

SOLUTION TO BODY BEHAVIOR, PART I

A lecture given on
3 January 1956

This is a - evening prep course lecture here at the HASI, and the whole lecture I'm going to give you is an overt act to you. Everything I'm going to tell you is actually an overt act against you. I want you to get that plainly and clearly, you understand. The reason I am saying these things right now is totally, entirely and completely to do you in.

Everything I am saying has malice behind it, no matter how kindly it is actually put. There's a certain malignancy in the propaganda itself that I'm about to give you.

Now, if you understand that thoroughly then this lecture won't upset you; but if you only halfway believe me when I tell you that, then I'm afraid the lecture will sit out in front of you and you'll have pictures of it. And if you believe that the whole thing is kindly meant, you'll remember it.

So, we wouldn't want you to do anything like that, remembering this or something of the sort, and so, you just understand that this is entirely malignant, that every size part of it is malicious.

All right. And we got that now?

Audience: Yes.

Got that real good? Fine.

It's just this one lecture, not what I always do. You know?

Now, for a very, very long time, a very long time, we have known about the overt act-motivator phenomena. We have even gotten very technical about it, and we have said that an unmotivated act against another was a DED, d-e-d, and that an act received in response to a DED was a DEDEX. In other words, there were various kinds of overt act-motivator sequences.

Now, what do we mean exactly by a motivator? It means something one receives in the way of pain, punishment or duress which then, thereafter, permits him to execute the same pattern and design against another without being guilty.

And an overt act, actually, is any action done against another. We use this sloppily too. We say also, "He is overt-act hungry." Well, that's just our pandering to people who don't know terminology. Actually, he's motivator hungry. In other words, he's done more to others than has been done to him, and therefore, he is left in a spot of being minus on the subject of motivators.

Well now, an overt act, for the purpose of this lecture and in Scientology, really means anything done to another, but because people understand an overt act is an overt act, we could say the individual wants overt acts done to him, see? He wants others to act against him. But we're going to use it in this wise: We're going to use the word motivator. He wants a motivator.

And, from here on in Scientology, the word motivator gets very, very technical: motivation for "separation from." A motivator would be an action received by an individual which thereafter permitted him to consider all obligations cancelled from that sort. You got that?

Quite important. We have changed the definition of motivator because the old definition is not factual. We weren't wrong, but we were not basic. And the basic reason, it turns out, why an individual wants or has to have these motivators is to permit him to then consider that he has had cancelled out for him any and all obligations which kept him connected to anyone or anything.

And so, we run in immediately into the splitting of universes, and we run into that mechanism most subscribed to by the body - that mechanism most subscribed to by the body, but usually unsuspected by the thetan. And we get the difference between a GE and a thetan. The GE's idea of a motivator is an action occurring to it, a body-genetic entity (merely meaning "a body") - an action happening to it which then permitted it to no longer consider binding any former ties to a certain sphere, activity or person. Got it?

How does the body feel it could separate away from others? By receiving enough motivators. It's the motivation for separation. Got it?

Now, the thetan gets into this because of his association with the body and expresses it most arduously under these circumstances, and you will see, at once, what I'm talking about and be able to get this thing turned right-side up, even though you've had it upside down for a long time.

You'll think an overt act is bad, that a body doesn't want one. That isn't the case. A body is so motivator hungry that if you just sat and conceived everybody to be entirely motivator hungry for a while, probably the whole puzzle would come apart. It would explain or rationalize each and every part of life's activities. They seem to be inexplicable. That's because there's a basic lie.

Everybody and anybody is apparently starved for good things to happen to him, and each action he takes, each and every action he takes, is apparently because he wants something good, and is actually because he's dying and is starved for something bad.

Horrible condemnation, but you'll understand this much better when I say this: Exteriorization and death are synonymous. Death is a sufficient motivator to permit exteriorization from a body. Now, just look at death that way: It's a sufficient motivator to permit exteriorization from the body. Right up to that moment, the individual felt himself so obligated to take care of that body and the other bodies associated with it and the environment in general, that he could not go off and leave it. He was bound there by contract, by agreement. His own high ethical level somewhere back on the track or at upper levels was such as to prevent him from breaking these ties, but death comes along and is a sufficient and adequate motivator to permit him to go off and do what he pleases.

He is not permitted to forget the whole thing unless the whole thing has done enough to him to cause him to break his contract. The basic agreements of tie, then, are ARC of one sort or another; and the body's mechanism for separating these ties and breaking off these contracts, these agreements, this ARC with life, of forswearing all of its responsibility, is to receive enough motivators. And if it can receive enough motivators, it then feels that it can shove off and do what it pleases.

The body feels this; the whole body is built more or less on this principle. And a thetan going along is only skating on the surface of this principle. He's skating so thinly on the surface of it that although he occasionally obeys it, he is not cognizant of it; he is not aware of it, but the body is aware of it.

And you have, then and there, the totality of the phenomenon known to Freud as the subconscious or unconscious mind. He was trying to account for this unconscious, this unknown, yet thinking reaction, which lay below the surface of knowledge of the individual, a thetan.

There was some rationale which a person couldn't quite grasp. There was a rationale of some sort which lay beyond the consciousness of the thetan which he couldn't quite grasp and, having grasped it, he couldn't quite credit. The body had gone along so long using only this mechanism of enough motivators to separate, that it had one method of exteriorization from any group or situation: Get some motivators. And if it got some motivators, it could leave; but if it

didn't get any motivators, it couldn't leave. It was bound by contract, by agreement, by ARC, by responsibility.

So, we have the teenage child-give you some very practical examples of this-we have the teenage child demanding from Mother and Father a sufficient number of motivators. Mother and Father must do something to the teenage child. Actually, the teenage child wants to separate from the bosom of that family, wants to go out and get married, raise a family and go off on his own. But he can't do this unless somebody has been mean to him. Get the idea?

So, he's got to accumulate, one way or the other, some motivators. So, he finds this or that wrong with his parents. They're doing this or that to him or her. And if the parents just went on being noble, the kid never would leave. So, a failure to grasp the situation gives us familial difficulties with children. The parents don't grasp this at all.

Actually, you could tailor up some customs which would match this reality and which would vanquish the actions of this - you can't call it an "unconscious mind," because it's not an unconscious mind; it's a totality of impulse on the part of a GE.

How does he get out of things? He gets motivators. He holds down the number of overt acts he does and accumulates motivators, and when he's got enough of them, he blows. Got the idea?

So, he'll go out of communication. He won't talk to anybody. You see, that's reaching, and it might be an overt act. And he'll just sit there, quiet, you know, waiting for somebody to gouge him. Of course, he'll occasionally look with a certain way or quite by accident do a certain thing, all by accident, which will then cause somebody to give him a new motivator. And if he's got one, he can shove off.

The preclear, who is eternally blowing the session, will conceive anything to be a motivator. This person has almost got enough to leave life, you know, almost got enough; and if they just see an auditor, a bad auditor preferred ...

You haven't started the session yet, you just walked into the auditing room, and you drop your handkerchief. And you start to pick it up again, and right away they're going to go. Incomprehensible. Worse than that, you're three minutes late for the session; they're five minutes late, but they know you were three minutes late. Get the idea? And they're going to blow.

Now, you, in your interest in the case or something like that, hold up and don't give an auditing command promptly, you give them a two-second comm lag or something like this before you give them the next command - they're off. They're already going to walk to the door, you know? What's happening here? They're looking for it.

Do you know - here's the great oddity, here's the great oddity: If you were to actually tell this person brutally something very harmful, you know, then they could leave with a clean conscience. They would at least be able to exteriorize from life - they see it.

But they would get out to the sidewalk, and they'd find they were still in a body - the body was still there, the body was still connected to this universe that it wasn't enough of an overt act. So, now they've got to go tell somebody a bunch of lies about you in order to at least get a general agreement on the part of the society that they have received one. Got it?

Now, the thetan ordinarily isn't, as we say in the US, isn't "hep" to this. A thetan doesn't really know this is going on. He will obey it sometimes because it seems to be so much the thing, on a sort of a response mechanism, but he will not at once recognize what his body is doing. Therefore, he will find himself going into sudden little flurries of upset that he doesn't quite understand, and he'll find suddenly that he's said something or done something that has a whole roomful of people very upset with him.

How did this come about? And he'll say, "Well, it's not because I - it's because I - I'm not so good. It's because of this, because of that." He's just cut right straight across into one of these things. The body for a moment, or one of its entities, has suddenly made an expression or done a thing which says, "Please, please, come on. Give me some motivators," see?

Everybody says, "Rrrhhh."

Well, that's enough. See, then the fellow can leave the group, leave the party. How do you get out of a trap? You accumulate some motivators. People have got to be mean to you. That's the way you get out of a trap if you're a body. See this?

Well, that isn't really the way a thetan does it, but a thetan is overtly interested in reaching. He's overtly interested in looking at this, looking at that, reaching here, reaching there - in a mechanism which is covertly interested in being reached. Different thing, see: being reached by anybody and everybody - a mechanism which wants to withdraw. Thetan is reaching, body is withdrawing.

And between these two actions you get a continual enturbulence between the thetan and the body. You get a miscomprehension. They're going in two opposite directions. At length, the thetan goes into apathy and he says, "All right, I won't reach anymore." He's just in total agreement with the body, see that? Just as easy as that. "Well, I won't reach anymore. I'll wait until they kick me out."

And this is the preclear that you stand in front of him, and you say, "Be three feet back of your head." He can't. But I - in the field of research you're liable to do almost anything. I have done this; I have done this: I have said to a preclear, "Well, it's all right with me, of course, but if you stay in your head one second longer, I'm going to take this fist right here and I'm going to knock your silly head off." And the guy will be very sad about this and back three feet back of his head.

Now, sometimes they try to kick themselves out of a situation by getting a picture of a motivator, see? They get a picture of one in front of them. And they say, "Well, that's good enough," only they can't quite convince themselves that it really was intended wholly for their destruction. "That was good enough," they say. "Look - look what - look what this person did to me. That's enough. I can shove off. I mean, I don't have to be responsible around here anymore. I can shove off, I guess, I hope."

And they get obsessed on the subject, and they tell you all about how horrible this person was to them. They're trying to build it up - build it up, until at last they, themselves, are convinced through having convinced you, that they can now shove off from any situation or responsibility with regard to that.

Some people have never exteriorized from their families, although they have left. And as the years go along, they'll feel sadder and sadder about the whole thing. They're not living up to their obligation, you see. And then one fine day, out of nowhere, they will suddenly conceive all the horrible things their family has done to them. And they'll start to dream up things, or they'll start to kind of rake at them, you know? Scratch at them a little bit, you know? And there will be an awful uproar going, terrific uproar going on, that they didn't really start, because that is the condition of the motivator: They didn't start anything. There they were standing there, perfectly innocent, and all this happens.

Well, that's the way a motivator must be and so they rig it up that way, and away they go. Now, just exactly why or how they can receive as many motivators as they do and still not be convinced is simply a matter of consideration. "How many motivators do you need?" is some kind of a process, untested, see.

You've known one human being that you - one morning, weren't feeling too good, and you walked into the dining room, or something like that, and you just didn't say anything. As a

matter of fact, it was beyond your capabilities to have talked to anybody. And they look at you and suddenly say, "Well, if that's the way you feel about it!" and leave. Well, that's their consideration of how much motivator they need in order to leave the dining room.

Now, you understand that a thetan falls into this. He falls into this only by example and stimulus-response and not by his understanding. His understanding is very hard to match up to this. Actually, you have to sit down and think for a long time before you get this thing entirely measured out, and then you'll never have it in the frame of reference of a body, because the body is just plain starved, and starvation isn't a thinking process. It begins with a consideration that one needs something. All right.

Now, how did it ever get in this condition? How did it ever get in this condition? If you took a highly ethical being and tried to trap him, what is the first condition necessary to the trap? Supposing he were not only highly ethical, supposing he were highly athletic and penetrative. Supposing this being could walk through anything, anywhere, at any time, be anywhere at any time, and you wanted to trap him. How on earth would you go about doing it?

There'd be one condition necessary to the execution of this design. Do you anticipate it?

Audience: Yes.

You'd have to get him to agree that he was under some sort of an obligation. No matter on what flimsy excuse, you would still have to get him to give his word, his contract, his bond, that he was under some sort of an obligation, see? This would be the first condition.

Now, because he gives this at a time when he is highly ethical, as he's punched around and thrown downscale, he doesn't ever change it, because he can't as-is it. He isn't at the same position of the Tone Scale, and it's always out of his reach.

So, the way we would go about trapping a thetan or a livingness that we wanted thereafter to move along certain definite patterns, would be to make a bargain about obligation. We would claim this individual had responsibilities. We would claim he had certain debts to pay.

Now, thereafter if the individual were highly ethical, he could not conceive himself to be absolved of these contracts since the contract maker suddenly becomes evaporated or unknown or unreachable, you see, and he would be left with this mechanism, then: The other person would have to break the contract. It would be up to somebody else.

But how would you ever get the contract really broken? How would you ever get it broken? The other person would have to break it, right? And that would have to be by pushing away, by doing something against, by saying, "We're no longer operating in the same frame of reference," that "We are some other being," you know, something else would have to occur. And out of all possible chances, evidently the one that the body has adopted is motivator: "You do enough things to me, and I am no longer held or bound by this contract; therefore, I can break the contract."

Death by violence, which can, to some degree, be traced immediately to an intent, is of course desirable over and above a nice quiet death where everybody is being very kind. If you really looked up and down the time track, you would find the individual stuck in incidents, situations, environments and places where everybody is being damned nice - the weak universes, the nondangerous spots. Got the idea? Because there's no motivators possible, and the individual will hang on to these pictures. Quite fascinating, quite fascinating.

I used to run into all kinds of violent deaths when I was researching past track deaths. Oh, my, you talk about violent deaths, you just run into them by the ton. You can take an E-Meter, and you just turn them up: death by shooting, death by drowning, death by this, death by that, you know. And they're just endless, it seems. And so, you run them. You run them out, and you

erase them, and you run them out, and you erase them, you just ... You say, "Well, this guy isn't changing. Where the devil is he stuck?" Well, he's stuck with everybody being nice.

One notable case was stuck in the last life as a miller somewhere in Europe. And he had about seven or eight kids and they were all standing around and they were all crying. And his wife was there and she was crying. And he was dying rather comfortably in a very, very comfortable bed.

And when we spotted this one, the E-Meter didn't jiggle. It was just stuck right there, straight up, nonbudging. He had no reason whatsoever to exteriorize from this situation. All right.

With this new understanding, running that same incident, what would I have done? I would have conceived that he didn't have enough reason to separate, and I would have had him mock up the bed, the wife, the children, each one, one after the other - mock them up, not run the original engram, see, so as not to upset his havingness. And we mock up each one of these things, each time, as totally constructed to do him in. Each one of it was born and raised and placed there with no other intent or motive of any character than to do him in, see. Total intention. And the whole incident would have blown, just as easy as this.

And we would not have forgotten the space or any shadows in the mockups. The space was made to do him in. The shadows were made to blind him or do him in. And we'd only have to get him, with his mock-ups, to get a conviction on each part of the scenery and every part of the scenery, selectively, and so forth, to blow him entirely out of the incident, swish. You never saw an incident disappear so fast in your life as one that is run in this fashion.

And what I'm telling you tonight is a solution across the boards for Dianetics and the running of engrams and also of an understanding of these strange motives that people have - you mean, strange motivator hungers they have, not strange motives they have. All right.

Now, let's look at this and realize that we're dealing with a nice scale, interesting scale, which at the bottom is solid - real life; and a little bit higher on the thing is mock-ups, pictures; and a little bit higher on the thing is problems. Problems are motivators - problems are the considerations of motivators. I'm sorry, but that's the way it runs. This isn't a theoretical stunt, this is just it. And just above that you have contracts, and just above that you have pure agreement.

In other words, proceed from the top: The thought "I agree" can be seen on this scale to become more and more solid; first, in the form of a complicated agreement, known as a contract; and then a little bit more, as a problem, which is a non-isable contract, you see? I mean, a good problem is one that just never solves. It's just - it's got lines in all directions. And just below this is the mock-up, you see, the solid. And just below that is the solid, real universe, which is the time agreement of us all. You see what that scale is?

And the odd part of it is that almost any part of it runs, but for cases in general, you have to pay attention to it as a scale. So that you might be able to run it in mock-ups; you might be able to run it in mock-ups, or you might have to go down into real life, sort of thing. Or you could run it as problems, or above that you could run it as contracts, or above that just as plain agreements.

But of all these theoretical things, the oddity is this: that there are two parts of the scale, so far as Homo sapiens are concerned, and they run on almost any level you can conceive. And the first of these is mock-ups with intent to harm; each part of the mock-up has an intent to harm.

This causes a great deal of careful auditing. You must get every part of the mock-up the preclear made to have an intent to harm, see - every part that he made. You don't leave scraps and bits and pieces lying around, such as the space and the bedspread and the clothes and that sort of thing. The shadows, and so forth - you don't leave them, because they'll just stay there, on this system. See, they don't go away. You've got to take up each part of the mock-up.

You tell him to mock up something which would intentionally harm him, and he'll get all sorts of things, and the landscape and so forth, and all of a sudden the central figure will come out of

the landscape. Now you've got to dispose of the rest of the landscape. You get how each part of it intended to harm him, too, and was created just to harm him and so on. All right.

Now, whatever commands are used or how this is done, that is what you are doing. Get that? And when he has enough of these motivators mocked up and vanquished, as an auditor said it, this ought to be SOP Sschlup, because the way these mock-ups, when they're rigged in that fashion, go into the body is horrible to behold. I mean, they go in so fast, they are digested in its entirety so quickly, that they almost make it impossible to trace them, where they went.

And your preclear, the first few of them, will say, "I wonder where that went." He doesn't even realize that it moved from out there to in there, see? The whole mock-up goes that fast. And it doesn't matter how much trouble your preclear has getting rid of mock-ups or how much difficulty he has making mock-ups, you can still do something of this with this process.

He gets nothing but blackness. All right, have him mock up nothing but blackness which is totally intended to harm him. Don't let him as-is the blackness he's got sitting there already. If it's there, he hasn't enough motivators yet. You've got to create some more. And the body best communicates on solids - solid objects. You have him mock up some more blackness and mock up some more blackness - each time the blackness and the space in which it's located. He gets the idea about that, that it's totally intended to harm him, blind him or do something wrong for him.

An auditing command suggested on this, is you just ask him after he's made the mock-up, about each part of the mock-up, is "What threat could that be to you?" And, the second he gets a threat that could be to him, it'll come in, swish, and away it goes. The next thing you know, his field clears up because he's had enough of this sort of thing.

And this is body havingness. The body's idea of real havingness is something that does him in. Hence, we find the avidity of little boys to go around carrying dynamite caps in their pocket. That's real havingness. Now, wherever we look in life, we find this principle being pretty well obeyed.

We get another, higher level on this in just plain problems. We say, "What problem could that be to you?" There's only one proviso here, is that you never address this to a condition; you always address it to a communication terminal. You be sure you do that.

Now, what I mean by that is, you say, "What problem could (blank) be to you?" Let's say that this fellow has a bad leg, he's lame. Now, this runs out a chronic somatic, by the way; it just does that. And that's very interesting, because we've been trying for five years, one way or the other, and for a long time we didn't even touch one because we'd make it worse. And certainly enough we'd make it worse: if we took away that problem, why, there wouldn't have been any other problem to replace it, and our preclear would have been in the soup.

But we can now, with this, run a chronic somatic. So, it becomes the responsibility of the auditor in Level One, just in starting the case, to clear up any chronic somatic the fellow has. He has TB or two heads or something like that, and you clear this up, just to get the case rolling. All right.

Now, this fellow has lameness. Take this "condition versus communication terminal." All right. This fellow has a lameness in his leg. And we don't run, then, "What problem could lameness be to you?" See? That's the problem. I mean, we're running "What problem could the problem be to us," see? That's wrong. A condition, that's off. You'd say, "What problem could your leg be to you?" or ". . . could legs be to you?" Any way you want to put this, see. But it's the terminal that you're running.

Now, the wording of this is very important, very important. The exact wording, since we have had problems - we've had lots of commands that ran problems; but we'd better make the wording of this, for just the classic example of the wording, exactly what we mean, because all of this, you see, had it, but we just didn't quite have it. You get the idea?

Well similarly, on this problems, we had problems as processes, but we just didn't quite have problems as processes, you see?

So, it's "Invent a specific problem (blank) could be to you." Boy, that communicates exactly what you mean.

Now, we don't have a process here that we're going to use. We do have a process here that does have some workability, but we're not necessarily going to use this thing, and that is, of course, "Invent a specific problem you could be to (blank)." We're not going to run that side of it.

Why aren't we going to run that side of it? That's the overt act side of it. And we're just going to cut his motivators to ribbons, and we'll just pin him down all the tighter on this same thing.

So, we're going to run just this one side on this lopsided thing, and we're going to say, "Invent a specific problem (your aunt) (grandfather) (legs) (ears)," whatever it is, "could be to you." Always a terminal, never a condition.

Now, do you know why, in SLP Issue 5, we were not getting the gains on the first level, we weren't getting psychometric gains, and why preclears were hanging up a bit? It's because we were solving some problems? Uh-uh. You just solve one problem for the preclear and you've solved one too many. Therefore, you must never evaluate for the preclear or solve his problems for him. He must always solve the problem himself, after he has a sufficiency of motivators to be able to leave or stay there at his own choice.

So, we just don't solve people's problems for them. We don't come in and say, "Well, I don't know what I am going to do because so-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so."

We can communicate, we can forward a communication line for them, but we certainly can't solve that problem. We're liable to make them quite ill. We're likely to make them quite antagonistic, quite upset. No, we must give them some more problems. All right.

Now, this individual will actually hang up every time you lessen his havingness in terms of problems, and his case will not advance. You've got to increase the number of problems because this is body havingness. And he'll never be able to get out of any situation; he'll stick all over the time track, if you solve any of his problems.

So, that is what we were doing in SLP 5. We were too intrigued with this problem of comparable magnitude and "Solve it," see? And we could do that, bang, bang, bang. Didn't increase his havingness at all. We're liable to stick him right there. We took one problem away. Ha! Ha! He can't leave now; he hasn't enough motivators. You got the idea? So, we just keep asking him about the problems.

Now, one way to go about this would be quite interesting. We take what he conceives to be the weakest universe. This would be, by better definition, that universe - by universe we mean any person, which is also a communication terminal, so on; any body or environment could be called a universe. We take any universe, and we ask him - and we discuss weak universes, and we get a universe; let me state it that way, see. He finally tells us the weakest universe he'd ever heard of.

We've actually gotten that universe which gave him the least number of motivators; that's the weakest universe. And that's the way it'll turn out after a while. It really isn't the weakest universe; it's the universe which has given him the least motivators, and he can't exteriorize from it. He's liable to have all the chronic somatics of that universe and everything else. He can't get away from it; he can't get out of it. He's stuck.

And you say he's in Mama's universe or Papa's universe? No. You'd better find out the person he's really stuck in. And he's possibly not stuck in Mama's or Papa's universe. You say, "Did your papa ever say a single bad word to you?"

"Oh, well, yes, many times."

He's not stuck in Papa's universe.

"All right. Was your mama always good and kind to you?"

"What, that old bat?" You know, yap, yap, yap.

No, it wasn't Mama's universe he's stuck in.

Well, we go on talking either about the weakest person he knows or the person who was best to him that he knows, and we're liable to wind up with the same person. It's the person he has no excuse to back up from.

And then if we were to ask him what problems could that person be to him, invent a specific problem that person could be to him, over and over and over and over and over and over and over, he'll all of a sudden sigh with relief and cease to have that person's somatics, and all other sorts of interesting things could occur.

Now, when you had that totally remedied and he was really in good shape and he had an enormous superfluity of problems; he just dreamed them up (he has lots of them) you could possibly ask him, if you wanted to, "What problems could you be to that person?" You just give it an additional push; but it's really not an essential part of the process at all.

You see how this is? An accumulation of motivators permits him to separate.

Now, you could run plain separateness and as a thetan he would happily go along and try to separate from that person, see? And as a thetan he might make the grade. Body's still stuck. Got it?

So, that was a happy strike when we made it; and when it was tested and so forth, it looked good because the thetan was separating from that weakest universe; but with experience, we found out that the individual body was not. It was still stuck. Got it? So, we had to run problems that could be to him. All right.

Now, we can take anything under the sun, moon or stars and either by having the individual mock up, create solidly, items of that character dangerous to him - let's say, for example, he has a bad leg. We just have him mock up legs and have how they could be a threat to him, menace to him, see? Legs that are totally dedicated to his eradication, if you want to get very possible about it; and all of the scenery, then, and the ground it's standing on - that all has to be dedicated to his eradication too. Don't leave bits and pieces around there.

Or we could simply ask him this question and get more or less the same result, more or less the same result-variable: "What problems . . ." "Invent a specific problem . . ." Of course, just the statement "What problem could legs be to you?" is the process and the wording of the process is "Invent a specific problem legs could be to you" or ". . . a leg could be to you," see?

He's got two bad legs, or he has trouble with his legs, why, let it be "legs." If you've only got one bad leg, better make it "a leg."

And make sure that he invents one. Don't let him go as-ising the problems already in the bank. Hound him. And we come up with this fantastic thing, we come up with the complete understanding of the situation. He'll eventually tell you exactly why he's got that leg that way and so on. He'll concede on it, one way or the other, and he'll get rid of it.

Now, we could do it another way and still cure him. We could talk about weakest universes; separate out and find a weak universe of one kind or another, locate one, nice as you please, and then ask him what problems it could be to him. And if we were really searching and we were real clever, we'd never have to ask him, "Did that person have trouble with his leg?"

That person did; or if that person didn't, then the weak universe married somebody or was connected with somebody that had a bad leg. Got the idea? There's two connections possible: Either the weakest universe had a bad leg, or the person the person married had a bad leg, and there is where the somatic is buried. And there is the way and the part and the place and the source of the service facsimile, of which you have heard a great deal, and there is its basic anatomy.

All right. The individual, having to create motivators, then stuck in places where he didn't have any. And not only stuck in these places, but tried like mad to dream some up; the body dreamed them up for him. Bad leg? Well, this person got a bad leg from Uncle Josie or something, huh? Person's got a bad leg, and so therefore, Uncle Josie has done him wrong.

Get the rationale that goes on behind the service facsimile? Totally unworkable. Getting away from Uncle Josie by having Uncle Josie's bad leg is not good sense to anybody, but it is to a body. Body thinks that's real smart: "That's the way we do it."

"The way to get away from sickness is to get sick, and that makes sickness a motivator, and therefore I can get away from sickness," see? It's good logic, wonderful logic. But whether it's logical or not is beside the point; it happens to be the function. That is the way it happens. All right.

This opens up to us, this opens up to us a considerable vista, a considerable understanding, which was occasionally entangling our processing and preclears.

Now, the usual course of action is, in walks Mr. Preclear, here he is and he's saying, "Look at this horrible leg, see. Well, I've just got to get rid of this horrible leg. I'm chronically, somatically ill. I had poliomyelitis ever since it got advertised so well."

And you say, "That's fine," and have him start locating the walls. He just doesn't belong there. He knows he doesn't belong there, not him. They came to the wrong place. He's trying to show you.

Now, very oddly, this would work as a sort of a freak sometimes. You'd say, "By golly, you know, that is just about the worst bad leg I ever saw." You know, he's liable to exteriorize out of the bad-leg universe. See, that's a freak.

That happens often enough in a medical doctor's office to give him an odd idea concerning psychosomatic illness, see? He believes that a spontaneous remission can occur which is unassisted by anything. He doesn't look at the fact that he was there, and he looked at it, and he agreed it was an awful bad leg. He said, "My, isn't that a wonderful, horrible, terrible, fear-shattering motivator you've got! My god, did they do that to you?" is what he's said, see?

And they say, "Gee, you know, maybe this is enough. Okay, I'll exteriorize."

But there is no such thing as an unassisted spontaneous remission. See, something had to occur in the thinking or talking line in order to make this thing happen. Well, that is exactly what happened. You know the mechanism now of a spontaneous remission, so-called.

You can play this trick. It's a fantastic trick. You take some guy - you take some guy, and he's got a bad scar, let's say, down the side of his face.

And you say, "Good god, man! Hoo! What a horrible scar! What a dreadful accident that must have been."

And he starts to tell you about it, and you - "Oh, I'm sure that it was worse than that. You're just minimizing it. You're just making nothing out of the whole thing. It was worse than that."

And you see him a couple of days later and the scar will have diminished or disappeared. You get the idea? You see, it's just a stunt, with workability, oh, I don't know, 20 percent, 25 percent, you know. It's minor workability, but it's something you might expect to have happen occasionally. See, you convinced him that the motivator he already had was good enough. You get it?

Now, if you walk up to him and say - did you ever do this with anybody? This is the reverse way. This is the way to make him sick. He walks up to you, he's got this scar. And you say, "Oh, I don't know. That will probably heal up; probably be okay."

And if you kept this up with him enough, the thing would probably become livid, and he'd probably go out and get cut again. See how it'd be? You've told him, "That's not a good enough motivator. Whatever universe you're stuck in, it isn't good enough to get out of it." Do you see how it'd work? Both ways.

Now, if, when you're talking to - within a body's hearing - you're talking within a body's hearing, you're talking on one or these others. You're either saying, "You can have more motivators" or "The motivators you have are plenty good enough" or "They aren't good enough," you could produce some interesting results.

Now, if you said, "You can have more motivators; there are more available" (not "more necessary," but "there are many more available"), you'd probably not only exteriorize him out of this one obvious universe, but you'd probably take him out of five or six more and out of his body.

And if you went along a little bit further and said, "Look, you can have even more than this," you could probably take him right on out of this universe, see, or he could be in and out of it at will. See how that would work? All right.

That's one system. Another system would be to tell him the ones he has and these are not usable systems, you understand. I mean, they're just illustrative.

You could tell him, "The one you have - or the ones you have are plenty good enough." You've had it. "You're in terrible - I never heard of such an awful accident. God! You know, last night I went home after you told me about that and I dreamed about it all night long!" The guy's liable to blow out of that particular type of incident.

And the other one, reverse, which would just pull him in right tight up against - into that universe he's stuck in, and stick him somewhat in yours, would be to say, "Oh-ho, that thing. Ha! You mean, you rolled off the mountainside, and there were only twelve people killed in the bus? Well, I knew a bus accident one time in which there were . . ." And he'll start dramatizing the incident.

All three of these conditions you should understand in order to handle this particular mechanism. All right.

As we look over the Six Levels of Processing, Issue 7, we find out that we're really handling very little else in there but these two factors: We're trying to make sure that he doesn't receive or get a thirst or get the idea that we're the executioner he's been looking for, see? Therefore, we follow the Auditor's Code, we use two-way communication, we give him communication bridge. You got the idea? And all of these things tell him "We're not the executioner. Wrong party." Got the idea? So, then he doesn't suddenly alert

Now, if we do something wrong, the body suddenly wakes up and says, "Gee, maybe I'm facing the best executioner yet. Maybe this guy Will just cut me to ribbons. Of course he could cut me to ribbons! He knows all about the mind; he's an expert. Oh, boy. Now, if I could just get him good and mad at me. . . " And away we go, see? And we just now can't have anything but Auditor Code breaks and "Scientology is horrible" and we're all doing her in and ... You know, this kind of thing is the only thing that can happen from here on out, because the person's got the idea that you're the executioner or that we're executioners, see?

Now, it's sometimes lucrative and remunerative to be in the role of an executioner. You could hang out your sign and say, "I ruin everybody," and you would probably have the darnedest business that you ever heard of. And this is quite fantastic, but it'd probably occur. Probably be one way to exteriorize everybody.

However, the odd part of it is that by pandering entirely to this thirst for motivators, the society would eventually get the idea that you were guilty of too many overt acts, and it would say, "Look, we have an excuse to play the other side of the drama. This person is guilty of enough overt acts, he is sufficiently bad. He eats babies alive, you see. Every day he goes down and monkeys with tram switches and makes things go wreck, and he has a steady contract with BOAC to interrupt their turbojets and so forth, in midflight over unpopulated areas of wilderness.

"This individual has all sorts of horrible and terrible things that he does, and so therefore, we might be able to get up to an overt act - in view of the fact he deserves it, you see, we might be able to get up to an overt act of actually walking along and frowning at one of his footsteps," you see?

That's what it would take to get an overt act against you in a society, see? Got it?

Now, eventually you would work yourself up to a point, though, where a few guys who had a lot left over, you know, they'd say, "Gee, there he is," and shoot you. You see how it'd work? How it would work. The other mechanism is, then, that in a society which is motivator hungry, only an individual who is agreed upon to be totally bad will ever be even vaguely attacked, see? And he'd have to be really totally pluperfectly bad.

The newspaper, actually, is - used to be something which released events of note and so forth. The newspaper today is really just an advertisement sheet of people who could have an overt act performed against them. That's about all it is; it's an advertisement sheet this way. Or "These motivators are now available in this society." It talks about one or the other, and this passes for news.

Now, your preclear, remember (and this we must have very clearly) is a thetan. He doesn't know this any more than any of us really knew this, see, as such, in articulate fashion; but it is happening as the mechanism on which his body does its exteriorization. And the second you talk about exteriorization, it starts thinking in terms of motivators. See, any thinkingness the body has on the thought of exteriorization thinks in terms of motivators. You get how this is? It's just an identification.

So, you have a thetan that you're trying to do something for, being pinned down by a mechanism which we did not entirely recognize or have the anatomy of. Well, we have the anatomy of this thing now; and it's a fantastic thing, how fast and furious that you can kick out of existence such a thing as a chronic somatic. You ought to try it.

Now, naturally, an individual who is out of communication with you as a thetan and so forth, is not going to be able to handle his body very well. We, therefore, have to start into some sort of a session there which is careful, which builds up a good ARC level, which eases in on it gently, because the individual isn't very strong in handling this body.

The body has totally run away from him, so that everything you do to the guy, he will then concur, in that it's an overt act, you see? He's just gone downhill to a point where he's almost totally agreed with the body and is following and falling right in with, without understanding, its motivator phenomena. All right.

This curiosity, then, is that you are trying to make somebody well who is somehow or another being impeded by something from becoming well. Something is impeding him. And it has been my task for a great many years to find out what impedes the bulk of these cases that don't improve, and I have tried to locate this and isolate it one way or the other.

There are many, many mechanisms which can release cases, that do well and so forth, but there has always been a little something hanging around the fringes, you might say. There is something that's not been quite understood about the exact mechanism of why the guy did it.

We know and have said that if we take away too many of his problems, he'll get some new ones. But that's an old remark; this is not even new with me.

We have said, well, some guys just are ungrateful. They're just completely unappreciative of anything, you know. And we've said that, and that sure didn't solve it. Recognizing that some guys just ought to really have had their teeth kicked in was the truth of the matter. They wanted their teeth kicked in. They were sitting there to get their teeth kicked in. That was the way they wanted to exteriorize, you see?

Now, almost anything that you know that would straighten out these things, would straighten it out if you straightened it out within this rationale, understanding this about people: that a thetan goes along doing his best, trying to reach out, trying to get something done, trying to guide these various things along the line, and that he is running something which has this deadly germ of its own destruction: that it must have more motivators and more motivators and more motivators.

Now, when a person is in very, very, very good condition physically, so on, this mechanism is not very apparent. It's only there slightly, you see? But after a person has been beaten around for a while, the mechanism works both ways. Logically, the thetan no longer conceives any reason to hang around the environment because it's no fun, see? This is "Daahhh, why hang around here?" which keys the body in instantly. "Oh, we're on this motivator kick, huh? And now we'll collect them."

Get the idea? So that this, in a person who is in fairly good condition, is not very apparent. But in a person who has started to go downhill, where the thetan is really stuck in and doesn't want to stay there, and he wants to exteriorize, he wants to get out, he doesn't find the thing very well in keeping with his ideas of how life should be run - this is all rational. A thetan is rational to this degree, you see.

He doesn't want to stay there. All of a sudden he keys in this other phenomena and mechanism that he really doesn't know anything about. And from that time on, he's going to take it. He's going to get it from left and right. He's going to go around, and he's going to do the darnedest things. Boy, is the body helping him out. You get the idea.?

So really, from the first thought that an individual wants to go his own way and chuck it all, his body is assisting him by accumulating motivators. And therefore, he gets psychosomatically ill, he gets aberrated, he gets this, he gets that. He starts to throw his abilities away. One of the best ways to do it is say, "You know, I used to be able to paint, but after Grandma got through with me, I can't paint anymore."

In other words, his lack of an ability to paint is the evidence that he has had something done to him. You see that? Just that. That's a negative proof, you see? Now, that's as bad as a chronic somatic. It's an absent talent. Who cost you painting? Mama, see? Grandma, somebody - your opposite talent. All right.

We look on the other side of it, and we see the individual there with all sorts of, oh, shoulder deformity, something like this. And he's got a bad shoulder and he can't raise his arm or something like this. This is just reverse evidence: "I have received a motivator." Now, he's undecided. He doesn't know whether he ought to leave or shouldn't leave. And there he is, see, stuck right there. All right.

So, we say to the guy, "What problems could shoulders be to you?" something like that. The universe, the condition, and so forth, is liable to show up quite rapidly. He invents new ones. He gets enough motivators. He feels, then, free to leave these situations. And actually, the body is so childishly easy to handle that it doesn't take much stressing. The thing is not a difficult thing to handle, if you understand it.

Now, the thetan, he'll comply with you. He will try to go along. Something is interfering with the processing; you're not quite sure what's interfering with the processing. It's probably the body and its motivator hunger. But it could also be the auditor and the auditor's hunger for motivation.

"Preclear refuses to get well. All I did is keep dropping ashtrays and change the auditing command twenty times an hour, and I didn't do anything wrong. And the fellow has really given me an awful overt act. Here I have sweated and slaved. I've just worked my brain to the bone, trying to help him out, and he treats me this way." You get the idea?

Well, if you find yourself breaking the Auditor's Code and that sort of thing, just stick out your - side of your face, something like that, and practice some Christianity, which is "Sock me!" And just have the preclear sock you two or three times. He won't know what it's all about, but after that, you'll handle him fine. You've got enough motivators as far as he's concerned; you could leave him anytime.

Well, now, this rather puts a new light on what we're doing, which is, really, kind of an old light too. But if you still think it's an old light, then you better take a look at this new light, because it's used a little bit different.

And if you want a little indoor sport, and if you want to do something in an idle moment or during a bus ride or something, sit down and try to conceive how every body (you understand: not "everybody," but "every body"), in the world is trying to run on this basis of being motivator hungry.

I'm sure you'll understand a great deal. I've been trying to do it and I haven't quite made the grade yet myself. I only know that it works in processing - but maybe some of you will.

Thank you very much.

Thank you.

Thank you.