultra* that you're working toward—power of choice. But that is not the highest thing there is. To handle thought with thought is higher than that—fantastically true. That's way up in the stars. How would you do that?

I used to have a little drill—kind of amuse you. I had a conviction on this. When I was a kid, writing travel articles and so forth, so on, before I started writing very much fiction and in the earliest days of fiction, I used to sit down and I would read the article on a pan-basis, see. So the rest of the whole country would read the article. And I'd send it off and it'd immediately be bought.

And I sort of had this silly notion, you see, that if I did this carefully, I'd always sell the article. So I didn't do it one day and didn't sell the article and that hung me with it, you see?

To this day, I won't know completely how much this influenced it because I have read some of those early articles and although they had zip and so forth, I certainly can't figure out how anybody ever bought them. That's an interesting thing. That should be very interesting to you—this thing.

All right. This person's body gets out of whack. Well, that's not by his choice. The body has made a choice to be out of whack. Now, the optimum would be for him to think, "Body okay" and it is, see?

Now, we misinterpret that by saying he must be in a condition of orders. He must be able to—orders—orders is a low level of this. The truth of the matter is, he must search for and establish consents. You just think of the highest echelon of orders as establishing the highest echelon of consents. Then a person isn't following something like a cannonball. Here's thought handling thought.

When a person cannot handle other people or cannot influence other people, let me assure you, he can't handle a cannonball either. And if he's got a broken leg he can't say to it, "Broken leg, square around"—snap, bing—broken leg is well. He can't do that. This would surprise you. I know—something that you would look at with incredulity. But there are people around who cannot heal broken legs or two heads with a postulate. 16

Now, the reason you go on so many vias to get them to do it is because, by these vias, they do find out they can do it. And the optimum course of processing would be to take less and less via toward the same goal—make the postulate fix or unfix at will, have it influence or not influence at will.

Now, somebody is around being very unhappy because when he thinks a thought, brother, does he get a somatic, see? He says he's very unhappy about this. He thinks one of these postulates or ideas that he reads in some old book on Dianetics or something, and wham! Man, he's got somatics from jaw to crown and the seat of his pants and he's in horrible condition.

There's nothing wrong with this individual's power of choice, let me assure you—not as far as humans are concerned. What is wrong with it is he doesn't know that it was he, thinking it, that did it, you see—to that degree. But he is able to influence and handle mass.

Now he falls back and says he's got to drive a car with his hands on the steering wheel. He's got to do all kinds of vias. As a matter of fact, theoretically, all he is doing is directing the course of energy through spaces with a bunch of via postulates, you know?

And we feel that if we get the postulate far enough removed and over enough vias, then some very interestingly effective things will occur. No. If we get the vias *out* between the postulate and the action, some *very* interesting things will occur.

Man is going in the wrong direction trying to put in more vias, unless he wants more game. If you want more game, put in more vias. If you want a faster game, start taking out vias, that's all—via between the postulate and the action. Reaction time simply measures the number of vias between the postulate and the action. That's all it measures.

Now, processing understood from this standpoint can make a lot more sense to you. If you understood this thoroughly, you could look over a preclear and tell exactly what he was doing and simply start getting him to know that he could reduce the number of vias in his action cycle considerably and make his postulates thereby more effective directly.

When you have an individual who is very low-scale, you get them to do something with thought that brings and exerts a better communication than they had. Now, the funny part of it is, is that control is the lower harmonic of communication. When an individual starts to go out of communication, he starts to get anxious about having terminals. Therefore, he feels he must control the terminal in order to have a communication terminal. And there is the only place control comes in—the only place where it's important.

He wants this communication to take place via terminals, so he feels he must control the terminal in order to have it stand there and communicate, see? And his lack of control is liable to give him less communication.

Well, just consider this as a bunch of vias and you see where control comes from. Why should anybody get worried about control? Cannonball flies through the air, it's going

2,780 feet per second, and the fellow says, "Stop," and it stops. He says, "Fall," it falls. But you don't have a game.

Football is flying down the field and it's going at nineteen feet per second—or whatever footballs go at, probably eighty-eight feet per second—it's doing all right. Oh, that's too high. Football probably goes about twenty-seven feet per second. Anyhow, it's flying down the field and one of the players on the opposite team says, "Stop," and it stops right there in midair and he says, "Fall," and it falls.

Nobody will sit in that stadium worth a nickel. And the reason they won't be fit to watch this game is because they can't tolerate this much postulate with that little communication connected with it.

Communication, necessity for, reduces the effectiveness of the postulate. You have to reduce the effectiveness of the postulate in order to have communication. If you have communication, you will improve the effectiveness of the postulate. 17

It's quite interesting, but one goes out of the postulate ability in order to get communication. And along with that, of course, he gets all parts of communication. He gets attention.

After somebody had made a show out of it: The twenty-seven-feet-per-second football going down the field, stops, falls, see—somebody made a show out of this—circus act or something of the sort—done this a few times. The audience would say, "That's fine. Let's have another act," you know?

He has violated parts of the Communication Formula by taking this much control and this few vias. Do you know that money is as good as it has vias? If you hide the source of money sufficiently, it has value. There is no other value to money than that.

If you disclose its source exactly, such as they do in a central banking system, you get upset in the field of money. People don't consider it's valuable, because they know who printed it. And they start talking about "printing press money." What other kind is there?

Well, you say, "There's money that really backs up property." Oh, is there? But if we put enough vias on it and hide it around enough corners, it becomes very valuable. And so then do people become valuable. So do footballs become valuable and so forth, you see, because they are derived at and controlled by a series of vias. The auditor is trying to find the optimum number of vias so the preclear can have a game.

I can see that occasionally an auditor would run into somebody who had to have vias put in. He didn't have enough game. And an auditor would have to sit there and get this guy to actually add vias into his activity until he did have a game, see?

The preclear doesn't have a game because the football is going down the field. He says, "Stop," it stops. He says, "Fall," it falls. It's just like this. It's no more, no less than that. That's what's happening.

And it's no game. He can't play football with anybody. An auditor might have to teach him to let the football fly all the way down the field and fall and bounce, doing it all, all the way, but not knowing that he was doing any of it.

To do this, an auditor would have to rehabilitate (1) the number of vias which the individual wanted and (2) this oddity—this great oddity: He'd have to rehabilitate the postulate of not-knowingness. He'd have to rehabilitate the preclear's ability to build machinery and hide it and so forth.

And then the preclear could have all kinds of games with all kinds of vias on it and probably be very happy about the whole thing.

So we have ultimate power as one goal, ultimate effectiveness in fixing and unfixing postulates as one goal of all processing—starting at the beginning with no effectiveness in fixing or unfixing postulates on the part of a thetan and ending with total effectiveness of fixing and unfixing postulates at the other end.

And monitoring this is the desire for a game—with the pay, communication. And a preclear will rise as fast and as high as he trusts that he can still improve himself and

still have a game. He can improve himself up to the point of having a game. And above that point, he considers that he's going downhill, even though his postulates are getting more and more and more and more effective.

What the preclear's idea of a game is may be something that the auditor has to straighten out, too. And so we get the various factors with which we work in auditing. We have communication as the pay for a game and the game itself monitoring a *total* recovery of the preclear at all times.

And the auditor is seeking some balance between these points. And the factors he's dealing with are relatively simple factors. They're easy to handle. And when he handles processes without an understanding of these factors, they sometimes don't work. But if he understands them very thoroughly, then, of course, the processes work seventeen times as fast.

Thank you.

Thank you.



GLOSSARY

Words often have several meanings. The definitions used here only give the meaning that the word has as it is used in these lectures. This glossary is not meant to take the place of standard language or Dianetics and Scientology dictionaries, which should be referred to for any words, terms or phrases that do not appear below.

Abbott: *Abbott Laboratories*, a company in the United States that manufactures various medical and psychiatric drugs, as well as vitamin preparations.

abreact: release or express an impulse, emotion, etc., such as one previously forgotten or repressed.

abuse: deceive or mislead.

Acropolis, the: the elevated, fortified section of the city of Athens, Greece. Beginning in the fifth century B.C., the Greeks built a series of structures there, a temple dedicated to Athena, the patron goddess of the city, and several theaters, etc.

Aesculapian: of the *Aesculapian school*, a school of mental and physical healing that began in ancient Greece, named after *Aesculapius*, the Greek god of medicine and healing.

aggregate, in the: as a whole; generally.

agin: informal for *against*. Use of *agin* emphasizes the opposition someone feels for something.

agrarian: of agriculture or farmers.

à la: after the manner, method or style of.

Alexander: Alexander the Great (356–323 B.C.), military general and king of Macedonia (an ancient kingdom in northern Greece). Alexander conquered much of what was then considered the civilized world, from present-day Greece to India.

Alexander IV: Rinaldo Dei Segni (1199–1261) Pope Alexander IV from 1254 to 1261 who instituted the Inquisition in France. The Inquisition was a special court within the Roman Catholic Church involved in seeking out and punishing those persons with beliefs contrary to the Church. The court confiscated goods from the “guilty” and those killed, thereby increasing its assets and profit.

Alexandria: a city and seaport in northern Egypt, founded in 332 B.C. by military general and king of Macedonia, Alexander the Great (356–323 B.C.). In ancient times, the city was the site of brutal conflicts between opposing Christian sects, resulting in mass slaughters of the city’s inhabitants.

algebraic dihedrals: *algebraic* means of or having to do with *algebra*, the part of mathematics in which letters and other general symbols are used to represent numbers and quantities. *Dibedral* means having to do with or forming a *dibedral angle*, the angle formed by the intersection of two planes. For example, in a cube, the *dibedral angle* would be the angle formed at the point where any two sides of the cube (planes) meet. Used here with the sense of being an advanced mathematical formula that requires great skill to solve.

Allah: the Arabic word for *God*.

Alpha Centauri: the third brightest star in the sky, visible only to observers in the southern hemisphere. It is the closest star to Earth and 4.35 light-years from the Sun.

antisubmarine warfare: a term for the various methods employed in detecting, fighting and destroying enemy submarines, as during wartime.

Armageddon(s): any “final” battle on a large scale that usually marks the doom of someone or something and that is so decisive that any renewed or further conflict is made impossible. Armageddon is the place (or the battle itself) in the Bible where the final battle between the forces of good and evil will take place.

ashcan(s): a large, usually metal receptacle for ashes, garbage, etc. Also used figuratively.

assuage(d): satisfy or relieve.

atomic and molecular phenomena: the subject or study of the structure and energy of atoms and molecules and the relationship between them. An *atom* is a very small particle which is considered the building block of physical matter. All the material on Earth is composed of various combinations of atoms which unite in an infinite number of ways into more complex structures called molecules. A *molecule* is one of the basic units of matter, consisting of one or more atoms held together by chemical forces.

autos-da-fé: elaborate public ceremonies and rituals where those tried and condemned by the Spanish Inquisition (a court appointed by the Roman Catholic Church to discover and suppress departures from established religious beliefs, ca. 1480-1834) were sentenced and often burned at the stake. *Auto-da-fé* is Portuguese for *act of faith*.

Axiom 36: a lie is a second postulate, statement or condition designed to mask a primary postulate which is permitted to remain.

Bacon: Francis Bacon (1561-1626), influential English philosopher who believed that any bias or prejudice in scientific thinking must be abandoned and that accurate observation and experimentation were vital to science. He helped develop the scientific method of solving problems.

“Ballad of Reading Gaol”: a poem written by Irish poet, author and playwright Oscar Wilde (1854-1900). Inspired by the two years Wilde spent in jail (British spelling “gaol”) in Reading, England, it is the story of a man condemned to die for murdering the woman he loved. The poem in part reads as follows:

*“The man had killed the thing he loved,
And so he had to die.
Yet each man kills the thing he loves,
By each let this be heard,
Some do it with a bitter look,
Some with a flattering word,
The coward does it with a kiss,
The brave man with a sword!”*

*Some kill their love when they are young,
 And some when they are old;
 Some strangle with the hands of Lust,
 Some with the hands of Gold;
 The kindest use a knife, because
 The dead so soon grow cold."*

ball, on the: alert and efficient or effective.

bank: literally, a storage of information, as in a computer where the data was once stored on a group or series of cards called a bank. Figuratively, to place something in storage for future use.

base time: the time continuum of the whole universe. The galaxies move in relationship to galaxies at such and such a rate. Photons travel more or less at such and such a speed given a standard medium through which to travel. That's base time.

beat (one's) brains in: a variation of *beat one's brains out*, to try very hard or labor strenuously with the mind to solve something.

Bedlam: an old insane asylum (in full, St. Mary of Bethlehem) in London, known for its inhumane treatment and filthy environment. Inmates were chained to the walls or floor and when restless or violent, beaten, whipped or dunked in water.

beef, rough: a coined term used to describe a trying or difficult situation.

"Be kind to your web-footed friends": a reference to "Web-footed Friends," a nonsense song, popular in the Boy Scouts, with campers, etc. The song has numerous variations, but generally goes as follows:

*"Be kind to your web-footed friends,
 For that duck may be somebody's brother,
 He lives in the midst of a swamp,
 Where it's awfully cold and damp,
 Now you may think that this is the end,
 Well it is!"*

Web-footed means having feet where the toes are joined together with a web of skin, such as a duck.

Bergman, Ingrid: (1915–1982), Swedish actress, born in Stockholm, and winner of three Academy Awards. She appeared in more than a score of American and European films and stage productions. After a lapse in popularity during her relationship with Italian film director Roberto Rossellini (subsequently her second husband) and the birth of their illegitimate child, she returned to America to rejuvenate her career in the late 1950s.

berth: a situation or place; a position or appointment.

big business: large business, commercial and financial firms taken collectively, especially when considered as a group having shared attitudes and goals and exercising control over economic policy, politics, etc.

birds, for the: useless; no good, or that should not be taken seriously, likened to food that birds would eat off the ground.

Biscuit Examination Service: a made-up name.

black and white phenomena: a reference to *Black and White Processing*, a process used to help a preclear to get rid of certain deposits of energy which are black and which are causing him trouble. This is done by getting the preclear to look at such an energy deposit and telling him to “turn it white.” The energy deposit won’t flow easily as blackness, but it flows easily as whiteness. When he turns it white, the energy deposit will flow and he can rid himself of the unwanted energy deposits.

Blankism: a made-up term.

board(s), across the: including or embracing all classes, categories, areas, groups. The expression comes from horse racing and refers to the notice board at a racetrack which displays the chances of a horse winning the race. When a person bets “across the board,” he wagers the same amount of money on a single horse to win the race, come in second or finish third. Thus, if the horse places first, second or third, the bettor collects money. The sporting use of this term originated in the 1930s and around 1950 had come to be used more generally.

boards, by the: be removed, lost, neglected or destroyed. The term *boards* in nautical language refers to the side of the ship. Anything that goes (or is thrown) over the side is lost.

boodle: the whole lot of; all of (something).

book at, throw the: to express disapproval of; scold; accuse (someone) of all the offenses he or she may be guilty of.

Bosun's Mate Jinks: a made-up name. A *bosun's mate* is an assistant to the *bosun*, an officer on a ship whose job is to supervise maintenance of the ship and its equipment.

Bovril: a brand name for a commercially produced beef extract produced in England. It is used as the fundamental element in seasoning soups, gravies, etc.

bowsprits: large, tapered spars (poles) extending forward from the bow (front end) of a sailing vessel, to which heavy ropes or cables are secured.

breach, throw into the: put into action as an emergency measure. A *breach* is a gap or hole, particularly in the wall of a fort or in a dike, etc.

breast: to meet or oppose boldly; confront.

bubonic plague: a highly contagious and often fatal epidemic disease transmitted by fleas from infected rats, prevalent throughout Europe and Asia in the fourteenth century. Also known as Black Death.

bucket, kicked (kick) the: a slang phrase meaning died.

bulkhead: any of various wall-like constructions inside a vessel, as for forming watertight compartments, subdividing space or strengthening the structure.

bullheaded: stubbornly refusing to change one's chosen course of action.

buoy, mooring: a buoy secured to an anchor or weight permanently attached to the sea floor, marking the location where a ship or boat can be moored. A *buoy* is a distinctively shaped and marked floating object often having a bell, light or flag to make it audible or visible. It is moored (fixed firmly in place) in water to mark a channel, indicate the position of a submerged object, warn ships of an underwater danger, etc.

but good: very much so; thoroughly, completely. Used for emphasis.

caduceus: a symbol for the medical profession consisting of a staff with a single snake wrapped around it, from a similar staff used in Greek and Roman times to represent both the god of healing (Aesculapius) and *Hermes*, messenger of the gods.

carburetor: a device in an internal-combustion engine that mixes liquid fuel and air in the correct proportions, vaporizes them (makes them into a fine mist) and transfers the mixture into the engine where it is exploded providing power.

cat: a slang term for a person, especially a man.

catatonic schiz: a *catatonic schizophrenic*, one suffering from *catatonic schizophrenia*, a condition in which a person lies there day and night and never moves, barely breathes. Breath hardly registers on a mirror when held to the lips, and there is hardly any pulse.

Cattagut: a made-up name for a place.

censor: in early Freudian theory, a force that represses ideas, impulses and feelings, and prevents them from entering consciousness in their original, undisguised forms.

chalk or palk or malk polio vaccine: a humorous reference to the *Salk polio vaccine*, a vaccine invented by US bacteriologist Jonas E. Salk (1914-1995) to prevent the disease poliomyelitis (polio). A *vaccine* is a substance which is put into the blood and that protects the body from disease.

Charles V: (1500-1558) Holy Roman Emperor from 1519 to 1558, and king of Spain from 1516 to 1556, who fought a losing battle to keep his Roman Catholic empire together. The Holy Roman Empire was a political entity of lands in western and central Europe, founded in A.D. 800 and dissolved in 1806.

chemical engineer: a person specializing in *chemical engineering*, the branch of engineering that deals with the large-scale processing of chemicals and chemical products for industrial and consumer use, such as the manufacture of cosmetics, fertilizers and food products.

chiropractic: a reference to *chiropractic*, a system of healing based upon the theory that disease results from a lack of normal nerve function and employing treatment by manipulation and specific adjustment of body structures (as the spinal column) and utilizing physical therapy when necessary in order to restore proper alignment.

clink: a slang term for a prison or jail.

clomps: a coined term meaning grasps or fastens onto, likened to clumsily walking upon something.

CO: an abbreviation for *Commanding Officer*.

collection plate: a dish or other container passed in churches, etc., for donations of money.

Companion cavalry: Alexander the Great's elite cavalry, the offensive arm of his army and also his elite guard. They rode the best horses and had the best weapons.

compatriots: fellow countrymen.

concourse: communication; interchange. From *con* which means together, and *course* which means to flow.

conditioning: teaching or getting (persons) to adopt certain habits, attitudes, standards, etc.; establishing a reflex or response in (persons) through habit or training.

confabulation: a talking together; conference; discussion.

corpuscule: a single living cell, such as one of the red or white cells in the blood.

corvette(s): a lightly armed, fast ship used especially during World War II (1939-1945) to accompany a group of supply ships and protect them from attack by enemy submarines.

cosmic rays: electrically charged, high-energy particles such as those emitted from an exploding sun or star.

Crusades: any of the various military expeditions by European Christians in the eleventh through thirteenth centuries to recover the Holy Land (modern-day Palestine) and Jerusalem from the Muslims. During the Crusades hundreds of thousands of people were killed.

curiosa: things that arouse curiosity, as by being uncommon, strange, etc.

cut loose: release from control.

cut (one) loose: encourage someone to roll or move forward with speed and no restrictions.

Darius: Darius III (380?-330 B.C.), king of Persia who tried and failed to prevent Alexander the Great, the king of Macedonia, from conquering the Persian Empire. At Darius's death, Alexander became ruler of Persia.

Darwin: Charles Darwin (1809-1882), English naturalist (someone who studies nature) and author. His book *On the Origin of Species* proposed a theory to explain evolution of life forms to higher forms by natural selection. This theory holds that all species of plants and animals developed from earlier forms, and that the forms which are best adapted to their environment survive and reproduce, while those that are less well adapted die out.

Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, The: a six-volume work by Edward Gibbon covering the final centuries of Roman history, published between 1776 and 1788.

dialectic materialism: a theory adopted as the official philosophy of communism, based on the works of German revolutionist Karl Marx (1818-1883). The theory maintains that the material world has reality independent of the mind or spirit and ideas can arise only from material conditions. Marx asserted that everything is material, including human culture. He stated all things naturally contain contradictory sides or aspects ("struggle of opposites"), the conflicts of which are the driving forces of change and result in development and the emergence of something new.

dickens with, the: a phrase used to express dismissal, rejection or an utter lack of interest.

die: (plural dice) a small cube marked on each side with a varying number of dots ranging from one to six, usually used in pairs in gambling and in various other games of chance, often shaken up in a special cup and then thrown.

ding, ding, ding (here comes the wagon): a humorous phrase used to indicate that whoever is being talked to (or about) is insane and one can hear the bells of the vehicle (wagon) from the insane asylum coming to take them away. It is also used to indicate that whatever one is referring to (such as an idea or action) is crazy.

diphtheria: a serious infectious disease that attacks the membranes of the throat, causing difficulty in breathing and swallowing, and releases a toxin that damages the heart and the nervous system. The main symptoms are fever, weakness and severe inflammation of the affected membranes.

dirty, get (one's) hands: to get involved, become active in, do the actual work oneself, so as to master the skills of an area, activity, etc.

dope: a slang term for information, data or news. *Hot dope* is very exciting or interesting information.

drachmas: silver coins of ancient Greece.

drum, beat the: vigorously promote, support or loudly publicize (something). Likened to the beating of a drum for ceremonial, promotional or other purposes.

- dubbed the flub:** a coined variation of *flubbed the dub*, a term used especially in the military, that means having botched something up or spoiled or ruined something because of stupid blunders or mistakes.
- eccentric:** a mechanical device as a wheel or plate with a slightly off-center hole, mounted on a rod (axle) and used to convert circular motion into other motion such as linear (backward and forward) motion.
- 8-C:** short for *Opening Procedure of 8-C*, which is R2-16 as given in the book *The Creation of Human Ability*. It is called Opening Procedure of 8-C as it is done at the beginning (opening) of Standard Operating Procedure 8-C. (The "C" in 8-C stands for "clinical.")
- eight to the eight billionth power:** eight multiplied by itself eight billion times. *Power* refers to the action of multiplying a number by itself a specified number of times. For example, 10 to a power of 3 (or 10^3) is $10 \times 10 \times 10 = 1,000$.
- Einstein, Albert:** (1879-1955) German-born American physicist whose theories on the nature of mass and energy led to development of the atomic bomb. After World War II (1939-1945), Einstein readily joined those scientists seeking ways to prevent any future use of the bomb.
- Eisenhower:** Dwight David Eisenhower (1890-1969), US general and thirty-fourth president of the United States (1953-1961). Hero-worshiped as the commander of the Allied armies that defeated Germany in World War II, Eisenhower was elected and reelected by huge majorities in 1952 and 1956.
- electroencephalograph:** an instrument for measuring and recording the electric activity of the brain; from Greek *electro*, electric, *encephalo*, in the head, plus *graph*, an instrument for recording information.
- endocrine system:** a system of glands which secretes hormones (chemical substances) from certain organs and tissues in the body. These glands and their hormones regulate the growth, development and function of certain tissues and coordinate many processes within the body. For example, some of these glands increase blood pressure and heart rate during times of stress.

erg(s): a very small unit of energy which measures an amount or quantity of work done. For example, to lift a weight of one pound (453 grams), straight up vertically one foot (.3048 meter), requires 13,560,000 ergs.

estrogen: a hormone (chemical substance) that develops and maintains feminine characteristics in the body.

et: informal past tense of the word *eat*; eaten.

factional: of or having to do with a condition characterized by *factions*, self-seeking groups of people inside a political party, group, organization, etc., working in a common cause against other such groups or against the main body.

factionalism: a condition characterized by the formation of *factions*, self-seeking groups of people inside a group, organization, political party, etc., working in a common cause against other such groups or against the main body.

fell swoop, one: all at one time or at the same time; in one sudden action or stroke, as of a bird of prey (a bird such as an eagle or hawk that kills and eats small animals) making one vigorous descent upon its victim. The word *fell* in this expression means vigorously, fiercely or capable of destroying.

finger off, take your: a coined phrase meaning to lose contact with, stop watching closely, directing or guiding. This alludes to the literal action of being connected with something by touching it with one's finger.

fish to fry, other: other affairs of interest or concern; other business to attend to.

flam-damn: a phrase used for emphasis to express anger, contempt, annoyance, irritation, etc.

flash: have a sudden realization (about something) or burst of insight.

floriculture: a made-up term. *Flora* refers to plant life, especially all the plants found in a particular country, region or time regarded as a group. It is also a systematic set of descriptions of all the plants of a particular place or time. *Culture* refers to the cultivation of soil and land for the growing of plants and crops.

for my money: in my opinion or judgment.

fount(s): a source or origin.

Four Horsemen: a reference to a biblical story (known as the Apocalypse) meant to foretell the end of the world and the last intervention of God in human affairs. (*Apocalypse* means revelation or disclosure.) The Christians of the first century believed this event to be close at hand. When it occurred, a new age of the world would begin, in which Christ and the church would be triumphant. Meanwhile, however, the evils and terrors of the existing world would increase and intensify. These evils were represented by four horses, signifying war (a red horse), disease (a white horse), hunger (a black horse) and death (a pale horse). The Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse have come to be a symbol of the evils of the earthly world.

Frank: a staff member of the Hubbard School of Scientology in New Zealand at the time of these lectures.

French Foreign Legion: a corps of foreign volunteers and mercenaries which forms an integral part of the French Army. Recruits between the ages of eighteen and forty are accepted, regardless of nationality, background or occupation and without being required to show any proof of identity.

gab-gab walla-walla: a humorous reference to idle talk or chatter.

geneages: a made-up word that rhymes with "lineages." Taken from the word *gene*, the basic physical unit of heredity that determines a particular characteristic in an organism and can exist in a number of different forms.

genetic blueprint: the plans of construction of a new body (in the orthodox manner of conception, birth and growth).

Gibbon, Edward: (1737-1794) British scholar and the greatest English historian of his time, famous for his work *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, published in six volumes.

girls, amongst us: a humorous variation of the expression between you and me (or ourselves), meaning in strict confidence between the person speaking and the person (or those persons) listening.

Gott mit uns: a German phrase meaning "God with us," a motto that was on the uniform belt buckles of German soldiers during World War I (1914-1918) and World War II (1939-1945).

grand slam: in sports, winning of all major competitions, for example, in tennis and golf, the winning of all of a specified group of major competitions by one player or team in one year. Used figuratively.

Gullaby Isles: a made-up name for a group of islands.

HAA: an abbreviation for *Hubbard Advanced Auditor*, a course at the time of these lectures intended to polish off and perfect the skills of an already professional auditor with more extensive training and coaching.

Hahnemann: (Christian Friedrich) Samuel Hahnemann (1755-1843), German physician and founder of *homeopathy*, a system of medical treatment in which a patient is given minute doses of natural drugs that in larger doses would produce symptoms of the disease itself. The system was created on the assumption that like can be cured by like.

harmonic(s): used to describe a frequency (number of vibrations per second) which is a multiple of a “fundamental” frequency. If one stretches a string, or rubber band, and strikes it, a tone or note is produced. One can measure the number of times per second that string is vibrating. Another string, vibrating at certain, but different, multiples of that vibration rate will sound pleasing. This is calculated out mathematically such as 1, 1/2, 1/3, 1/4, etc. Such can be seen with strings in a piano, each one different in length and vibrating at different rates per second. By striking two or more at a time, simultaneously, one can hear which notes are harmonious (pleasing) when played together and which are disharmonious (harsh or not pleasing). Thus, by extension, something which repeats characteristics at a higher or lower point on a scale will be harmonic and seem to be similar and agreeable.

HASI: an abbreviation for *Hubbard Association of Scientologists International*, the organization that served as the central dissemination center, guaranteed the excellence of the technology, processed public and was the central training center for Dianetics and Scientology.

Hearst, William Randolph: (1863-1951) controversial American publisher who established and built up the largest chain of newspapers in the United States. His papers were noted for journalism that gains or holds the interest of readers by printing or headlining news stories that are sensational, scandalous or ordinary news that is sensationally distorted.

heels, down at the: worn-out as from overuse, likened to an old pair of shoes where the heels have worn down.

helm hard down, put her: turn the helm of a ship as far as possible towards the same direction from which the wind is coming. The helm controls the direction of a ship's movement. To *put the helm down* causes the ship to turn into the wind. To *move the helm hard* means to move it sharply and as far as possible in some direction.

high and dry: stranded and abandoned, and perhaps helpless. From the circumstance of a ship out of the water, stranded as by having been thrown on the shore by a storm.

high C: a musical tone of a relatively high sound or level. Used figuratively to mean energetically or at a high level of activity or production.

Hiroshima: a seaport in Japan that was largely destroyed in 1945 during World War II (1939-1945) by an American atomic bomb. This was the first atomic bomb ever used in warfare and killed approximately 75,000 people.

hoist by one's own petard: victimized or hurt by one's own scheme, weapon, etc. In earlier warfare, a *petard* was a metal cone filled with explosives, fastened to walls and gates and exploded to force an opening. *Hoist* means to raise or lift up. In an army, an *engineer* is a soldier who destroys enemy fortifications, roads, etc. The expression is a reference to the fact that the engineer who set a petard was in danger of being blown up by it. It comes from a line in the play *Hamlet* by English playwright William Shakespeare (1564-1616):

*"Let it work; for 'tis the sport to have the engineer
Hoist with his own petard."*

Homoiousians: those holding the teaching that God the Father and God the Son are of a similar nature, not of the same nature.

Homoousians: those holding the teaching that God the Father and God the Son are of the same nature.

horsepower: an informal term for power, strength or force. Originally from the rate of work of a horse; raising 550 pounds to a height of one foot in one second equals one horsepower.

house in order, gets one's: arranges one's affairs in a proper and logical manner.

house is in order, (one's): one's affairs are arranged in a proper and logical manner.

House of Representatives: one of two lawmaking bodies of the United States, the other being the Senate. The House and the Senate must pass identical versions of a proposed bill before it can become law. (The term *representatives* refers to the fact that the House seats are given relative to each state's population, that is, the bigger the population of the state, the more representatives they have in the House. In contrast, the Senate has two members from each state no matter the size of the population.)

Hyde Park: a large public park in the center of London, which includes the *Speaker's Corner*, a place where professional speakers and ordinary people have complete freedom to make speeches and publicly express their views on political, social and religious questions.

ice floe: a large flat mass of floating ice.

inertia, (law of): the first of three laws of motion formulated by English scientist and mathematician, Sir Isaac Newton (1642-1727). The law of inertia states that every material object continues in its state of rest, or uniform motion in a straight line, unless it is acted upon by a force.

interaction, (law of): the third of three laws of motion formulated by English scientist and mathematician, Sir Isaac Newton (1642-1727). The law of interaction deals with the forces of action and reaction (the two forces that make up the interaction between two objects): Whenever one object exerts a force on a second object, the second object exerts an equal and opposite force on the first.

ion: an atom or group of atoms that has acquired an electric charge by losing or gaining one or more electrons. An *electron* is any of the negatively charged particles that form a part of all atoms. An *ion banging around inside of a tube* refers to a *vacuum tube*, a device used to control flows of electrical currents. An electrical current is created and controlled in a vacuum tube by different electrical charges attracting each other or alike electrical charges repelling each other. (It is called a *vacuum tube* because it is a sealed glass tube or bulb from which almost all the air has been removed.)

Isis: ancient Egyptian goddess of fertility, later worshiped in the Greek and Roman empires.

Iskander of the Two Horns: a name given to Alexander the Great (356–323 B.C.), military general and king of Macedonia (an ancient kingdom in northern Greece). The name came from the two ram horns that he wore as a headdress. The horns were a symbol of the Egyptian god of life, Ammon, who had a human figure with the horns of a ram sprouting from his head.

Jaguar: a brand name for any of the various high-quality sports cars and luxury sedans first manufactured in Coventry, England, in 1936 by SS Cars Limited (later renamed Jaguar Cars Limited).

jar (up): become unsettled. Literally, move or shake from impact.

jib sheet: a rope or chain (sheet) attached to a *jib*, a triangular sail set at the bow (front end) of a sailing vessel.

Joan of Arc: (1412?–1431) national heroine of France, a peasant girl who, believing that she was acting under divine guidance, led the French Army in a momentous victory that repulsed an English attempt to conquer France. Captured a year later, Joan was burned by the English and their French collaborators as a heretic.

juice: an informal term for electricity or electric power.

key, out of: out of harmony (with); not matching.

kickback: characteristic of a sharp, violent, especially unfavorable or undesirable reaction or response.

Lamarck: Chevalier de Jean Baptiste Pierre Antoine de Monet Lamarck (1744–1829) French naturalist (someone who studies nature) who believed that evolution occurred and proceeded in accordance with natural law and whose ideas influenced Darwin's theory.

Laplanners: members of a people of northern Scandinavia, Finland and part of northern Russia.

law of inertia: the first of three laws of motion formulated by English scientist and mathematician, Sir Isaac Newton (1642–1727). The law of inertia states that every material object continues in its state of rest, or uniform motion in a straight line, unless it is acted upon by a force.

ledger, bottom of the: a variation of *the bottom of the barrel*, designating the location of persons or things in the worst state. A *ledger* is a book in which a summary of monies or assets in and

out is recorded. The credits, showing an addition or gain, are noted on one side and the debits, showing any losses or debts, are recorded on the opposite side.

Leipzig: a city in eastern central Germany, the location of Leipzig University where Wilhelm Wundt (German psychologist) and others developed “modern psychology” in 1879.

Level One: the first of six levels of processing published in late 1955 in *Certainty* magazine article, “The Six Levels of Processing.” Level One is Locational Processing. The object of Locational Processing is to establish a stability in the environment of the preclear on the subject of objects and people. The article “The Six Levels of Processing” is included in the lecture series supplement.

Level Three: the third of six processing levels published in late 1955 in *Certainty* magazine article, “The Six Levels of Processing.” Level Three is the subjective level. Here the preclear is invited to inspect his own “reactive bank” or his own thought processes. The article “The Six Levels of Processing” is included in the lecture series supplement.

Library of Congress: one of the major library collections in the world located in Washington, DC, housing one of the largest bodies of printed material. It was established in 1800 by the United States Congress (lawmaking body of the government) for service to its members but now also serves other government agencies, other libraries and the public.

lights, by (our): in agreement with or in keeping with one’s knowledge, ideas, opinions, etc. *Lights* here mean the information and capacities, natural or acquired, of an individual.

light, seen the: reached a full understanding or realization; been converted to some idea or belief.

Lilly: *Eli Lilly and Company*, an American company that manufactures and distributes medical drugs as well as highly dangerous and destructive psychiatric drugs.

lineages: the series of families from which one is directly descended.

line, draw a: set or lay down a definite limit.

Linotype: of or having to do with a *Linotype*, a typesetting machine formerly widely used that sets type line by line on single strips of metal from which it is then used for printing.

Locational Processing: one of the processes of Level One of the Six Levels of Processing. The object of Locational Processing is to establish a stability in the environment of the preclear on the subject of objects and people. It can be run in busy thoroughfares, graveyards, confused

traffic or anywhere that there is or is not motion of objects and people. It is run in the auditing room itself to orient the preclear. The Six Levels of Processing are fully described in the article "The Six Levels of Processing" in the lecture series supplement.

lock, stock and barrel: the whole thing; all of anything. Originally this term meant all three elements of a firearm—the *lock*, or firing mechanism; the *stock*, or handle; and the *barrel*, or tube.

long and the short of it, the: the most important fact (of a statement, situation, series of actions, etc.); the only thing that need be said.

look-a-here: informal for *look here*, an expression used to call attention to what is about to be stated.

lower the boom: to impart something serious or important, likened to the boom of a sailboat, a long pole that extends from the mast to hold the bottom of the sail. In a changing wind, the boom can swing wildly if not secured, leaving one at risk of being struck.

mad-dog: crazy; wildly out of control, likened to an animal such as a dog or horse suffering from rabies (an infectious disease that causes madness and sometimes death).

master-at-arms: a low-ranking officer responsible for keeping order, maintaining discipline, taking charge of prisoners, etc., on a ship.

Methodism: the beliefs and practices of Methodists.

Methodist: a member of the Christian religious body characterized by concern with social welfare and public morals. Developed from the teachings and work of John and Charles Wesley in the early eighteenth century and so called from the methodical study and worship practiced by the founders while at Oxford University, England.

mice and rats, seven brands of: a reference to the bubonic plague, a serious fatal infection from bacteria transmitted by fleas from infected rodents (gnawing animals such as mice and rats) and characterized by high fever, weakness and the formation of swellings (called buboes). The bubonic plague swept Europe in the mid-1300s killing some twenty-five to forty million people.

miceology: a made-up word—a joke. It combines *mice* (rodents) with "ology" (study of). *Miceology* is a corruption of "psychology" which uses rats and says one is the *effect* of his environment. Psychology—miceology. The rest of the joke is they study mice not men.

Mickey, slip (someone) a: to secretly add a drug or fast-acting laxative (both known as a *Mickey Finn*) to a person's drink to deliberately render him unconscious or otherwise helpless. The name has been attributed to a gang member by the name of Mickey Finn.

militarist: someone who adheres to *militarism*, the belief that a country should maintain strong military resources and be prepared to use them aggressively to defend or promote national interests, while at the same time regarding military efficiency as the supreme ideal of the state and subordinating all other interests to those of the military.

mind you: take notice, observe or understand.

money, for my: in my opinion or judgment.

mopery and dopery on the high station: a made-up term for an offense or violation of a law or rule while in a high position. *Mopery* means vagrancy or criminal loitering; *dopery* is a coined term rhyming with *mopery*.

moth-eaten: antiquated, worn-out or out-of-date.

Navy Department: the former name of the *Department of the Navy*, one of the three military departments (Army, Navy and Air Force) within the Department of Defense of the United States Government. The department is responsible for having naval and marine forces trained and ready to carry out military missions for the defense of the nation.

ne plus ultra: the utmost limit to which one can go or has gone; the furthest point reached or capable of being reached. The phrase is Latin and literally means "no more beyond."

never-never land: an imaginary, unreal state, condition or place. From the popular play *Peter Pan* (written in 1904 by Scottish playwright J. M. Barrie [1860-1937] and made popular by the animated Walt Disney movie of same name). It is the home of Peter Pan, the main character of the story, and is a place where children never grow up.

Newton: Sir Isaac Newton (1642-1727), English scientist and mathematician, who formulated the three laws of motion. These laws in brief are: (1) *inertia*: a body at rest remains at rest and a body in motion remains in motion unless acted on by an external force; (2) *acceleration*: the motion of a body changes in proportion to the size of the force applied to it; (3) *interaction*: every action produces an equal but opposite reaction.

Nirvana: the goal of the Hindus. Hindu beliefs are that “Reality is One” (Brahma) and that ultimate salvation, and release from the endless cycle of birth to death is achieved when one merges or is absorbed into the “one divine reality” with all loss of individual existence.

North Atlantic: of or having to do with the northern part of the Atlantic Ocean, extending northward from the equator to the Arctic Ocean (the waters surrounding the North Pole). During World War II, the sea routes of the North Atlantic saw considerable naval action, with ships of the United States Navy guarding supply ships headed to England and Russia and fighting off attacking German submarines.

Northeast Sea Frontier Command: a reference to the *Eastern Sea Frontier*, a United States Navy designation for a defensive organization established during World War II (1939-1945) for offshore coast defense and antisubmarine patrol along the Atlantic coast of North America. Initially, the Eastern Sea Frontier consisted of few modern ships and aircraft that were ineffectively deployed to protect shipping and supply routes along the Atlantic coast, resulting in many American ships being sunk by German submarines.

obviate: to do away with or prevent by effective measures.

offbeat: the moments between accented beats in music. In this sense beats are regularly accented or emphasized moments of the music. In between these beats (offbeat) there is no emphasis or accent.

old hat: well-known or familiar to the point of being commonplace.

on high: in a high position or a position of authority where one makes important decisions.

Opening Procedure (of) 8-C: R2-16 as given in the book *The Creation of Human Ability*. It is called *Opening Procedure of 8-C* as it is done at the beginning (opening) of Standard Operating Procedure 8-C.

Orthodox Church: a reference to the Eastern Orthodox Church, the Christian Church dominant in Eastern Europe, Western Asia and North Africa which rejected the authority of Rome in 1054. This church now includes certain churches of Russia, Greece, Romania, Bulgaria, etc.

out of whack: improperly ordered or balanced; not functioning correctly.

Ownership Processing: processing based on the principle that the discovery of the actual creator or genus of anything will bring about its vanishment. Ownership Processing is run by having the preclear state that this owns the condition or that owns the condition and just have him keep stating that this or that or the other thing, and including himself and his machinery and the body's machinery, owns or made the condition or the pictures owned or made the condition, until the condition vanishes. All masses, spaces, conditions depend on misownership for their persistence. In the absence of misownership—we own up to the ownership of everything that we did and know the ownership of everything that everybody else did or has—why, everything would disappear. Ownership Processing is declaring the proper owner.

Paddington Station: one of the five main railway stations situated around central London, England.

Palmer: Daniel David Palmer, a chiropractor in the late 1800s. He was the first chiropractor to practice in the United States. He founded the Palmer School of Chiropractic in Davenport, Iowa.

pan-determinism: the willingness to start, stop and change, along the dynamics. The degree of pan-determinism which a person has is his willingness to start, stop and change along the dynamics. In other words, to monitor other dynamics, that is pan-determinism. The action definition is: The willingness to control two or more identities whether or not opposed.

pants, little white: a humorous reference to a *frill*, a strip of paper curled at one end and rolled to be slipped over the bone end (as of a chop) in serving.

para-science: the study of phenomena assumed to be beyond the scope of scientific inquiry or for which no scientific explanation exists.

Parke-Davis: an American company that develops and manufactures various medical and psychiatric drugs.

parley(s): a discussion, especially one between enemies over terms of truce or other matters.

peccadillo: a small or forgivable fault or sin; an insignificant offense.

pell-mell: in wild, disorderly haste.

peonies: plants with large pink, white, red or yellow, showy flowers.

Persians: natives or inhabitants of *Persia*, an ancient empire located in western and southwestern Asia that included parts of what is now Iran.

petard, hoist by one's own: victimized or hurt by one's own scheme, weapon, etc. In earlier warfare, a *petard* was a metal cone filled with explosives, fastened to walls and gates and exploded to force an opening. *Hoist* means to raise or lift up. In an army, an *engineer* is a soldier who destroys enemy fortifications, roads, etc. The expression is a reference to the fact that the engineer who set a petard was in danger of being blown up by it. It comes from a line in the play *Hamlet* by English playwright William Shakespeare (1564-1616):

*"Let it work; for 'tis the sport to have the engineer
Hoist with his own petard."*

phonograph: an instrument that reproduces the sounds from records (plastic disks with grooves in them on which sound is recorded); record player. As the record turns, a special needle picks up its sounds, which are heard on a loudspeaker. Older record players had a handle which one wound up and caused the record to spin around.

phrenology: the now discredited psychological theory that a person's character and intelligence can be measured by feeling the bumps and depressions on the skull.

pigskin: an informal term for an American football.

pitch: an angle taken on something, especially in order to forward a particular cause or to support a particular viewpoint.

platter: a phonograph record, a twelve-inch disk with grooves in it, on which sound is recorded so it can be played over and over.

poliomyelitis: a disease, widespread in the 1950s, that usually occurred in children and young adults. It affected the brain and spinal cord, sometimes leading to a loss of voluntary movement and muscular wasting.

pooh-bah: literally, a leader, authority or other important person. Used in the lecture as an extension of *poob*, a word used to express disdain or dismissal.

potential(s): *potential* means possible as opposed to actual. Hence, electrical potential is the electrical flow something is capable of producing and refers to two or more sources of energy, one capable of producing more energy than the other and which will cause an electrical flow to occur from the one with greater potential to that one with lesser. This is commonly seen in a battery where one side is indicated as the negative (pole), and the other the positive (pole), with the electrical current flowing from one to the other.

pot, going to: going to ruin, deteriorating; becoming useless or worthless.

Poughkeepsie: a city in the southeastern part of New York State, USA, located 75 miles (120.7 kilometers) north of New York City.

prefrontal lobe(s): the region at the front and top left or right side of the brain. A *lobe* is a roundish projection or division, as of an organ of the body.

prefrontal lobotomy(ies): a psychiatric operation carried out by boring holes into the skull, entering the brain and severing the nerve pathways in the two frontal lobes, resulting in the patient becoming an emotional vegetable.

protoplasm, stream of: a reference to the evolution of organisms themselves, from the very first, continuing along a protoplasmic line, from generation to generation; the conception, birth and growth of bodies; the genetic line and evolutionary chain on Earth.

psycho-anal-ism: a humorous coined variation of the word *psychoanalysis*, in reference to the supposed personality type in Freudian theory termed *anal*, assumed to refer to a stage of childhood development marked by focus on the anal region. Also related to adult personality traits such as obsessive neatness, stubbornness and frugality, which are considered to have originated during or to be characteristic of this stage of development.

psychometric: having to do with testing the intelligence, aptitude and personality traits of individuals.

punk: a worthless or unimportant individual.

Q and A: by Q and A we mean that “the *answer* to the question is the *question*,” and we indicate a duplication.

quack: a person who pretends, professionally or publicly, to have skill, knowledge or qualifications he or she does not possess.

quill pen: an instrument for writing formed from a feather (quill), as of a goose, that had its shaft sharpened and slit at the end and which was dipped into ink. Quills were the principal writing instruments from the sixth century until the mid-nineteenth century.

R2-40: a Route 2 process called Conceiving a Static. This process uses the discovery and principle of ultimate truth. If one has no prior postulate and makes a postulate, then that postulate cannot be a lie. If one then makes a denying postulate second to this primary postulate, he then has accomplished a lie. The process contains only the command, repeated over and over: "*Conceive a thetan.*" This process is described in the book *The Creation of Human Ability*.

R2 step: a reference to the process R2-46 Other People as given in the book *The Creation of Human Ability*. The process Union Station is a variation of process R2-46 using the two questions: "What do you really know about that person?" "What would you permit that person to know about you?"

races, off to the: a phrase used to mean up and running, making a good start, progressing well and energetically. This alludes to a race, such as a horse race, where the horses bolt out of the starting gate to get a head start on the other competitors.

rack: a former instrument of torture consisting of a framework on which a victim was tied by the wrists and ankles to be slowly stretched by spreading the parts of the framework.

racked up: accumulated or amassed.

rank or serial number: a reference to a person's identification. From an international rule regarding the humane treatment of prisoners of war that a prisoner is only bound to divulge his *name, rank and serial number* (a series of numbers used for identification in the military) to his captor, but cannot legally be forced to give any further information.

reach: in sailing, a type of *tack*, a stage in the zigzag movement of a ship that is changing direction in order to maximize the benefit from the wind. Specifically, a *reach* is the tack that the ship travels on when the wind is blowing from the side of the ship.

reef: a hazardous obstacle to the achievement of an objective. Literally, a ridge of rocks, sand or the like lying at or near the surface of the water. As they are difficult to see, being partially or fully covered with water, reefs are a hazard to ships, which sometimes hit them or become stuck on them and are damaged or wrecked.

rhetoric: language that is elaborate, insincere or intellectually devoid of meaning.

rigmarole: a lengthy, needlessly complicated procedure.

Roman Empire: the empire of ancient Rome (which at its peak included western and southern Europe, Britain, North Africa and the lands of the eastern Mediterranean Sea) that lasted from 27 B.C. to A.D. 476, when it fell to invading Germanic tribes.

Roosevelt, Franklin Delano: (1882-1945) thirty-second president of the United States (1933-1945). It was during Roosevelt's presidency that the expectation that an immensely powerful bomb could be constructed was presented to the United States Government (1939-1940) by a group of scientists including Albert Einstein (1879-1955). President Roosevelt and his advisers decided to invest a large amount of money to forward testing and development of the atomic bomb.

Route 1: one of two series of processes (Route 1 and Route 2) that make up Intensive Procedure as laid out in the book *The Creation of Human Ability*. Route 1 processes were designed to be used on a preclear who could be exteriorized.

rubles: the standard unit of currency in Russia.

Saint Vitus' dance: a disorder of the nervous system characterized by involuntary jerking and twitching motions in the body, somewhat resembling a grotesque dance; named for the saint that, during the Middle Ages, sufferers would pray to hoping for a cure.

Salk (polio) vaccine: a vaccine is a substance that is put into the blood and that protects the body from disease. The *Salk polio vaccine* was invented by US bacteriologist Jonas E. Salk (1914-1995) to prevent the disease poliomyelitis.

sea gulls, for the: a variation of *for the birds*, meaning useless; no good, or that should not be taken seriously, likened to food that birds would eat off the ground.

seen the light: reached a full understanding or realization; been converted to some idea or belief.

Separateness (Processing): a reference to R2-48, Separateness, as given in the book *The Creation of Human Ability*. This is a key process attacking individuation. Separateness is best run by having the preclear out in an open place inhabited by a great many people. The auditor has the preclear point out things from which he is separate.

Shakespeare: William Shakespeare (1564-1616), English poet and dramatist; the most widely known author in all English literature.

sheets: ropes or chains attached to one or both of the lower corners of a sail, serving to move or extend it.

sheets run, let the: allow the ropes (or chains), which are used to adjust the sails of a boat to run freely through one's hands, thus letting the sails flutter freely in whatever direction the wind takes them. The sheet is attached to the bottom corners of a sail, and is used to either shorten or extend the sail or alter its direction. When one lets the sheet run, the sail becomes slack and is not influenced by the wind. This is sometimes done to prevent a boat from capsizing (turning over) in a storm.

shoots the works: effects (brings about) something to the fullest extent, expending all one's energy.

sign on the dotted line: put one's signature on a contract or similar document, thus showing full agreement to terms or conditions.

Six Basic Processes: six Communication Processes which form the background to all processes and bring an individual up a gradient scale of tolerance for more and more communication. The processes are: (1) Two-way Communication, (2) Elementary Straightwire, (3) Opening Procedure of 8-C, (4) Opening Procedure by Duplication, (5) Remedy of Havingness and (6) Spotting Spots in Space. These processes are described in the book *Dianetics 55!*

sixes and sevens, at: with a carelessness as to the consequences of one's actions. This expression comes from *to set on six and seven*, which originally meant risking one's entire fortune, as in gambling or carelessness as to consequences of one's actions. (*Sixes and sevens*, is an alteration

of "fives and sixes," a dice game in which throwing a five and six, the highest numbers in dice, was regarded as the most risky gamble to be made.)

Six Basic Steps: the processes of the Six Basic Processes. *See also* **Six Basic Processes.**

Six Levels of Processing: a gradient scale of six levels of processes published in late 1955 in *Certainty* magazine article, "The Six Levels of Processing." These processing levels are described throughout this lecture series and in the article "The Six Levels of Processing" included in the lecture series supplement.

sixpence: a former British coin equal to six pennies.

snap(ping) terminals: same as *close terminals*. Close terminals is when B snaps against A, and B and A coincide. And that is identification, and this is obsessive duplication. Identification and obsessive duplication are the same thing. The terminals *snap* together—no space.

snub the sheet in the block: to stop the motion of a sheet (rope or chain) that is moving through a block. *Snub* is a nautical term for suddenly stopping the motion of something. The sheet is threaded through a block (a casing, usually of wood, commonly found on vessels of all sizes and used to facilitate the working of ropes) which increases the mechanical power of the ropes by their use in various combinations. A sailor can snub a sheet by jamming the block through which it is running.

soldiery: a group of soldiers.

soup, in(to) the: in trouble or in difficulty.

Spanish proof marks: marks impressed on a pistol that show it passed a test from a Spanish inspector. It is a reference to any one of a number of pistols (handguns) made by gun manufacturers in Spain between World War I (1914-1918) and World War II (1939-1945). In making such pistols, the designs of well-known American guns were copied but were made with inferior workmanship and poor quality materials. Consequently, they tended to blow up in one's hand when fired.

spook: startling, as if affected by unusual phenomena. A *spook* is an informal name for ghost or spirit.

spud: an informal term for a potato.

- squadron:** a unit in the air force which usually consists of twelve to twenty-four aircraft.
- square (all) around:** put (everything) in proper order.
- squared (around, away, etc.):** sorted out and straightened up, fixed up.
- stab her up into the wind:** a coined phrase meaning to thrust or drive a ship into the direction from which the wind is blowing.
- standing wave:** the resultant wave when two similar waves travel in opposite directions and meet head-on. When this happens, it appears that at certain points, the wave is motionless.
- steamed up, all:** excited.
- Step I(s):** refers to a preclear who could respond to the first processing step of Standard Operating Procedure, which directs the preclear to be a foot (or three feet) behind his head. This came from application of this procedure wherein the auditor tests the preclear for each step, from Step I on, until he finds a step the preclear can do and labels the case as that step number, i.e., a (Step) I.
- steppes:** vast, comparatively level and treeless plains of southeastern Europe and Siberia.
- stiff:** a slang term meaning a fellow.
- stock in trade:** any resource, practice or device characteristically employed by a given person or group.
- straw:** something too insubstantial to provide support or help in a desperate situation; literally, stems of grain such as wheat, oats, etc.
- stuffed shirt:** a self-satisfied and inflexibly conservative individual.
- Sundays, month of:** an indefinitely great length or period of time; practically never.
- tactician:** one versed or skilled in the science or art of *tactics*, the technique of deploying and directing troops and ships in efficient maneuvers against an enemy.
- tailors up:** creates or adapts to a particular purpose or need.
- ten-to-the-eight-hundred-millionth-power:** ten multiplied by itself eight hundred million times. *Power* refers to the action of multiplying a number by itself a specified number of times. For example, 10 to a power of 3 (or 10^3) is $10 \times 10 \times 10 = 1,000$.

thingamabob: a word used when the proper word for something is not known or does not come to mind.

throttle: a device (such as a lever, pedal, handle, etc.) controlling the flow of fuel or power to an engine.

time continuum: a consecutive series of postulates proceeding from a basic postulate on any subject and out of this we get universes. The definition of a *universe* is that body of space and energy which has in common a time. And so a time continuum is built out of a series of postulates.

time-machined: sent something into the past by means of a fictional or hypothetical device called a time machine.

Time magazine: an American weekly magazine, first published in 1923 in New York City, New York, USA.

'tis: a short form of "it is."

Torquemada: Tomás de Torquemada (1420-1498), Spanish monk, head of the Spanish Inquisition (special court of law directed at suppression of beliefs contrary to those of the Catholic Church). Under Torquemada's authority, thousands of Jews, suspected witches and others were killed or tortured.

training pattern: a stimulus-response mechanism set up by the analytical mind to carry out activity of either a routine or an emergency nature.

tubes: a reference to *vacuum tubes*, devices once broadly used in electronics to control flows of electrical currents. They are called vacuum tubes because they are sealed glass tubes or bulbs from which almost all the air has been removed in order to improve electrical flow. (Removing the tubes from a piece of equipment would make it wholly inoperational.)

Union Station: a variation of the process R2-46, Other People as given in the book *The Creation of Human Ability*. Union Station is run in places like bus terminals, railway terminals and airports—any place where there are lots of people walking around, not necessarily people sitting still but there are lots of people in view. It has two questions: "What do you really know about that person?" "What would you permit that person to know about you?"

uranium(s): a heavy, silvery-white metallic radioactive element, one of the heaviest naturally occurring elements found on Earth. Uranium is employed in certain nuclear weapons and it is the source of energy for nuclear power plants.

wad, shoots the: expends all one's energies or resources at one time.

Westinghouse: a reference to *Westinghouse Electric Corporation*, a company founded in the United States in 1886, dealing mainly in electrical and electronic equipment.

whack, out of: improperly ordered or balanced; not functioning correctly.

wheel: a person who steers a ship. A *wheel* is the spoked round steering device by which the ship is steered.

wheeze(s): a trick or cunning deception frequently used.

Wichelow, George: British stage magician and Scientistologist during the 1950s.

wild variable(s): a factor in a situation or problem that behaves in an uncontrolled, strange or unpredictable fashion. *Variable* is most commonly used in mathematics and science where it represents something unknown or unpredictable. A variable is often contrasted with a constant which is known and unchanging.

wind-up: of a mechanical object, constructed with a spring that is wound up by means of a handle with a rotary motion to store power for operation. Older record players were driven by such a wind-up mechanism.

witch doctor(s): a person in some societies who attempts to cure sickness and to drive out evil spirits from a person, place, etc., by the use of magic.

works, the (whole): everything; all related items or matters.

wot not: a coined term meaning to not be aware of, have no knowledge of. *Wot* is a form of the verb to wit, an older English word meaning to know.

wound up in a ball: came to be in a state of confusion; mixed up.

writ: abbreviated form of *written*.

wroth: angry; full of wrath.

Wundt: Wilhelm Wundt (1832-1920), German psychologist and physiologist (a specialist in the study of the functions of living things and the ways in which their parts and organs work); the originator of modern psychology and the false doctrine that man is no more than an animal.

Xism: a made-up term.

INDEX

Abbott, 227

aberration

succumb and, 134

ability

basis of, 269

can do what don't give a
damn about, 241

first postulate and, 29

hub of, 241

motion/none and
not-knowingness, 168

rehabilitation of, 30

three to restore, 168

to announce one's
presence, 173

to communicate, 218

to consider, 30

to create, 39, 46

to have terminals, 71

to know, 221

communication line
and, 221

to play game, 220

abreact, 39

absolutes

practically unobtainable, 1

acknowledgment

crazy person and, 72

pc at point of, 251

Acropolis, 111

action cycle, 272

admiral, 206

Aesculapian temple, 118

aesthetic value, 172

affinity

depends on, 198

objective mock-up and, 176

age

old-, 135

aging bodies, 15

agreement

new sets of, 125

superstition and, 84

alcoholic, 105

Alexander IV, 188

Alexander the

Great, 208-210

alignment

of data, 106, 123

sane transition and, 111

stable datum and, 116

with existence, 122

Alpha Centauri, 125

anchor points, 68

animal

Man and, 186

APA, 9**apathy**

“dare not create” and, 49
 disease and, 213
 total intolerance, 260

ARC, 170

ability to postulate self in
 places and, 194
 handling not with force
 but, 195
 preclear and, 170
 raising of, 176
 Third Dynamic, 170
 shoot havingness with
 lousy, 232
 tolerance for stupidity
 and, 127

ARC Triangle

understanding and
 knowingness, 221

Armageddon, 144**artificiality, 8****As-isness**

communication and, 21,
 204
 mass and, 15
 two-way communication
 and, 26

asteroids, 17**Athens, 111****atomic bomb, 90****atomic fission, 185****atomic molecular
 phenomena, 80****attempted abortion**

underlying polio, 144

attention, 273**attitude**

instinctive healing, 131

auditing

see also **processing**

auditor

chief difficulty of, 179
 effectiveness of processes
 and, 275
 expendability and
 good/bad, 243
 good, 231
 mental mechanisms
 obedient to, 107
 rehabilitate natural
 knowingness, 131
 seldom listen on how bad is
 an, 234
 society find the, 195

start session and find, 179
 without E-Meter, 261

Auditor's Code

artificial masses and, 32

authorship

basic lie, 59

automaticity

body and, 16
 not-knowingness and, 2

autos-da-fé, 185**awareness of awareness
 unit, 121**

tolerance of, 118

Axiom 36, 30

first postulate system, 29
 second postulate and, 2

Axioms, 201

stable datum and alignment
 of data, 106
 study of, 146

Bacon, 89**bacteria, 204****badness**

consideration, 7
 harmonic on native state, 10
 how person gets, 7
 powered by goodness, 8

- second postulate, 7
- that which retards one communicating, 21
- "Ballad of Reading Gaol,"** 38
- bank**
 - ability to influence or not, energy in, 266
 - clearing the, 148
 - confusion and unknown data in, 142
 - defend stable datum or collapse, 145
 - electrical phenomenon, 68
 - jammed, 4
 - misownership and, 28
- barbarism,** 185
 - causation of, 151
- base time,** 2
- basic-basic,** 233
- Bedlam,** 80
- beingness**
 - getting out of own, 7
- Bergman, Ingrid,** 14
- Be three feet back of your head,** 259
- betrayal,** 44
- between-lives,** 191
 - how they make body switches in, 259
 - memory, 223
- black and white phenomena,** 120
- blackness,** 60
 - machines producing, 20
- black picture,** 59
- blueprint**
 - definition, 88
- body**
 - aging, reason for, 15
 - blueprint of, 88
 - determining cannonball versus, 270
 - electrical anchor point system, 68
 - electronic structure, 258
 - finish off an illness, 101
 - get identification, pick up a, 180
 - no understanding and snapping into, 190
 - outside till lay hand on in anger, 194
 - picking up, 199
 - stable datum and, 99
 - who built, 18
- book, experiment with,** 222
- botany,** 89
- brain tumor,** 253
- brightness**
 - tolerance of, 168
- Buddhist,** 185
- camouflaged hole,** 263
- careful**
 - about communication, 72
- case histories**
 - engram scanning on a Step I, 227
- cases**
 - engrams and, 77
 - entrance of, 265
 - must continue to have mass, 55
 - no reaction and intolerance, 262
 - "not me," 266
 - not register on E-Meter, 256
 - Six Levels of Processing, cracking, 228
 - tough, 229

catatonic**schizophrenia**, 161**censor**

definition, 260

chain

engram, 233

change

personality, 31

change of mindnot-knowingness, motion
and motionlessness, 168**chaos**bringing order to, 121
departure from religion,
and, 189**charge**, 253**chemistry**wild disagreement between
physics and, 150**children**aligning data and, 113
crying, 73-74
upset, 44**chiropractor**, 104

Scientology data and, 148

chiropracty, 130individual trying to succumb
and, 134**choice**

survive or succumb, 132

Christianityfailure of, 181-193
self-devouring, 182
tenets, didn't follow
own, 185**chronic illness**, 99**circuits**, 18**civilization**European, 193
maintaining the, 190
pattern to assist, 193
service of, 151**clairvoyant**, 219**class four**,**Scientology**, 31-32**class one**, 28-34

definition, 32

class three, 29-33, 40, 62

definition, 33

class two, 28-33, 62control and, 60
definition, 33**class xth**, 32-34

definition, 33

co-auditing, 240**cognition**

class one, 34

columnists, 12**comments**

second-hand, 46

communicationas-ising of mass and, 15
ask for and then protest, 71
bad intention and no, 187
consideration of good
and, 21
control and, 60, 272
cutting, 215-217
anatomy of, 216
effectiveness of postulate
and, 273
enforced, *see* **enforced
communication**
game and, 220
game of, 11, 22
how to communicate
wrongly, 206
identity assumed to
have, 180
increase abundance of in all
its parts, 21
knowingness and, 221

- masses become solid in
 - game of, 268
 - no war when countries in, 200
 - pay of game, 13, 274
 - postulate
 - ability and, 273
 - Scientology as successful as it has, 201
 - security of, 170
 - sexual sensation is, 22
 - solvent, 186
 - tolerances and, 177
 - trust and, 169
 - unwilling to as-is by, 23
- communication**
- breaker**, 214
- Communication**
- Formula**, 21
- bugs in, 262
- control and, 273
- processing parts of, 177
- communication lag**, 245
- communication lines**
- cut
 - knowingness and, 219
- head of disturbance and, 212
- security and, 215-217
- self-determinisms and, 220
- war and, 211
- Communication**
- Process(ing)**, 61
- communism**
- Christianity and, 184
- comparable datum**, 91
- competence**, 123
- Conceive a Static**, 196
- confusion**
- argue and create, 101
- bring order
 - out of, 148
- communication, solvent for, 186
- "don't know"
 - handling, 245
- engram of, 157
- games and, 161
- handling of, 103-127
- how to cause, 141
- intolerance of
 - confusion senior to self, 155
 - desire to *be*, 156
- merchant of, *see* **merchant of confusion**
- not-knowingness and, 2
- psychotic and, 156
- startling phenomena entering, 129
- tolerance of, 122, 126
 - confusion merchant and, 160
 - obeying pictures and, 121
- tolerate, 5
- transfer area of, 159
- unknown data in the bank and, 142
- conscience**
- restimulation of somatic and, 257
- consents**
- highest echelon of, 271
- conservation of energy**, 52
- conservatism**, 163
- consideration**
- badness and, 7
- making and unmaking masses and, 30
- working, 70
- control**
- communication and, 60
- definition, 70

- games and
 - total, 272
- lower harmonic of
 - communication, 272
 - responsibility and, 64
- control-happy**, 61
- control mechanism**, 119
- conviction**, 109
 - bad mock-ups, 46
 - definition, 187
 - pain and, 45
 - weapons of, 94
- creation**
 - dare not, not cannot, 39
 - if can't uncreate, don't create, 61
 - masses and spaces, 28-36
 - monster and, 39
 - of games, 124
 - shift to change and control, 64
 - see also* **Frankenstein monster**
- creativeness**
 - time, mass, space and lookingness and, 62
- Creative Processing**, 77, 100, 140
 - alcoholic and, 105
 - dare not create and, 63
 - résumé of, 25-47, 49-75
- crime**
 - no differentiation between right and wrong, 257
- criminal**
 - definition, 259
 - in the influence of, 263
 - lie detector not working and, 257
 - nuts, 257
 - politics, 263
 - restimulation and, 257
- critical**, 264
- criticism, second-hand**, 46
- Crusades**, 185
- cycle-of-action**
 - destroy and, 51
- cycle of an illness**, 207
- cycle of religion**, 111
- dare not create**, 39, 49-56, 63
 - energy, 43
- Frankenstein-monster effect, 42, 49
- mock-up, 46
- Darius**, 209
- Darwin**, 85
- data**
 - defending, 145
 - incomplete, 138
- "Data Clear,"** 148, 154
- death**, 4
 - invitation to, 143
- degradation, theta trap and**, 154
- destruction**, 50-57
 - unfinished cycle, 51
- determinism**
 - restoration of, 269
- dialectic materialism**
 - definition, 184
- Dianetics**
 - basic datum of, 118
 - how used, 93
 - make digestible phenomena of, 98-102
 - popularity, responsibility and, 117

- Scientology and
 - bodies of stable data, 117-121
 - two subjects, 127
 - up against superstitions, 85
- Dianetics 1955!***, 262
- Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health***, 83
- differentiation**, 264
- diphtheria**, 99
- diplomatic relations**, 212
- discrete**, 39, 42
 - cat example, 57
 - versus destroy, 50
- disease**, 204-224
 - apathy and, 213
 - building new
 - communication line, 217
 - communication and, 204, 219
 - communication
 - breaker, 214
 - must have invitation, 143
 - prevention, 145
 - preventive medicine and, 211
 - suppressive factor, 222
 - unmocking body ahead of, 204
- dissemination of materials**, 92
- disturbance**
 - communication to head of, 212
- “don’t know”**
 - artificiality, 8
 - process, description of running, 237-239
- dramatization**
 - confusion and, 161
 - not permitted, 158
 - wiping out reactive bank and, 39
- dreams**, 65
 - Greeks and, 118
- drugs**
 - different results and, 136
- drunkard**, 105
- dwindling spiral**
 - anatomy of a, 215
 - Frankenstein monsters and, 43
- Dynamic Principle of Existence**, 118
 - stable datum and, 118
- dynamics**
 - dynamic thrust, 3
 - eight, communication lines on, 218
 - First, *see* **First Dynamic**
 - Second, *see* **Second Dynamic**
 - Third, *see* **Third Dynamic**
- eating**
 - communication and, 23
- edifices**
 - Christianity and huge, 190
- education**
 - all data aligned to stable datum, 142
- educator**
 - auditor as, 148
- 8-C**
 - A, B and C, 269
 - insane person and, 73
- Eighth Dynamic**, 108-111, 218
 - artificial stable datum, 110
- Einstein**, 125
- Eisenhower, President**, 147

- electrical anchor point system**, 68
- electrical trouble**, 67-71
- electric shock**, 9
- electroencephalograph**
unreliable and stupid, 253
- electronics**, 253
- electronic surges**
pain and, 206
- emergency**, 243
communication, preclear and, 72
- E-Meter**, 95, 253-262
cases that do not register on, 256
misownership and, 261
stimulus-response mechanism and, 258
two-way communication and, 261
- endocrine system**, 96
- end of cycle**, 51-57, 63
misownership and, 58
none in the physical universe, 54
- energy**
all-important to preclear, 246
consideration it can exist, 244
dare not create, 43, 49
desperate feeling and, 63
heavy MEST energy to postulates, scale, 175
- energy hunger**, 65
- energy sources**
lowest terminals, 171
mock-up, 171
- enforced communication**, 220
unknowingness and, 221
- England**
European civilization and, 192
- engram bank**
motto, 36
- engram of confusion**, 157, 158
- engrams**
body of logic and, 116
body stuck in middle of, 100
can't stop bleeding artery by running, 101
cases from standpoint of, 77
finishing off an illness and, 100
first lesson to learn, 92
handling with certain gentleness, 130
how to run, 233
intolerance so high, can't run, 263
of confusion, 157, 158
persons reacting more severely to, 120
poor communication system, 223
residues, 57
scanning, 227
solve on basis of a stable datum, 153
somatics in an, 79
tolerance of confusion and, 160
- enturbulence**
communication into, 206
- eternity**
duration of the physical universe, 55
- evaluation**
upsetting stable datum, 113

evil

Man versus God, 114

existence

realign oneself with, 123

expendability

ability and, 243

of mass, 56

exteriorization, 145

remedying havingness
and, 229

running not-know and, 247

something you don't know
about that person and, 231

terminals and, 66

extreme leftist, 164**extreme rightist, 164****facsimiles**

definition, 2

poor communication
system, 223

pulling in, 2

faith, 108, 110

going to pot, 111

fascism

Christianity and, 188

fevers, 100**fifth postulate**

occlusion and, 4

**first and second postulate
system**

illness example, 40

two-way communication
and, 30

First Dynamic, 9, 195, 217

restoration of determinism
on, 269

first postulate, 228

goodness and, 7

intentions and, 8

practice running, 245

second and, 229

**First Postulate Union
Station, 230**

good results and, 235

fish, spirit of, 211**fixation**

too little motion, 161

two different, 164

flying saucers, 53**food**

experienced via
communication, 23

football

example of control and
game, 273

force

motto of engram bank
and, 36

never handled
anything, 194

forget

not-ising and, 3

versus remember, 228

foundness

versus lostness, 241

Four Horsemen, 214**Fourth Dynamic, 218****fourth postulate, 3, 10, 228****Frankenstein**

monster, 34-35, 37, 49-56,
63

conviction and, 45

Creative Processing and, 75

must suppress

consideration, 37

overcoming of, 41-42

protesting, 55

Freud, 113

prenatals and, 79

function

monitors structure, 96, 143

future

not-knowingness and, 2

future lives, 92**game**

- ability to play, 220
- changing mind and, 123
- communication and
 - principal, 11
- communication as pay of, 274
- creating a, 124
- intolerance and playing the, 265
- no communication and end of, 12
- not-know and play, 6
- one real worry about, 12
- optimum, 161
- pay is more
 - communication, 23
- put in more vias for more, 272
- stillness and confusion and, 161
- take out vias for faster, 272
- thetan postulates a
 - not-know to have, 1
- value of, 13

Gates of Mars, 191**GE**

- in terror, 144
- philosophy of, 134
- wound-up, 258

generals, 35-37, 206

- conduct of a, 205

genetic blueprint, 85**geometry**

- effect of knowingness about, 5

German militarists, 208**Gibbon, Edward, 181****glandular system, 97****goals**

- merchant of confusion and, 159
- processing and, 274
- processing and less via toward, 271
- worthwhile, 151

God, 108, 114

- confusion and, 103
- Greek gods, 111
- no inclusion of, 190

godless nation, 184**good**

- Man versus God, 114

- that which assists him to communicate, 21

see also **goodness**

goodness

- badness and, 7, 8
- first postulate, 7

good roads, good weather, 149**gradient scale**

- of terminals, 70, 174

grand piano, 54**granting of beingness**

- definition, 246

Greek, 118**group**

- how splinter, 188

group spirit, 109**guilt**

- complexes, 47
- "dare not create" and, 49

HAA class, 230**Hahnemann, 100****hallucination**

- definition, 19

harmonics

- on native state, 10

HASI

- give society a hand, 180

havingness, 15

machine to repair, 19
remedy, 229

Separateness and, 232
shot, with lousy ARC, 232
terminal trouble and, 65

head, three feet back of

enemy and, 211

healing, 204

engram and field of, 102
fatal error in, 132
field of, 92

Hearst, 257**heaven**

Christianity and, 191

hell, 191**heresy, 109****high command**

unmock troops faster than
enemy, 205

Hiroshima, 38**Hitler, 210****Hollywood**

Dianetics office in, 234

Homoousians, 182**Homo sapiens**

lowest order, 260

hopelessness

most suppressive
factor, 222

hormones, 96

react now, didn't
before, 140

horses

sleep in beds, 141, 145

humanity

science versus, 80

human mind, *see* mind**hurting, 43-46, 57****hypnotically**

governable, 163

ideas

pain and, 45

identity

assumed by thetan, 180
no, 197
talk using existing or
brand-new, 199

"I don't know"

mock-up and, 29

ignorant

Christianity tenet of
being, 188

illnesses

creation of the monster
and, 40-42
cycle of, 101, 207
first and second postulate
system and, 40-42
inability to surrender, 204

imperfections, 105**inactivity, 49****individual**

society and, 217

individuality

on the subject of
creativeness, 64

inertia, 53**infection, 204, 206****influence**

thinking of something
and, 264
toleration and, 264

insane

our business not with, 133
real statement made by, 133

insanity

8-C and, 73
engram and, 154
final answer, 133
mechanical aspect of, 157

- intelligence**, 126
improving of, 31
- intention**
bad
communication and, 187
how come about, 7
blunted good, 200
first postulate and good, 8
- interest**
game and, 13
- interiorization**
compulsion of, 194
- international clique, myth of the**, 163
- intolerance**
apathy and total, 260
more and more till he quits, 264
of confusion, 155-156
of life and own decisions, 267
stimulus-response and complete, 264
- introversion**, 182
- invalidation**
ability that can't be accomplished, 175
upsetting stable datum, 113
- IQ**, 94
- Iskander of the Two Horns**, 208
- Joan of Arc**, 14
- Jones, Johnny**, 143
- juice scarce**, 74
see also **electrical trouble**
- justice**, 255
- kleptomaniac**
psychotherapy and, 83
- know**
before you communicate, 224
- knowingness**, 8, 219-224
anything and everything, 1
ARC and, 221
communication and, 221
cut communication line and, 219
factor to be repaired, 221
harmonic on native state, 10
improving, 239
natural, 131
no time and total, 1
- knowledge**
assimilation of, 130
- labor**, 165
- Lamarck**, 85
- Laplanders**, 212
- law**
physical sciences, 52-54
- Level One**
no rapid reaction and intolerance, 260
power of choice not entered by, 269
- Level Three**
two-way communication first, 251
- Level Two**
see also **second level**
- Library of Congress**, 83
- lie detector**, 95
background facts of, 258
Ownership Processing and, 252
real criminal, doesn't work on, 258
Scientologist could read, 256
what it measures, 255
- lies**
basic, 59
preclear and, 62

life

- new phenomena into someone's, 129
- scale of intolerance and, 264
- wrong stable data in, example, 141

life unit, 180**Lilly**, 227**living**

- communication and enjoy, 23

livingness

- confusion as superior livingness, 155
- something can be done about, 127
- spark of, 112

location

- definition, 241
- not-known is lostness, 240

Locational Processing, 230

- basic not-knowingness and, 240
- how to run, 246
- objects or people, 244

locks, 39, 145

- fixing on engrams, 164

lost(ness), 240-244

- motion and motionlessness, 258

"Love thy neighbor," 185**machinery**

- energy to run, 50
- gone haywire, 20
- reason one has, 16
- theran, 18

make-break point, 34**Man**

- best part of, 203
- definition, 112

masses

- communication and solid, 268
- communication as-ises, 15
- expendability of, 56
- handle with postulate, 270
- increase in comm and losing, 19
- making and unmaking
 - class four, Scientology, 31
 - class one, 28
 - class three,
 - Axiom 36, 29, 30

- class two, two-way communication, 28

- interrelation of classes, 32

residues, 57

restore as-ised, 19

scarcity of, 56

two-way communication as-ises, 27

- creating with, 28

materials

- dissemination of, 92, 97-102

mean average, 126**medical doctors**

- bleeding artery and, 101

medicine

- observable structure and, 87

memory

- between lives, 223
- brand-new system of, 223

mental block

- against straight spine, 141

mental mechanisms

- obedience to auditor, 107

Merchant of Chaos, 156

merchant of

confusion, 156-160
handling, 158-160

mind

command of the, 92
know more about, 98
lie detector and knowledge of, 254
no influence on energy banks, 257

minister

symbol and, 181

misownership

bank and, 28
electrical charge and, 253

misowning, 56**mock-ups**, 57-75

affinity by objective, 176
dare not create, 46
"I don't know" and, 29
loss of ability to, 16
picks up another, 143
solve problem of survival by knock off, 132
terminal by, 173

money

as good as has vias, 273

monster

creation of, 40
more than there are, 45
see also **Frankenstein**

monster

motion engrams, 165
motionless engrams, 165
motionlessness
intolerance and
fixation, 161-165
not-knowingness and, 168
tolerance of, 161-169

motion pictures, 14**motivators**

body of data, 120

motto

"Peace on Earth; goodwill toward men," 183

mysticism, 79**name**

dramatizing, 266

native state, 3, 7, 8, 228

cause, 3
communication disappears in, 21
rather wide, able
knowingness, 1

Separateness runs toward, 247
what is, 11

neurotic, 130**newspapers**, 46**Newton**

law of interaction, 52

Nirvana, 6**no game**

Christians and, 182

no interest, 262**Northeast Sea Frontier Command**, 210**Not-iness**

remembering and altering, 3

not-know

end of war and, 213

not-know(ingness), 240

ability to create, 5
automaticity and, 2
confusion and, 2
future and past, 2
game and, 1
Locational Processing and, 240
not-is and, 106
play a game and, 6

- rehabilitated, 246
- rehabilitate postulate
 - of, 274
- subject of mind and, 131
- time and system of, 2
- why an individual creates, 1
- not-knowingness**
- processes**, 218
 - communication and, 219
 - time continuum and, 218
- nuclear physicist**
 - atom bomb and, 90
- objective mock-up**, 176
- objects**
 - optimum way to run
 - spotting, 269
- occlusion**
 - fifth postulate and, 4
 - knowledge and, 228
- “only one”**
 - how get to be, 246
- Opening Procedure**, 196
- Opening Procedure 8-C**
 - power of choice and, 269
- Operating Thetan**
 - definition, 66
 - making others cognite he’s
 - there, 66
 - terminal without mass, 173
- opium**
 - stimulant, depressant or no
 - effect, 136
- opportunity**
 - communication and, 13
- optimum game**, 161
- order**
 - versus consents, 271
- organization**
 - body and, 195
- origin**
 - pc at point of, 251
- Orthodox Church**, 184
- Other People**
 - theory, 229
 - Union Station and, 229
- overt act**
 - body of data, 120
- overt act-motivator**
 - confusion and, 158
 - sequence, 145
- overweight**, 57
- ownership**
 - basic lie, 59
 - bodies and, 18
 - two-way communication
 - above level of, 27
- Ownership Processing**
 - blackness and, 60
 - lie detectors and, 252
 - scarcity of mass and, 56
- PABs**, 226
- pain**, 206
 - communicating with, 204
 - conviction, 45
- Palmer’s primary tenet**, 131
- pan-basis**, 270
- pan-determinism**
 - Alexander and, 209
 - definition, 269
- para-science**, 79
- Para-Scientology**, 97, 211
 - past lives and, 92
- parasitic existence**, 42
 - on masses that exist, 56
- Parke-Davis**, 142, 227
- particle**
 - velocity of, 13
- past**
 - not-knowingness of, 2
- past lives**, 92

pay, 71

communication, 71, 168,
177

perfect duplicate

disappearance and, 55

perpetuation, 206**phrenology, 78****physical science**

laws not true, 52

physical scientist, 96**physical universe**

eternity and, 55
protest against, 55

physiologist

psychologist is, 255

pictures, 58, 78

body of data, 120
effort to remember
and, 223
example of cow, 18
knowingness in form of, 3
obedience to, 121
past appearing in present, 2
poor communication
system, 223
prenatal energy, 88
telling preclear about, 116

playing fields, 55

communication terminals
and, 244
end of cycle and, 56

poliomyelitis

attempted abortion
underlying, 144

politics

criminal, 263

pool of theta, 6**postulates, 237**

agreeing or not with
physical universe, 245
badness, goodness and, 7
communication and, 273
determining cannonball
with, 270
"don't know"
process and, 239
fifth, *see* **fifth postulate**
first, *see* **first postulate**
first and second
badness and goodness, 7
fourth, *see* **fourth postulate**
handling mass versus
thought with, 270
handling people with, 271

have influence or not at
will, 271
heavy MEST energy up to,
scale, 175
making and unmaking
masses and, 30
practice running first, 245
reduce vias, make more
effective, 272
ridges and, 258
scarcity of, 74
second, *see* **second**

postulate

third, *see* **third postulate**
two-way communication
and, 26
unable to make stick, 256
working, 70

postulate scarce, 74**power**

observational, 232
power of choice, 147
know or not-know, 221
Opening Procedure of 8-C
and, 269
pictures and, 117
somatics and, 271
tolerance and, 267

power trouble, 65

trying to empower the terminal, 67

precipitation, 206**preclear**

all confusion in bank and, 101

games and recovery of, 275

invalidated, 93

never talked, 18

no reaction on anything, 261

often decide not to be solvable, 179

pay and, 72

processing lostness out of, 240

startling phenomena and, 129

start session and find, 179

predictability

truer stable datum and, 139

predisposition, 206**prefrontal lobotomy**, 9**prenatal**, 79

energy picture, description, 88

prevention

disease, 145

preventive medicine, 211**problem(s)**

communication solves any, 187

"Data Clear" and, 148

processes

Be three feet back of your head, 259

Communication

Process(ing), 61

Creative Processing, 25

Level Three and subjective, 251

Locational Processing, 230 not-knowingness, 218, 219

Opening Procedure, 196

Other People, 229

Somebody who is separate from you, 231

Something don't know about, 229

Something you could associate with in this room?, 247

Something you don't know about, 236, 244

Something you wouldn't mind not-knowing, 236

Something you wouldn't mind not-knowing about that person, 237, 240

spotting, 247

Tell me a decision that you could make, 267

Things you're separate from in this room, 247

Things you're together with, 247

Union Station, 229

What did the other person know about you?, 229

What did you know about the other person?, 229

What other terminals would you permit to exist?, 246

workable and safe, 235

processing

goals of, 22, 274

increase points in Comm Formula, 21

increase tolerance and power of choice, 269

modus operandi back of, 1

optimum course of, 271
see also **auditing**
process of comparable magnitude, 148
protoplasm
 unending stream of, 88
psychiatry
 badness and, 9-10
psychic block, 138
psychologist
 is a physiologist, 255
psychometric testing, 94
psychosomatic illness
 course of disease, 206
 understanding and, 203
psychosomatic ills, 138
psychosomatics
 disappear, 95
psychotherapy
 kleptomaniac and, 83
psychotic
 confusion and, 156
purpose, basic, 244
R2-40 in *The Creation of Human Ability*, 196
radio set, 16-17
rationale
 missing links in, 130

reactionary, 163
reaction time
 definition, 272
reactive mind
 data on, is a series of
 precisions, 84
 dramatization
 mechanism, 39
 Frankenstein monster
 and, 38
 solidity in the, 3
 solved, 77
realign oneself with existence, 123
reality
 depends on, 198
 "R" is the terminal of
 communication, 171
 terminals and, 175
regressed state, 233
religion, 109-111, 181
 cycle of, 111
 definition, 189
 most outrageous stable
 data, 114
religious movement, 188

Remedy of Havingness, 229
 anchor points and, 68
 definition, 65
remember
 alteration of Not-ness
 and, 3
 versus forget, 228
reorganizing datum, 158
research
 honesty and, 237
 how to, versus not, 227
 scientific mental, 87
residue, 52
responsibility
 control and, 64
 no, 199
 ownership and, 59
restimulation, 85
results
 accomplishable, 175
 bad, 234
ridges
 communicating wrongly
 and, 206
 electronic standing wave
 or, 255
 more when misowned, 258

- postulate and, 258
- residues, 57
- stuck needle and, 256
- right(ness)**
 - differentiation of wrong and, 264
- Robin Hood**, 257
- Roman purges**, 181
- rudiments**, 248
 - of auditing, 233
- Russia**, 183
 - Orthodox Church in, 184
- Salk (polio) vaccine**, 144
- sanitarium**
 - bang people out of head and, 259
- sanity**
 - decision to live again, 134
 - legal definition, 257
 - make someone sane, 148
- scanning**
 - engram, 227
- scarcity**
 - of mass, 56
 - of terminals
 - Creative Processing and, 26
- science**
 - discipline of physical, 81
 - explanations and, 79
 - humanities versus, 150
 - human versus physical, 90
 - monitor the study of, 151
 - new mission, cause a civilization, 151
 - not, 84
 - no understanding of beings, 90
 - ruin of man and physical, 92
 - stable data and confusion in healing, 96
- Scientologists**
 - answer satisfactorily, what is a, 195
 - lie detector reading and, 256
 - successful as communicates, 201
- Scientology**
 - ask which of these data could you use?, 146
 - best reality on, 108
 - blocked off from, 142
 - bring into good ARC all that Man knows, 151
 - can undo itself, 181
 - definition, 230
 - Dianetics and bodies of stable data, 117-121
 - two subjects, 127
 - disseminated principle in, example, 146-147
 - look over simple truths of, 148
 - no barrier to good communication, 201
 - safe subject, 5
 - science of sciences, 150
 - society and, 195-202
 - three feet back of society's head, 180
 - understanding and, 203
- screens**
 - residues, 57
- Second Dynamic**, 22, 268
 - disease and, 219
- Second Dynamic peccadillo**, 143
- second level**, 252

- second postulate**, 228, 229
 badness and, 7
 derives strength from first postulate, 3
 force of not-know behind, 2
 knowingness, effect, 3
 shift from creation to change to control, 64
- sect**
 butchering sect, 186
- security**, 214-217
 definition, 215
- Self Analysis**
 Creative Processing and, 25
- self-auditing**, 235
- self-determinism**
 communication lines and, 220
 motto of engram bank and, 36
- self-expendability**
 examples, 242-244
- sensations**
 communication and, 22
 communication wins and beautiful, 24
 sexual, 22
- Separateness Processing**
 flatten spotting people first, 232
 havingness and, 232
- session**
 how to start a, 179
- sex**, 96
 sane look on subject of, 140
- shame, blame, regret**, 28
 "dare not create" and, 49
- show**
 communication and, 13-15
- significances**
 processing of
 second postulates and, 40
- Six Basic Steps**
 improved majority of cases, 226
 versus Six Levels of Processing, 225
- Six Levels of Processing**, 225, 228
 cracking cases, 248
 Level Three
 Creative Processing, 25
- slave**
 producing, 119
- sleep**
 curve, 82-83
- snapping terminals**, 241
- society**
 advanced surgery in whole track, 132
 barbarism, when will sink to, 185
 failing, 263
 falsified information and, 84
 finding the auditor, 195
 full-out enforced survival and, 132
 individual and, 217
 no-reach into, 182
 run R2-40 on, and upset, 197
 stay in communication with, 201
 vitality of, 13
- solvent**
 communication, 187
- somatic**
 power of choice and, 271
- somatic strip**, 107, 129
- Somebody who is separate from you**, 231

- Something you could associate with in this room?**, 247
- Something you don't know about**, 229
- Something you wouldn't mind**
not knowing about that person, 237
- sources, spot energy**, 244
- space**
two-way communication and, 28
- space opera**, 259
- spectators**, 11
- speed of light**
constancy of, 52
- spin**
engram of confusion and, 157
psychiatry and, 10
religion and, 114
stable datum and, 113
- spinbin**
attack stable datum and, 145
- spirit of fish**, 211
- spirit of man, woman**, 211
- splinter groups, how come about**, 188
- spotting**
objects, 269
people and, 232
- squirrel**, 186
description and anatomy, 104-105, 106
- stability**
instability or, 129
- stable datum**, 99, 103-127
aberrated condition of, 115
aberration and, 113
align and integrate his data and, 149
alignment of education and, 150
amplification of existing, 142
attack, example of, 145
Axiom on, 106
axioms and commonly held, 146
"everybody knows," 136
example of incorrect, 131, 134, 135
half, 134
lack of, 124
no need to upset his, 98
number of, 123
one life, 143
predictability and, 139
spin, and invalidating, 97
structure monitors function, 135-150
unpredictable phenomena and, 138
unsettled, 104
- standing wave**, 255
- static**, 121
conceive a, 196
- Step I (case), engram scanning on**, 227
- stillness**, 161
- stimulus-response**, 120, 127, 260
body on, 256, 264
completely intolerant, 264
definition, 267
example, 268
intolerances, example, 267
- strategy**, 210
- structure**
function monitors, 96, 143
thought could monitor, 265
- stuck needle**, 256

stupidity

- attitude in regards to, 127
- running out, 239
- stable data and, 115
- tolerance of, 126
 - obeying pictures and, 121

succumb

- second postulate, 10
- security and, 215
- super-agitated and, 163
- survive or, 132

super-conservative, 163**superstition**, 84-85, 108

- concerning the mind, 85
- cult-like, 91
- past studies, 93

suppressive factors, 222**Supreme Being**, 108**survive (survival)**

- against any choice, 132
- enforced, 135
 - go mad as answer to, 133
- native state, no time and no, 10
- succumb or, 132

symbol

- minister and, 181

systems

- fourth, Scientology, 31
- third, 29
- two, 27-28

team, winning, 11**Tell me a decision that you could make**, 267**terminals**

- aesthetic value and, 172
- by mock-up, 173
- by postulate, 173, 176
- communication and control of, 272
- connectable, 221
- description, 171
- gradient scale of, 70, 171-174
- hunger, 65
- indestructible
 - communication, 21
 - no reality on, 171
- Operating Thetan and, 173
- out of comm and anxious about, 272
- reality and, 171, 175
- scarcity of
 - Creative Processing and, 26

Sixth Dynamic, 173

- solid, 244
- stops creating, 22
- trouble, 64
- unmocking, 220
- unwillingness to let exist, 246
- values, 172

terminal scarce, 74

see also **scarcity**

textbook, 82**theory**

- underlying each of six steps, 226

therapy

- as-is confusion, 148
- comparable, 149

theta

- trap, 154

thetan, 121

- do something for a, 125
- dream of a, 21
- from native state to effect, 3
- mass and, 49
- no compulsion to interiorize unless, 194
- no identity till assumed, 180

- not-knows to have
 - game, 236
 - playing game and, 6
- Thetan Exterior**
 - definition, 66
- thinkingness**, 139
- Third Dynamic**, 195
 - your interest, 218
- third postulate**, 10, 228
- thought**
 - handling with
 - postulates, 270
 - monitoring structure, 265
- Thou shalt not kill**, 183
- time**
 - creation and, 61
 - no survival in no, 10
 - not-know and creation of, 1
- time continuum**
 - not-knowingness processes and, 218
- time machine**, 107
- Time magazine**, 79
- time stream**
 - flow at uniform rate, 4
- time track**
 - native state on, 11
 - Scientological, 32
- tolerance**
 - awareness of awareness unit and, 118
 - communication and, 177
 - for three principal things, 268
 - improving pc and, 177
 - obeying pictures and, 121
 - of brightness and stupidity, 168
 - of confusion
 - engram and, 160
 - of losing things, 241
 - of motionlessness, 161
 - of not-knowness, 168
 - power of choice and, 267
 - three fronts, 170
- tone**
 - run engram till comes up, 233
- Tone Scale**, 248
 - communication and, 19, 23
- Torquemada**, 191
- toxins**, 99
- training**
 - pattern, 264
- trance, deep**, 259
- trap**
 - destroy and, 51
- trouble**
 - not know, then get in, 236
- trust**
 - communication and, 169, 177
- two-way communication**
 - as-is-es, 26, 252
 - Level Three run when good, 251
 - many methods of using, 252
- unconsciousness**
 - part of reactive mind, 89
 - producing, 119
- understanding**
 - unmocking and, 203
- Union Station**, 229
- universe**, 218
 - creation of
 - class four, Scientology, 32
 - three ways, 29
 - Frankenstein monsters and, 43

unknownness

control mechanism
and, 119
Man and, 112

unknowns

like vacuums, 142

unmocking, 55, 60

body ahead of disease, 204
contact instead of
enemy, 205
leg instead of
illness, 203-204
terminal, 220

vacuum

for data, 130
unknowns and, 142

valence

swapping, 7

value, game and, 13**vias**

games and, 272-274

viewpoints

willingness to assume
all, 269

villain, 15**waiting**

compulsively, 51

war

between commanders, not
troops, 209
communication
and, 205-206, 211-213
communication
breaker, 214
philosophy of, 36

**wavelength, rhythm
and, 53****weapons**

beyond resistance, 90
necessary to resolve
Man, 199

**What did you know about
the other person?, 229****What other terminals
would you permit to
exist?, 246****whirlwinds, 122****Who is looking at the
pictures?, 120****Wichelow, George, 184****wigwam**

lostness of, 241

wild variables, 54**witch doctor**

instincts and untrained, 131

womb, return to the, 79-80**world**

do something about, 202

World War I, 200, 208

Christianity died in, 183

World War II, 200**writer**

hallucinations and, 20

Wundt, 89, 256**X-ray, 253**

