

QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD

A lecture given on 11 February 1957

[Start of Lecture]

Thank you.

Well, this is the 11th of February, 1957. And this is lecture number twenty-eight, and it's a question and answer period. And all I'm going to do here is try to clear up a few points with you which might have come up during these lectures or during this course. If anybody has any questions written down, why, I'd be very, very happy to answer them. So, if you'll just pass them forward....

Here is a question: „*What about looking for stable data by asking bluntly, 'What do you know for sure?'*”

As a matter of fact you had this process under Certainty Processing. Remember, old Certainty Processing: took all the component parts of life and said „*What is your greatest certainty at this point and level?*“

Now, up to a point, that restimulates stable data and makes a person feel better. And just beyond that point it takes the stable datum away, and he feels horrible. If you remove a stable datum on a preclear, even if it's a very aberrative datum -- „*Horses sleep in beds*“ -- he then feels confused and upset. That is the immediate consequence. The confusion, which is backed up and evidently held off -- but actually held in place by -- a stable datum, is a sequence of „*not-knows*.“ Everything in one of these confusions is a „*don't know*.“ You might say every particle really says „*don't know*.“ So, you've got a „*know*“ which goes up against „*not-know*“ or „*don't know*“, and if you as-is the stable datum completely, the person has all of the „*not-knows*“ left, even if it's a crazy stable datum. A person who is crazy probably had some crazy stable data, and then people convinced him that they were not sensible stable data, and that caved in the confusion and there he went.

So you've got a limited process here on „*What do you know for sure?*“ And as long as it merely restimulated the person a bit and didn't work at it very hard, why, you'd find out he'd feel much better, and then used any longer than that would go into a confusion. Okay?

Male voice: But how would you process stable data?

Well, one of the ways of processing stable data is „*Give me a datum of comparable magnitude.*“ This permits a person to add to his stable data. And that is given on this basis: a datum of comparable magnitude to. „*Can you tell me a datum of comparable magnitude to...*“ whatever it is -- the stable datum. „*Horses sleep in beds: Give me a datum of comparable magnitude.*“

Now, that is used, ordinarily, on very high-power, central postulates. Space is an „*only one*“ thing. There is nothing comparable to space. A mass -- the whole subject of just mass -- is an only-one datum. There is no datum of comparable magnitude to the datum of mass, in the ordinary sense of the word. People just say there is no comparable magnitude. This makes those fixed data. Now, what that fixed datum is curing is something else, but it is curing something.

Now, if you ask a person for a datum of incomparable magnitude, he obtains then, eventually, data of comparable magnitude. But it permits him to work out along the line and substitute better data for aberrative data.

„*'Women are all crazy.' Now can you give me a datum of comparable magnitude to that?*“ „*Give me a datum of comparable magnitude to women.*“

Fellow says, „*That's impossible!*“

„*Well, no. A datum of incomparable magnitude to a woman.*“

„*That's not possible. Oh, well, yes, yes, you could say something like this. You could say that my wife, who can't cook, is a datum of incomparable magnitude to my mother who was a good cook.*“

You see? And he'll start shifting around in this fashion. He'll run a substitution line, which is a logical line. He'll eventually wind everything up as being totally logical, and then everything gets totally illogical, which it is anyhow. You can knock out stable data by this substitutive process of data of incomparable magnitude. You can even process space, you know? You can say datum of incomparable magnitude to space. Person will wind up with one after a while. Quite fascinating. Okay?

Who else has got one of these?

Male voice: Two of them.

„*I looked at the eight dynamics in reverse order one day, and would these dynamics from eight to one also be the description of the first descending spiral?*“

Yes. Very definitely.

„*Is a thetan in successively lower tone in successively higher dynamics? If he goes downtone, does he go up in dynamics?*“

Well, yes, you could say so. It would be the degree of agreement. Each one of these dynamics is a greater agreement than the one preceding it. So that as you go down-scale, you actually are getting into greater and greater agreement with more and more inhibitions, more and more identities, more and more things in general.

Quite amusing. An individual has the idea of beings, and then has the idea of being something. He has the idea of being alive, and then he gets alive as a great many things. And this great many things, he eventually boils down to something like the eight dynamics, you see? Then it goes below his ability to subdivide this, and it all looks like a confusion again. Nearly everybody seems to have decided on these eight dynamics, one way or the other, because you start boiling down confusions and they come up with the eight dynamics.

Now don't think, then, that the eight dynamics are actual or that they exist further than the idea of classification or association. These identities are, of course, but the identities exist because the consideration is that they exist and that a person is or is not part of them.

So as a person joins, let us say, one of the dynamics and feels he can work there in that level, and then leaves it, denies that it exists or gets away from it, says it's no good and backs out, he actually has run agreement-disagreement. And if you have an individual agree with something and then invalidate him, and then agree with something and then you invalidate him, and you agree with him and invalidate him, of course, he keeps going downscale.

This individual agrees that there are spirits. Well, there are spirits. That's obvious. He's agreed to it. Well, this is the truth; it certainly can't hurt him any. And one fine day somebody comes along, however, and proves to him conclusively -- like, oh, I don't know, some fellow who occupies a chair in the University of California at Berkeley that does nothing but prove the nonexistence of extrasensory perception, spirits and anything else, see? He works on it heavily. Well, this fellow has agreed there is a seventh dynamic. We don't care when or where on the track; he's agreed there is. Now somebody else comes along and invalidates him, see?

For instance, how would you feel if somebody said to you, „*Now, there's a table here? You agree there's a table here?*“ And then somebody tells you forcefully, „*There is no table here,*“ and proves it to you. See? Actually, merely the sequence of invalidation is the sequence of getting stuck in lower and lower dynamics.

The dynamics themselves make a workable set of teams for a game. But now as one joins them and then is driven out of them, he will go right on down Tone Scale, and there'll be nothing there but bottom all the way south.

Interesting fact, however, that merely describing and detailing the eight dynamics bring the person back into the first agreement. And he gets the first agreement and things realign for him, and he then gets into better shape.

If a person couldn't understand these at all, he's on about the fifth or sixth inversion. In other words, he'd be completely psychotic. Okay?

This question: „*Could you again say something on the subject of terminals as you outlined in a previous lecture?*“

Well, the only thing I'll say about a terminal: If you can envision a terminal as a mass, you've got it. A terminal that is shedding or flowing in a single direction would be a

terminal with a communication line. You'd have the terminal-plus-line. And the existence of a mass also has the connotation of the existence of a space in which the mass can be located or situated. So that you actually can't discuss a terminal in a totally isolated fashion. We cannot say, „*Well, there are terminals, and then there's space, and then there's partides,*“ you know?

If there are particles, then there probably must have been a terminal. And if there is a terminal, then there's space in which the terminal can be situated. But when we say terminal, we mean something which has the capability of communication. That is the connotation of terminal over and above mass. Otherwise, you might as well say „*fence post*“ rather than „*terminal,*“ you see? A fence post is a fence post is a terminal is a fence post is a terminal. No, this doesn't work. Because a fence post doesn't really have the potentiality of communication. That requires some liveness.

Now, you get up into your first doubtful band, you'd say, „*Well, a fence post is not a terminal.*“ Now, a man obviously is a terminal. He can flow out and receive; he has a potentiality of communication. Now, let's take a tree. Is a tree a terminal or isn't it? Does the tree have the potentiality of flowing out or in? You get into a nearly philosophic argument. You say, „*Is the tree alive or isn't it alive?*“ And this would be answered by „*Does it have the potentiality of communication or doesn't it?*“ And if you decided yes, then you'd have a terminal; if you decided no, then you wouldn't have a terminal.

A terminal always has the connotation of two things: communication and mass. There are no terminals without mass, the way we use the word. Now, in view of the fact that this is solely a matter of definition and almost entirely in the area of Scientology, you would find terminal meaning other things in other places.

For instance, electrical gear uses properly the word „*electrode*“ for something there which can receive or emanate. But here is a terminal which is used in what we call a mechanical communication, see? And we would have to call that, to ourselves, „*terminal*“ -- „*mechanical terminal.*“ It looks very like something alive -- a little electrode that is flowing out and receiving, and so on. It has mass. It evidently has some meaning. It has a situation there. It's doing something; it's outflowing, inflowing, and so forth. We could say, „*Well, that's a terminal. That's all right.*“

Funny part of it is, many other things are called terminals which don't have that. Actually, I've seen a hole with a bolt through the side of it called a terminal, and so on. So we just give this this specialized use. We mean a mass with a potentiality of communication.

Now let's take condition. Condition. This could be the significance attached to a terminal, but the terminal does not have to be present for the condition to be recognized or discussed. In other words, we do not immediately and automatically have to have another person present to talk about that person. That person is a terminal of one kind or another, for one purpose or another; and then we can talk about that person without that person being present.

Well, therefore, we could enunciate conditions about that person, and we could say, „*Oh, her dress is much, much too long*“ Now, this is not the terminal. The longness is a

condition. It's a modified dress, you might say. Well, the dress itself: that's not really a terminal, you see? That's again a condition. It's a terminal clothed, we hope. In such a way, we sneak down from the idea of long or short or hot or cold, down to an adjunct of the terminal such as a dress.

Now, a word coming out of a person could seem to be a kind of a terminal itself, you see? It has that potentiality. But actually, it isn't and doesn't process and is really just a particle. And that's the symptom. A person speaking is a terminal shedding, a terminal communicating. There's something moving out from the terminal. Something moves in toward terminals and out from terminals. So we wouldn't really process words if we wanted to get a fast job done. We'd process terminals. We wouldn't have problems about words. We wouldn't have problems about long dresses. Get the idea? We'd have problems about men. We'd have problems about women. See, we could have problems about Gerty, but not problems about Gerty's long dress. You got the idea? Why? Because we're removing from the subject just that many vias.

You might say that everything that man recognizes in this universe stems... By the way, „*recognize*“: I mean that he perceives directly with his eye, sense of touch, smell, and so forth; everything he perceives directly is an emanation from a terminal. That's the way he looks at it. See, although the man is alive and it's a thetan which created the liveness and prompted the speaking and so forth, the appearance is that a terminal called a man has spoken and symbols are emanating from this terminal, see? And so it appears, and it's totally an apparency that terminals are the authors of everything else.

Somebody tries to discuss God very long, he gets very anthropomorphic about it. He tries to build God in man's image and goes on because he feels uncomfortable not having a terminal there.

And that pretty well covers the subject of terminals and so on, beyond saying that if you wanted to do a fast job of processing... You know, you can do an effective job of processing particles. You can do an effective job of it. You can run repeater phrases and all sorts of things. But you actually will have a slow -- much slower time of it. If you just have a person mock up Mama and keep her from going away, you will eventually run out everything Mama ever shed on the person. Got the idea? You'd eventually get the whole works. Now, this is much simpler because it's lesser in number, so it's not as complicated.

So therefore, it's a very good thing to know about terminals. And sometime you'll be running along very glibly, and you're getting problems, problems. You say, „*Well, it's one of those things Ron said, you know: when he's got ahold of the main life problem, and he's just running forever.*“ And then you start to notice his havingness is sort of shooting to pieces. And that shouldn't be. And this isn't right in some fashion or other. And you suddenly wake up to the fact that you've been running a problem of comparable magnitude to his appetite. Huh! Whew! Rough deal. And that would be a rough deal to process. Problem of comparable magnitude to somebody's appetite? Oh, it might flatten after a year or two if his havingness stood up there long enough.

Now, you could go at it very smartly and still process appetite by being a little bit slippery here. You just say, „*Do you know anybody who used to eat?*“

„Oh, yes. Uncle George. He was the fattest man in seven counties, you know?“

And you say, *„All right. Give me a problem of comparable magnitude to Uncle George.“* Because you hazard that where his ideas of eating came from -- the person who had the weirdest ideas about eating. Remember, you're just guessing.

You say, *„Well, who was the skinniest person you knew?“*

„Oh, that was my mother.“

„Did she ever have any trouble with eating?“

„No, no, no.“

„Did you ever have any trouble with your mother?“

„No, no, no, no, no.“

„Did you have any problems with your mother, ever?“

„Oh, no, no -- a sweet girl,“ and so on.

Remember Mother, once upon a time, was a terminal or is a terminal. *„Problem of comparable magnitude to Mother.“* You'll take some of the tension off eating by processing George, simply because George was always used as the horrible example by Mother. But if you were really hitting it dead center, you'd be processing Mother, see? And you would find out all the phobias Mother laid in would run out simply by having him mock up Mother and keep her from going away, or hold her still or make her more solid, see? If the preclear could do this, you'd just have it made.

So that's the benefit of knowing this about terminals and just clarifying the whole situation. And the processing of terminals by keeping them from going away, and making it solid, and so forth, are the processes.

Okay. You have a preclear look around the room and find out what he could have and he starts picking out particles of air, you know he's going to be in for trouble, usually. He isn't capable of facing up to any terminal. And you'd better find out what terminal he can have in the room or in life or someplace or anyplace, and you'd find he'd get much better.

He can consider a chair a terminal or something, and it's a very sloppy way to go about it, see? It's not really capable of communication. Chairs aren't capable of communication. You think they are sometimes, when you bark your shins on them. You think *„It bit me.“* You've seen children spank boards that they tripped over, and so forth. But it's a mistake.

There's a rule about this: You process that terminal from which the preclear received the ideas which bother him. And you tell yourself at once that he could not have received very many ideas from a chair that would really have bothered him. You can process any personnel.

Now you say, *„Well, how about this life? What if we start going back into earlier lives?“* Well, you have Then and Now Solids. And after that is flat, you probably could pick out

each terminal that the person has ever been associated with in the last seventy-six trillion years, and hold it still and keep it from going away. You would run flat every foreign idea that he had ever acquired.

It's quite interesting to be able to even state a formula, by the way, which would do something like that. No matter how wild it sounds, and so on, to even state a formula by which a person could, with one simple action, run out every foreign or confused idea he had about anything, is quite remarkable. And that is merely stated by „*You would find the author of the idea and keep him from going away, hold him still, make him solid.*“ It doesn't matter; whatever your preclear could do. And that would best be done when Then and Now Solids was practically flat.

Okay, Alicia?

Female voice: Yes.

Something else?

Female voice: On that?

Yeah.

Female voice: Yes. The other problem is, can a thetan be a terminal as thetan without body?

Can a thetan without a body be a terminal? Well, he certainly is capable of making a terminal, but unless he has something to register in the same time-space continuum as the person who is seeking to communicate with him, he would not be a terminal.

Female voice: What do you mean by „*something to register*“?

Hm?

Female voice: What do you mean „*unless he has something to register*“?

Just that. Time-space continuum. You'll notice that conversation and communication travels across a period of time. There's a time span involved in every period of communication. And those things with which you communicate are in the same time span that you are in. Now, if he mocks up something, you mock up something, each one of you have something, then, in the same time-space continuum. You can then engage upon communication, but not otherwise.

Female voice: Okay.

Okay.

All right. Here we have one: „*Recommend a process for repairing havingness on self.*“

Sure. Trio. That's it. You can always run Can't Have on your body, too, you know? You know you never run Have on your body? You always run Can't Have on your body. You know that?

You all of a sudden burned your hand. You know, you go pshewww! Well, there's a dozen ways of processing it. Creative Processing: mock up some things. Of course, if

you're in really good shape you'd just say „*Unburn*,“ and that'd be that. But if you got to put some method to it, why, „*Mock up a burned hand and shove it into the hand*.“ „*Mock up a burned hand and shove it into the hand*.“ „*Mock up a burned hand...*“ This is one of the ways of doing it.

But there I call to your attention, you're running Havingness on the hand. That is a Remedy of Havingness. You're mocking up things and stuffing them in. That you're mocking up a burned hand answers up to the games condition. This was always a little bit of a mystery: Why was it that the acceptance level of the hand was a burned hand? No, the acceptance level of a thetan for that hand was a burned hand. He wouldn't really let the body have a hand. He'd let the body have a burned hand.

So if you did that -- which is a rather fast thing to do -- you could then turn around and find something that the hand couldn't have. „*Look around and find something the hand can't have*.“ „*Look around and find something the hand can't have*.“ You would be amazed, immediately after an injury, trying to find something that adequately fits this that you can select out all by itself, because it's just a „*can't have*“ just across the board, see? Everything answers this. The body has just been injured. You look around -- „*can't have*“! Brother! That fulfills everything.

Now, that inverts and goes down to a total have -- such a thing as jail. Just asked somebody for a gag one time. It's always -- this arrest mechanism is always very much present. „*Look around and find something a jail can't have*.“ See? You've got a present terminal and a terminal that isn't present, you see? Here's these two. You can run Objective Can't Have as long as one of the two things (either what he's looking at or the object) is present. In other words, the jail is present, why, he could imagine a bunch of things the jail couldn't have. You get the idea? If the body is present, he could actually even imagine some things the body couldn't have. But there, you're running a double-barrel process. Both terminals are present, see? „*Look around and find something the body can't have*.“

Jail, let's say, is amusing because this is a real struggle for a preclear -- to find something that a jail cannot have. Because a jail can have everything, including his wife and fortune and his body. And that's the one thing that just could have everything, you know? He eventually will find one thing, you see, that the jail cannot have. At that moment, he'll start to come out of it.

Similarly, a person can be injured so badly that when he starts to run what his hand can't have, he has a horrible struggle because his hand can have everything. The whole environment seems to be collapsing on his hand, you see? That's the lower-order manifestation. So that is a very good one.

Now, another thing you could do is simply run out the engram. It's normally what I do when I get hurt. Somebody else gets hurt, I audit them decently. If I get hurt, I normally pick up the engram by one corner and go yank, dust my fingers and say, „*What an intolerant fellow you are. Obviously you can't have an engram*.“ Well, that isn't true, you see? The body is so constructed that it cannot have this particular picture, no matter how much I want it!

Okay. I wouldn't do too much self-processing; I'd go find an auditor. But there are moments when you are in pain, your body is upset, you've got to make something squared away, you've got to measure up to some existing situation, and you can run something like Can't Have. But Trio, to tell you the truth, is the only stable self-process that I could absolutely guarantee across the boards that would never wind you up in something or other. The liability of self-processing is you're liable to do it when you're bad, and lay in a sort of an engram called self-processing, and then you go on dramatizing the engram called self-processing, you know?

Second question on this: „*What about a pc that has flattened an object in MEST Processing and still can't handle live terminals?*“

Well, we just took that up in the HGC. We just took that up in the HGC today. We had one -- a salesman, a Dale Carnegie special. When he took his first APA he was right across the top. He was in beautiful ARC with everything, you know? Dong, what wall? After he'd been processed for a while, his APA went right out through the bottom. But he actually told the Director of Processing that this time he felt he was being honest about it; he hated everybody. If you can imagine somebody who was nothing but selling ever since he was about twenty-one, you see, and just nothing but sell, and a compulsive, obsessive „*got to agree*.“ What's he doing all that time? He's keeping people from going away while he gives the sales pitch, see? That's a games condition.

Well now, that's a similar case. You say he can't handle live terminals. Yes. Now, somebody could possibly appear to flatten objects and spaces. He could appear to flatten it. I can guarantee it was not real for him in the first place if he couldn't handle live terminals, see?

All right. So he could appear to flatten this, and then all of a sudden you'd strike live terminals, and you'd say, „*What happened here? This thing just doesn't add up*.“ Because these things really bite!

Well, the process recommended for this preclear was a very simple one: „*Go out in the park and find people and make them more solid. Spot people; make them more solid. Spot a person; make him more solid*.“

Now, obviously he can't hold those people from going away yet. But we cut in someplace or another, and hope that it works. See, we couldn't get this step of keeping it from going away. We'll just make it more solid, right here and now. We can't have those people held still. See, they're still walking around. So we just shoot the moon and hope he can do this, and then ride some gradient scale that permits him to make something solid in the environment, until he finally clicks over to people one way or the other. You just have to play this thing back and forth very carefully.

Being stuck on people is below being stuck on walls, if they're really totally stuck.

Okay. „*What is procedure for opening a case?*“

You know it very well.

Number four: „*When one communicates with people he uses ideas and mock-ups. As I understood it, talking and words are not the means of actual interchange of ideas*.“

Oh, this is the whole subject of communication you're asking for there. We have to agree upon the meanings of words, which gives us an apparency thereafter of communicating with words. I'll just let you run into that some day. I mean, that's not anything to explain. That just kind of is, you know?

Male voice: All right.

Okay? That it?

Male voice: Yes.

All right.

Male voice: Can I have something on this opening-a-case business?

No. You've been spending six weeks on that.

Male voice: All right.

A case opens the moment it is in communication with the auditor. And if you've got it in total communication with the auditor and the environment, the guy would be totally Clear. So you see that on opening a case -- you're rather in a fundamental fundamental there -- all you have to do is make the pc aware that a communication has been addressed in his direction, and you've opened his case. I mean, it's as elementary as that. I just don't want to discuss that particularly right now.

Male voice: I was thinking of some of the postulations, that a fellow might have „*change*,“ or something, on top of his case -- „*I can't change*,“ or something like that.

No. You use Scientology on him and try to keep it from working, you'll have a picnic today. You remember what I told you about postulates? You just don't remember what I told you about postulates. I said: You've got the whole room. You agree that there's a room. You agree that it's totally solid. You're totally fixed on the idea that it's solid. You're agreed with everybody else who is totally fixed it's solid. And now you make a postulate, and you say, „*All right, be unsolid.*“ You see? Then you say, „*Well, I'm weak. I can't make a postulate which unsolidifies the entire room just like that, see? And it doesn't disappear for everybody; it just disappears for me a little bit, you know? That means I've failed.*“

Why is it a failure? It's a failure simply because it is after the fact and during the fact of a tremendous postulate which you're doing all the time: „*There's a great big room.*“ And you're saying, „*Big room, big people, I'm in agreement,*“ and you're saying this very forcefully. And then in this little tiny voice you say, „*All right, disappear.*“

Okay.

Male voice: Okay.

You bet.

„*If a child hurts self, what to do at once and later?*“

It all depends on what you mean by „*at once.*“ But if you mean really at once, that's shut up. Child hurts himself, at once you shut up. Now, try not to say, „*Shush, shush, shush*“ and „*Stop it*“ and „*Keep quiet*“ to everybody around you. Just shut up. If the

other people are talking, too, why, you sometimes can shove them away, but don't engage in much persiflage. And you'll find a child doesn't get stuck all over the track. That's the first thing you do. And afterwards, why, best thing to do is try to engage in a little mimicry with him, I found lately. Nonconversational mimicry. Child looks at you and says... And finally you look at him and you say... He gets the idea, and he'll come right out of it.

I've busted a kid out of an engram with about fifteen seconds of mimicry -- broken him right out of an immediate injury; I mean, a serious injury. And he came right out of it. Bang! About fifteen seconds. He did something quite by accident, and I did something, and he looked at me, and he did something, and I did something, and he did something, and I did something. Notice I was making him cause. What he did, he did by accident.

That's a trick I learned from Commander Thompson, by the way. He used to train cats. It's almost impossible to train a house cat - - I mean really train a house cat into doing all sorts of dog tricks and so forth. He used to be able to do that, and he taught me how to train cats when I was a kid. He would wait for the cat to do something and then he'd reward it. And if you don't think that requires patience! You're going to wait for this cat to do something that's going to be totally accidental, and then you're going to approve of it. Wow! Oh, you can just burn up hours and hours and hours trying to train a cat.

Well, be perfectly prepared to burn up a lot of time doing this with a kid. You wait for a kid who is injured to make a move. See? Wave his hand a little bit. Wave your hand a little bit. Something like this. And so that might look to you as a very slow route on patching up children.

The processes which work on children are as follows: Mimicry, Mimicry, Mimicry, Mimicry, Mimicry, and then Locational, and candy.

Yes, Margie.

Female voice: One of the best ones I've found is Jan's „*Pass the Object Back and Forth*.“

Oh, yeah. That's terrific. That's terrific. That's very good. You're talking here about an injured child, however.

Female voice: Oh, I'm sorry.

Yes.

Male voice: This was brought to my attention the second time with Marilyn's Kay. The first time, she was downstairs running in and out of the banisters here a couple of weeks ago, and somebody stepped on her foot. And she yowled and went over to her mother, of course. And Marilyn just looked at her. And I thought this was rather strange, because I'm used to, when a kid is hurt, scoop her up, and .

Hm.

Male voice: ...give her something. All right. I let that go. Marilyn, wonderful person and so forth, so hardhearted, just sat there and looked at her kid! So, I forgot about it.

Yesterday, I was here in front. Kay stepped down and ran her leg up against the rough concrete step here and bruised herself, badly. And Marilyn just stood there looking at her, again! And I said, „*Well, Marilyn knows what she's doing*” So I asked her this morning, and she said, „*You got to get her attention. You got to get the child's attention and get her settled down a bit.*“

Right.

Male voice: Is that right?

Yeah, pretty much, pretty much. The less commotion you make around an injured child, the better the child is off. Processing is always secondary to emergency treatment of injury; by which I mean, if an artery is pumping, don't stand there trying to run 8- C. Get a tourniquet. You know? And many times you'll find an aspirin is quite workable. Some other auditor is running the preclear someday or another and the aspirin runs out so quickly and easily that it's just a little head twinge or something like that. He didn't notice it, but that doesn't mean it didn't get run out someday.

Don't make an emergency situation always an auditing situation, because they're sometimes quite hectic and sometimes quite upsetting. The time to hand out auditing is when the body manually has been hung back together again. You get the idea? You can hang somebody back together again.

Now, it's perfectly true that you could obviously run out a broken leg if you had enough time and enough preclear in an auditing room and so forth, but very seldom do preclears break legs in auditing rooms. They generally break them on streets, amongst traffic, so forth. And that's no time to be auditing a broken leg; that's the time to be looking around for an ambulance.

You people, by the way, by golly, should know emergency first aid. Could I recommend this subject to you very, very heavily? Emergency first aid. If a guy's head is falling off, the obvious thing to do is to push it back on again, not to go into communication with him. You've got two hands and his head is falling off, and all you have to do is take ahold of his head and put it back on.

Yes, you changed position of the head. Yes, you did an alteration. Yes, this is very bad on the psyche. But not near as bad as not having a head.

You really should learn tourniquets, application of, and the minor remedies. If you don't know these things you ought to look it over. There are many good books on this subject, by the way. The best books on these subjects are the Boy Scout books. Much better than the naval training manuals or some of the others. Boy Scouts take it seriously and the navy is just trying to -- I don't know what the navy is trying to do with first aid. I often wondered.

All right. Here's a question, here, that says, „*We have unconditional freedom of choice as a stable datum. Please explain why the one thing a thetan can't do is die.*“

Oh, a thetan can die if he postulates he can die. And then he simply comes back to life. I'll tell you why I know this as a fact. That's a better answer here. „*Please explain why the one thing a thetan can't do is die.*“

I'll tell you why I know this. I'm not going to tell you why this is, because it's not answerable, but I can tell you why I know this. Because no process addressing death has any great use. Processes which address death, which seek to do something about death as a condition, fail, of course, to some degree, because death is merely a condition.

But the condition of death is obviously what is wrong with a person, isn't it? A person dies. He is afraid of illness because he dies, because it hurts and he dies and he kicks the bucket, and that means no more body and loss of body, and so forth. So death is very bad. That's the final conclusion. So death is very, very bad.

Why doesn't it process? It's so artificial a condition that it will not process. You see, almost any other condition processes, but death doesn't process. A thetan knows he's a swindler from one end to the other. And you process death very long, or try to process it and try to get some concept of it and so forth, and he'll finally tell you he's an awful cheat on the subject.

Death is kind of a funny joke if you want to know the truth of the matter. But it's awfully good to be able to die and have everybody have an agreement on the fact that when one dies, one is dead. I know more preclears that would have been picked up in this life and hanged or electrocuted.

As a matter of fact, my grandchild -- I was playing the inquiring reporter. I was demonstrating a spy dictaphone -- a German spy dictaphone. Little Debbie was lying there perfectly happy and everything was going along all right. And so I said, „*All right, who did you murder?*“ And Debbie whimpered. I wasn't talking to Debbie. My attention was suddenly directed toward her, and she whimpered much harder. And I said, „*All right, who did the murder?*“ And she broke out into screams and cried and got very upset. Suddenly occurred to me, everybody thinks he is guilty of murder.

A person who dies is guilty of murder. Everybody is certain that there is a reality to death because everybody acts the part out so well. But death is a third-dynamic fact, and is very demonstrably something that happens to other people and never happens to you.

Now, in view of the fact that there's no such thing as time except as it's postulated, how could there be any such thing as immortality? -- which answers the other side of the question. One thing a thetan can't do is die. It is so obvious. A thetan isn't going down a time track. See? That's one of the reasons he can't die. Things can die, or the pretense or action of death, the dramatics of death or something like this can occur; those appearances can occur. One can have all sorts of engrams related to death, and so forth, but the actual fact of death is not processable. That's how I know this. That's the only way I know this -- besides having died a few times.

Well, all right. Now, here's somebody who says he's confused over the subzero Tone Scale -- fixity of position there. Subzero Tone Scale would be the below-apathy scale.

One never gets really fixed on a scale. He gets submerged on a scale. His alivenesses are from where he is, below him. In other words, the thing shuts out like you draw a curtain. It doesn't disappear, he just doesn't react at those levels anymore. If a person

is in totally good shape, he would be at all positions on a Tone Scale. See, he could be at all positions on the Tone Scale. All right, now, it cuts out from the top down. And it's just like drawing a curtain down the scale. So that we would draw the curtain and he would be there, and then he could only recognize this. It's just the awareness.

It's not a question of fixation. It's a question of how much of the scale is he aware of? Of how much of the scale is he aware? That is the exact statement. It's a question of awareness, and so on. And he is evidently aware from where he is and below. He's most aware in his immediate level. And you really raise a curtain of awareness on him rather than change or unfix a position. And it's easier to process people if you look at it that way. You're just making him aware of the fact that other emotions exist.

The startlement with which some preclear will look at you at some time or another and say, „*You know that boredom and apathy are different?*“ Right up to that moment, you see, they certainly knew what people felt like when they were bored. And then one fine day, why, you broaden their awareness on the lower end of the emotional band, and they suddenly recognize that boredom is quite different than apathy; anger is different than resentment -- they get these differences. In other words, they become more aware.

Another thing that happens on the Tone Scale is quite funny. It sometimes acts kind of like somebody is squashed, in that the more you process them, why, the more stuff seems to come off of the spot where they are processed. In other words, what you're merely watching, though, is merely an increased awareness of the material of the scale, and it comes off in proper order. That is, by the way, explaining this: how it comes off in proper order. All you do, of course, is start raising a curtain of awareness on an individual, and naturally he cognites each time as he gets aware of a higher level. He isn't going anyplace. The Tone Scale is simply getting higher. And he is simply getting more and more over the Tone Scale.

A person who is only capable of mystery is still capable of mystery, but it takes a good guy to be capable of mystery and, up the line, symbols. And that guy's pretty good. He's capable of mystery and symbols, and he can do mysterious symbols, you know? He's got a good command of mystery.

A priest could be terribly bad off and still have a very good concept of mystery, don't you see? But it'd be all he had a concept of. Now we'd have to bring him up here, and he'd eventually get an awareness of sex and eating and symbols -- real symbols. And he'd get an awareness of effort and that'd tire him out the first time he looked at it. And eventually, he'd come on up the line; he'd have awareness of emotions.

A torturer, or something like that, is not somebody to worry about particularly. He really isn't cruel; he just is not aware of any other sensation than the sensation he himself is aware of. He's sometimes just trying to prove that other sensations exist or don't exist. And it's quite interesting. But he is not aware of the amount of pain he's causing.

And if you want to civilize a child, all you'll have to do is make the child aware that something else hurts too. Now you've put him up toward a third-dynamic awareness

of pain. Actually, there's no reason why he couldn't feel all the pain of every being in the universe, simultaneously, at one fell swoop. And yet you say it'd be a lot of pain. I don't know. „*Be a lot of pain.*“ What are you doing that you would consider that a lot of pain? You got the -- got the reverse look? Awareness -- awareness of dynamics and scale and so on.

It's interesting, by the way. You might someday plot the Tone Scale alongside of the dynamics -- both of them into the same plot. Quite amusing.

Well, I've given you quite a bit here. Is there any absolutely sizzling question which has occurred to anyone, which will help you in auditing procedure, as a last fell swoop here? Something that will help you in your own auditing procedure. Any question concerning auditing procedure? Yeah?

Male voice: What happens when you override the guy 's willingness to be processed?

There's two ways of looking at this. If a fellow is unwilling to be processed, he's unwilling to be communicated with, he's unwilling to exercise his wits, you see; he's unwilling to expend any energy, he's unwilling to sense something that you sense. Curious state of beingness: It's one of the more fantastic states for an individual to be in.

It's quite one thing for a professional auditor to refuse to be processed by some other professional auditor. See? He'd rather have another one process him, or something like that. That's choices of auditors. When it gets down to a basis of this individual is unwilling to experience something he doesn't know much about and has heard only good repute of... It doesn't look violent; it doesn't look like it's going to do anything bad to him; he has not been given any misgivings or something -- he's still unwilling to be processed: he isn't unwilling to be processed. See, he isn't unwilling to be processed. His bank, however, is merely in restimulation. And these people who are unwilling to be processed are madder than hatters.

I've had considerable experience with this, as you can imagine. And you show me somebody who is totally unwilling to be processed in any fashion whatsoever, and man, that person is a real spinner. And one of the things that's startling about some psychiatrists is, wow! boy! how did you ever get a preclear in that condition, you know? It's quite amazing. Unwillingness to be processed could be said to be nonexistent. See?

Now, of course, you could pep up a whole slew of people, and they'd all get horrified at the idea of being something that had been otherwise defined for them. See, you could start a panic on this subject, and you'd experience, then, the reaction of an entire group that would just refuse to have anything to do with it; it was against their principles.... You get the idea of the exaggeration. But individually they are unwilling to have something happen that they don't know anything about, really, but think they know all about, see? And they're unwilling to have a falsity occur. But this falsity could never occur. But then, how able are these people to differentiate? Pretty darn wild; pretty darn wild.

It's almost a war condition, whereby all the Germans are taught that the English and Americans are all bad and eat babies, and all the English and Americans are taught

that the Germans are all bad and eat babies. And then after a war like this, why, a German, an Englishman and an American get together, and they get drunk and they wonder what the hell that fight was all about. Have to be based on a total lie in order for this condition to really have anything.

But I'm talking about the fellow who doesn't know anything about it, hasn't been evaluated for him, he hasn't been charged up on this basis at all, and then he is unwilling -- no boo-boos, nothing -- to be processed. I can tell you the guy's madder than a hatter. I've looked them over.

It isn't because they've resisted my processing. It isn't because of this and that. I mean, I've just looked them over. I got curious about this. I used to think, well, people had a power of choice to be processed or not to be processed, and they could decide this way. And I found out these people were uniformly not in the condition to decide. Somebody'd say, *„I wouldn't want any of that,“* and my ear would go up about an inch, you know? And I'd take a look at this person, you know? Not because I felt any resentment toward him, but I wanted to know what kind of a beast this was, you know? It was a beast. And it's quite interesting.

So, if you enter into communication with him and successfully get into communication with him, even on the subject of his being unwilling to be processed, you're auditing him the whole way. Get that? It's a horrible thing, he'll realize eventually, that he's being processed all the time that you're talking to him. So don't ever audit him. Just take that as the beginning of the session.

And just communicate. See, communicate. *„Well, could you explain to me why you're unwilling to be processed?“* is a good auditing question. *„Who is it that you don't want to have process you?“* That's a good complicated question. (See, *„Look at me. Who am I?“*)

All kinds of processes. But actually, they're in a screaming protest. And when I really got wise to this, and really snapped nicely and had this thing entirely bracketed, was I heard one of these fellows who was unwilling to be processed, one day, discuss at once the medical profession, psychiatric profession, school teaching and any other communication activity. And he was agin' every one of them and hadn't realized his reaction was the same on every front of aid, assistance, education, help, love, kindness, mercy, sweetness or life. And his reaction was totally different. But because you ask him about Scientology, then you think he's against Scientology, see, and he doesn't want to be processed by Scientology. No, he's *„against.“* He doesn't want to be. See? It's not the process. It's just he doesn't want to be.

Okay. Well, you've had it.

Female voice: Can I ask you one more question on admiration...

Yeah.

Female voice: . of our president? Is he reaping the benefit now or the reaction of the admiration with all these reactionary forces starting on him all the way...?

Well, I hope so. I hope so.

Female voice: And you know there have been meetings all over the country where they were taking up these problems of what Eisenhower has done to the Republican Party. There were three meetings last weekend in which they denounced him for his action as a Republican.

Well, Eisenhower was the boy who won the election, and the American people then woke up afterwards and found out what they'd done. They're just getting an idea of what they've done. It's quite interesting. A reaction of admiration, you say. Yeah, that can be pretty violent.

A fellow is going along minding his own business. All of a sudden he gets admired from every quarter, and he doesn't like this very much, but he finally gets accustomed to this operating climate. And then it shifts. And that is how people get in the soup. That is how they fall from high places. They have to have climbed before they can fall. They have to have been admired a great deal before they miss it.

It's a very funny thing, but to have a man get the shakes because he isn't taking dope, it's necessary for him to have been heavily doped. In other words, the act of admiration is absolutely necessary to a reaction against negation. You just go along through life knowing everybody hates you anyway, you get along fine.

Well, that's the way Eisenhower felt about it, undoubtedly, before he was elected; something like that. He knew the troops resented you and he knew that his officers were trying to climb over his head. And he knew how to keep things in place. And nobody had gone wild over Eisenhower. As a matter of fact they kind of thought he was an old crab. Then all of a sudden they cut loose and wham! Quite amusing, quite amusing. And then he began to think of himself as a great savior, and he was going to make history.

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

Maybe somebody will get this squared around. But he evidently is taking orders from American oil interests, the way it looks.

You know, I did a funny crystal-ball read on that whole thing. I have a witness: Suzie. I've been talking about the Middle East and what was happening in the Middle East for about three years as one of the more interesting neglected phenomena. It was totally neglected. And then a short time -- several months ago -- when we were in England, I took a look at what was boiling up a little bit and I said, *„England and France are not going to be friends of ours. Isn't that unfortunate? We're going to have a harder time in Europe now. Because I just know, looking at the leaves in the teacup, that Eisenhower is about to swing the crookedest two-way switch that anybody ever swung. And we're going to wind up, if not in actual, in factual possession of the Suez Canal. I'm just sure that these are the cards that are being played, and I'm just sure that this is the dicker that's happening“* And Suzie said, *„Zuuhh.“*

And I said, *„That's going to make us real popular. The HASI is going to have a rough time of it if this kind of thing happens. We better de-Americanize the joint to a marked degree,“* and started acting to a large degree on that basis. It's true. It evidently is swinging right on around the line.

There were no indications at that time. It was really just reading the teacup. Just straight crystal-ball gazing.

Female voice: I got that too, and the oil industries are the ones that are doing it here.

Yeah. Well, it'd be very nice if the major oil companies of the world owned the Suez Canal. I mean, that'd be nice. But I don't think that we've got brains enough to manage the doggone thing. My God, we can't even manage Clinton.

I think the American nation -- the American people, and so on -- are terrifically sound, terrifically sound. You put most Americans on their own under anything, and they'll generally do the decent thing. But they start clawing each other up politically, in political circles, and boy, they certainly -- we certainly -- do get the division of the government and the people. And this government seems to be acting further and further from the will of the people. That's the only thing that keeps puzzling me, but it doesn't puzzle anybody abroad. They know what an American is; they watch the policies of this government. And that started to worry me because I hated to be identified with this type of policy -- grasping, upset or stupid, reactionary.

As a matter of fact, the biggest asset which Russia has is our Department of Immigration. And the biggest asset we have, fortunately, in Russia, is probably theirs. And yet the Russian people will shake you by the hand. The farmers we've sent over there, the farmers that they've sent over to us, will just get along fine. And everything goes along fine; there's nothing wrong, and so on. And then these darned-fool... These guys they dig out of... I don't know where they dig them out of; it's old foundations, or something, of burned houses, and they put them in these posts.

And all of Europe seems to have, straight across the boards, total information on only one thing: the conduct of the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the United States government. And I don't care whether it's some little mountain town in Spain or in the middle of France, you get it both barrels. And they'll tell you about it. *„Oh, I know America. America is supposed to be a free country. Uh-huh! Ellis Island, huh? That's where they send you when you go over there. That's right. The FBI will take your fingerprints and the Immigration people take your fingerprints. We only fingerprint criminals. I suppose we're all criminals.“*

These people are hot on the subject. I mean, they're flaming hot on the subject. It upsets them. It upsets their dignity. Because the American has, evidently, enough tolerance not to feel that his dignity is completely overrun if he rubs elbows with a few stinking officials or something. But a foreigner is very, very touchy on this subject. Somebody take his fingerprints? It's an assault on his dignity. They have all the tradition of freedom, and we have all the laws about it. Big difference.

Now, I never went anyplace in Europe that I didn't have Immigration-Naturalization - there's been somebody in that town who had gone over to America and had been held on Ellis Island and hadn't been passed through, and a bunch of trouble had been made for him. And he'd been passed: When he tried to get out of the country, he had to go down to Internal Revenue and declare and pay tax that he didn't owe and et cetera, et cetera. And boy, were they sour.

And Eisenhower says, „*Well, we got to spend 480 thousand billion, skillion, trillion dollars. Let's make it a nice, big comfortable sum, and we'll buy all this goodwill.*“

Why the hell doesn't he just take a stroke of his executive pen and wipe Immigration and Naturalization Service out of existence? And he would at once buy eighty skillion dollars worth of goodwill. Just like that -- bang!

This is the land of the free. They got a statue up there that says „*Give us your lame, halt and blind.*“ They better take down their advertising posters or make it real. See? They've got to do one or the other, and that's the trouble we're in, in Europe.

Now, the great American nation today, if it suddenly gets involved down here -- Eisenhower and a half a dozen big oil companies, see, and these don't even represent the spirit of industry in this country but just a bunch of promoters, grabbers -- they suddenly get in cahoots and throw a big swindle whereby the Suez Canal passes into American control; boy, they wouldn't be able to hire enough J. Walter Thompsons, and Baten, Barton, Durstein and Osbornes, and other advertising agencies, or appropriate enough money abroad, to make our name smell sweet.

And yet guys like me or like you go abroad and we run into this head-on, see? You get worried after a while. You say, „*Gee whiz. If somebody is giving us a black reputation like this, they shouldn't be permitted to do so.*“ Yet they do.

You can't tell anybody abroad that you're not totally responsible. They make you totally responsible, see? „*What is the idea, having an Immigration and Naturalization Service which fingerprinted my brother, and did this to him and did that to him, and so forth? What is the idea? You're against everybody.*“

America does have, fortunately, one program abroad today: that's us.

Male voice: Nobody refuses to take your money over there, though, do they?

Hell, that's usually what the government tells you down here. But as a matter of fact, they have. They have. It's an interesting fact about buying your way around. People don't respect you if you're too easy on them. „*All Americans are rich.*“ That's still abroad, and so forth. Makes it tough on us across the boards.

Either America joins the rest of the world as a government, you know, and is responsible for as much as its arms could control, or it doesn't. And it's on this big maybe, see? We're either going to do something... or „*Well, we'll do that tomorrow*“; „*Now, let's do... no, no, no, no.*“ You know? „*Let's have this big aid program, and let's run all these guns into Hungary, or let's make all these people free. Let's put up a bunch of radio stations, and let's do this and let's do that and let's do something else.*“ „*Oh well, we're tired today and we won't back it up,*“ see?

People get unsettled and they get upset. And someday they'll get nervous enough about us, I suppose, to declare a war. But American philosophy and American machinery, American methodology, and money: these things are totally respected. Boy, you're liable to have somebody come halfway across a Spanish town to locate you, to find out how to turn on his refrigerator. And you say, „*Well, I'm not a refrigerator man.*“

And they say, „*Well, you're an American.*“

I've seen a British lorry sitting alongside of a road waiting for an American despatch rider to come along, with a British master mechanic standing right there. You know? I mean, the army waiting for an American to come along. They'd run out of ideas. Maybe some damn Yank, see, would know what it was.

But we all live in this world today, and it's an awful doggone small world. It's getting smaller and smaller. One of these days we're going to have to learn how to live with everybody. We're going to have to find out how to have a government down here, though, before we manage that, because everybody identifies the people with the government, and that makes it.

Male voice: The government and the movies.

Yeah, the movies. I've gotten in more fights! I finally admit just in a sort of an apathetic way, „*Well yes, yes. When you get west of Washington, DC, out into West Virginia, yes, you have to carry guns. Yeah! I tie mine low, myself, but...*“ I've actually gotten into fights when I've said, „*No, you don't carry guns in the United States.*“

„*How do you live with all those shells flying around?*“ somebody said to me one day.

And I thought, „*Boy, that's a good gag*“ and I started to laugh. And I looked at the guy, and I found out he was totally serious. I said, „*Well, I usually drive an armor-plated, bullet-proof limousine.*“

„*Oh,*“ he says, „*you do. Good.*“

Yeah. Well, that's way off the subject of Scientology. It's a subject, however, which we shouldn't have anything to do with, so we shouldn't have to be worrying about it. Somebody else ought to be worrying about this one. We got a job to do. We're doing our job.

But since October 15th, Suzie has been sitting in an office in this organization doing nothing but getting up the government reports of Dianetics and Scientology. She's done nothing but that. And there's the waste of a valuable personnel if I ever saw one. She's gotten to a point where she can confront them, though, and that was pretty high. She confronts them right out the door now. Somebody comes around and bothers her illegally about, I don't know, the „*air tax*“ or something like that, why, they'd better have their figures right and their forms right, because she knows more about it than they do. Yeah.

But this organization is having a rough time right now because of that, see? We live with that in the organization all the time. We're having a rough time, not with the government, but we have so many other things to do on an executive level that it makes it very hard for us to get all of our job done. And it's just enough weight that it upsets us, and we resent it. We feel it isn't our job. So that makes us upset about government. And then we have trouble with British personnel, let us say, or have trouble with somebody over in Europe, or something; and they try to knock apart some little set-up that we've got, of some kind or another, because „*What the Americans have done now,*“ see?

And we say, „*Look, for heaven's sakes, what's this got to do with Scientology? What's this got to do with the HASI?*“

And they say, „*Well, you're guilty of everything the American government is guilty of.*“

Finally we begin to think that this government down here had better be guilty of less.

We'll wind up with the Suez. I'm sure of it. Boy, but it isn't worth what we'll pay for it.

Hey, did you read this latest one? They're going to dump all the atomic waste at the poles.

Male voice: Oh, that's great.

Yeah, I think this is a terrific idea. I like that. Very good. They're going to dump all the atomic waste at the poles. The West Germans are trying to get everybody to dump the atomic-waste products at the poles. If the South Pole ice were to melt totally, you would raise the elevation of the seas of the world thirty-six feet, and that is a bit higher than the boulevards of New York City or Washington, DC. And if they only melted it half off, why, that would only raise it something on the order of eighteen feet, you see, which would simply flood all the basements of all the seacoasts of the world. Make it impossible for you to drive automobiles in any of these cities, or something like that. Wouldn't destroy them utterly, you know?

Male voice: Wouldn't it make a great city like Venice?

That's a good idea. Venice is a nice town. I know a girl down there. Well anyhow, their gondolas are real nice. Hey, maybe that isn't a bad idea. Let's get behind that. Venice is very funny, you know -- very funny town. It got built up in the water just because nobody could swim that far.

Well, that's way off the subject. Well, we've answered all the questions in the book and you're very, very smart people now. And you don't need to know anything more, and you're all set and raring to go. And tomorrow you'll think of all the questions you should have asked.

Okay?

Audience: All right.

Good night.

Thank you.

[End of Lecture]