

ILLUSION OR TRUTH

Transcripts and Glossary

L. RON HUBBARD

The 18th Advanced Clinical Course Lectures # Washington DC, July -August 1957

Part 2



Golden Era Productions®

A HUBBARD® PUBLICATION

INTRODUCTION

In these twenty-two lectures, given to the students of the 18th Advanced Clinical Course, L. Ron Hubbard covers subjects intimate to everyday living-phenomena one encounters continuously as part of life's routine. Some of them so common that they seem "just part of the scene," utterly "normal," rarely given a second thought. Subjects like sleep. Laughter. Time and "the past." Mental image pictures and thinking itself. What *are* these things, really? Are they as "normal" as they appear? Or are they illusions, part of an intricate mechanism trapping man in this universe, stuck in a body, caught up in a mind, quite blind to the truth and the reality of his tremendous native ability?

Ron throws the light of understanding on these topics and many more, shattering eons-old illusions with a straight, hard, clear look at the truths of existence. This is data about life and living, data every thetan must have to break through to the truth and operate free from the lies of the past.

The 18th ACC took place in Washington, DC, beginning on the 8th of July and ending on the 16th of August, 1957, with sixty-eight students privileged to attend. Now, for the first time, these lectures are broadly available in their entirety.

You've been running blind too long. L. Ron Hubbard has offered you the way to *see* again. Welcome to *Illusion or Truth*—the lectures of the 18th Advanced Clinical Course.

-The Editors

CONTENTS

<i>29 July 1957</i>	
The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes	
1	
<i>30 July 1957</i>	
Death	1
5	
<i>31 July 1957</i>	
Surprise—The Anatomy of Sleep	3
1	
<i>1 August 1957</i>	
Thinnies	4
5	
<i>2 August 1957</i>	
Ability—Laughter	5
9	
<i>5 August 1957</i>	
Factors Behind the Handling of IQ	7
3	
<i>6 August 1957</i>	
The Scale of Withhold	8
7	
<i>7 August 1957</i>	
CCH	101
<i>8 August 1957</i>	
Confronting	11
5	
<i>9 August 1957</i>	
Instructing a Course	12

9

16 August 1957

The Future of Scientology

14

5

About the Author 155

Glossary 159

Bibliography 201

Address List of Scientology Churches and Organizations 227

STUDENT USE OF TRANSCRIPTS

The tape transcripts in this volume serve a vital purpose for students. With a written text of the tape in hand, students can follow the tape rapidly and spot their misunderstandings.

Such transcripts do NOT supplant the tapes, as *how* the words were said and *how* preclears in auditing demonstrations actually responded are quite important.

L. Ron Hubbard

THE OPTIMUM 25-HOUR INTENSIVE, ANATOMY OF PROBLEMS, TRAINING ATHLETES

A lecture given on 29 July
1957

Audience: Hi! Hello!

Thank you very much.

Well, tonight we start a brand-new series of tapes. Brand-new series of lectures based on Q and A.

Rightly or wrongly, Scientologists to some slight degree, to people who are interested in Scientology but aren't, yet, have the reputation of not answering questions. To some slight degree. And I'm going to show you here in the next couple of weeks that I can answer questions at great length. Therefore, this is the first of these question and answer things. And maybe I'll get tired after this—after a couple of days and we'll do something else. Anyway, this is lecture number eleven, 18th ACC, July 29, 1957. The beginning of a series of questions and answers on the subject of Scientology.

And I think that you probably haven't thought of any questions yet to amount to anything. There's hardly enough here to bother with yet, but these will come up. I'd very much appreciate questions in class. I don't partic— I mean, about your class activities. I don't particularly appreciate questions asked so that other people will be informed, and which you already know the answer of. Now, I'm going to sit down here at least for part of this lecture and look over some of these questions. And any question that can't be asked in a paragraph... Now, here's a good question: "What would be the optimum one-week intensive to give on a case where one week of CCH 1 and 2 would just begin to crack it?"

Well, I can answer this by saying that CCH 1 and 2 would be what would be used.

Male voice: I see.

Now, this unfortunately contains the answer to the question. Don't you see? Well, "What would be the optimum one-week intensive?" is a very good question. And I think that you would like to hear the answer to that. Right?

Audience: Yes.

All right. The best intensive—the best thing to do with an intensive here today—by which we mean a twenty-five-hour, straight-at-it series of processes—would probably be the first of the CCH, which is CCH 0, followed by a good test pass here of CCH 1, CCH 2, CCH 3, CCH 4, CCH 1. That brings us to the end of the first day. Providing the auditor can't duplicate. Now, it would actually bring us about ten or twelve hours deep.

And I would then, depending on the type of case it was, continue from that point either on up the control line or I would simply crack the case wide

29 JULY 1957

open on all of its refusals to communicate, improve the communication, turn the fellow loose in my area and tell him to talk about Scientology to people. That's what I'd do. That's what I'd do. Now, what somebody else would do would be something else.

Now, people who don't like people communicating and things like that, they could go on and run this sort of a process: they could say, "Recall birth. Thank you. Recall conception. Thank you. Recall a past life, with great reality. Oh, you can't do that, eh? Well, thank you." And get them introverted. You see? So that they couldn't then communicate and say what a bad session it was.

Now, a lot of people who would go out anyway and say what a terrible session it was, of course should be handled that way. Raise their IQ, not their communication, you see? If they're going to be very critical of it, of course it's best to just sit on their heads for twenty-five hours and skip the rest of it.

Answering your question very directly: I'd run CCH 0 at the beginning of every session in the intensive. There's a difference between beginning of session and beginning of intensive. And I would run CCH 0 at the beginning of every *session* in the intensive. Keep that nice and flat, keep that from going out from under. I would run CCH 1, the presenting the paw—the hand process until I was fairly—he was fairly willing that he'd reach to me. And then I would run enough Tone 40 8-C, let him find the auditing room and—so that he wouldn't kick up any fuss that way particularly. I wouldn't make any endurance test out of it, however. And then I'd run some Hand Space Mimicry so he'd get some reality on the auditor very well; and then probably some Book Mimicry to get him to duplicate.

2

But if he was doing extremely well, was developing little comm lags of one kind or another, I would just go ahead and audit straight out from my assurance that he had found the auditor, the auditing room, was willing to reach. You see, that's what those first steps establish. They're not really an endurance contest; they work. You know? I mean, they can be worked in this direction.

But how can you get the most case gain and how can you get the case into the greatest level of communication, if that is your goal? How can you shed the most psychosomatics and so forth? The indicated course by the CCH processes, actually at this level of CCH 4, is not as direct as you would be willing to think. After all, you're auditors who know something about your business, don't you see? And there are things that you can just *do* with cases. You just decide to do something with a case and then you *do* it with the case. You see? And you push the case around on any course possible.

Now, you'd need to know this, however: how sure were you that you could control his body and his attention? And if you were sure that you could control his body—you know, he did CCH 1, Hand Presentation and he did CCH 2, Tone 40 8-C, he did these pretty well, he had some good reality on Hand Space Mimicry—you would have a fair guarantee that you had a good body control. Right? And there to some degree you could direct his attention.

Well, if you were going to go any further with the case on CCH, you would simply go up the ladder, don't you see? But that isn't necessarily the exact thing to do. This is a sort of a shotgun sort of thing that would get all the cases. But it's not necessarily true that you would take off there at 4 with 4. You could go this route very easily: instead of CCH 4, Book Mimicry, you could go into this department: Locational Processing. Just a training process. In this particular case though, you'd be training his attention. Well, why would you graduate from CCH 3 to training? A training process of one kind or another? You'd just be making sure that you could keep his attention directed.

OPTIMUM 25-HOUR INTENSIVE, PROBLEMS, ATHLETES

Now, Locational might itself—run ninety hours—might or might not flatten a case. We don't care. But we know what it would do. We know that it would place the preclear's attention under control. And knowing that it would place his attention under control, we then could run a thinkingness process on the preclear, providing we would come back and take his attention under control adequately again and again and again. So if you were going to follow some sort of a thinkingness pattern with this preclear, it would be really up to you what you ran on him; but for *sure* you would have to include in this process two other processes. I don't care whether it's Rising Scale Processing you were doing, you were running Black and White or dichotomies or anything else, there's two things you'd have to include in it. And one is CCH 0 at the start of every session. And the other is Training 10 (I think it is) to direct the attention here, there and every place. Is that right? All right.

Now, why? Well, when you run a thinkingness process on a preclear with lots of significance in it, he runs into things which makes him obsessively come off of it and he is changing all the time and he's liable to run into something that makes him difficult to follow your thinkingness command. Well, if you come off of that and give him something on the order of, "Notice that wall. Notice the ceiling. Notice the floor," and make him turn his head in that particular direction, you have taken again control of his attention, don't you see? So you'd hardly call it a process because it has no end goal in itself; it's just keeping the preclear in line. And this is one way of handling the preclear's attention. Do you follow me?

So you couldn't omit—and this is scraping down the lowest thing—you just could not omit out of an intensive CCH 0 and some form or version of Locational Processing. These two things would have to be in there pitching.

All right. Training Zero is there because an individual gets into problems in the middle of an intensive, as well as at the beginning. It's all—be very well if all the present time problems occurred on Sunday and you were going to start the preclear going on Monday. It would be very nice if they would always arrange this, but very often these present time problems occur on Wednesday or even Thursday. And I have spoken to preclears about this reprovably and I have said, "In the following week I don't want you to have any present time problems of any character," but it hasn't done any good. Probably because I didn't put a canceller in ahead of it or something.

But here is the point here, that a preclear gets into restimulation and telephones George. And George says, "*Yeooow yeahhh yeahhh yeahh yeahh.*" Preclear got into restimulation and decided George was a perfect heel and called up George and said so. Or decided—preclear decided she didn't know how Mama had possibly put up with it all those years and wrote Mama so, and the answer doesn't come till Friday. You got the idea? In other words, the preclear in restimulation made trouble for himself. And very often while he's coming through these things he's more liable to make trouble for himself than ordinarily. So you can expect present time problems to occur during an intensive. And if you expect anything else, you're just trying to postulate out of existence the behavior of man. And I'm sure that you . . . I'm sure that you could do this, given a little spit, but I haven't been able to so far. Anyway, what—I'm doing very well on it, though.

Here's always a thought with this. The pattern of CCH is as follows: you control the body so that you can control attention; you then control attention so that you can control thinkingness. If you're going to run a thinkingness process with significance in it at all, it is at least necessary that you continue to control

29 JULY 1957

attention. Do you see? You can't void controlling attention, no matter what you do. If you're going to start running thinkingness—he's just sitting there and about the highest, hottest thinkingness process you can run on a preclear is this: "Think a thought. Thank you. Think a thought. Thank you. Think a thought. Thank you." And you just could carry it off almost at that basis and he'd be replying whether he would or no. It is a control of thinkingness process, which is quite an amazing process all by itself.

Now, you went that far, you could probably do it all right. The funny part of it is, it wouldn't run on me. I mean, it wouldn't run as an automaticity because I found out something the other day that's very incredible. I could sit there for about a half an hour without thinking a thought. Found it very, very easy to do. I was feeling very stupid and I said: "Well, I wonder how long I can sit here without thinking." I sat there about a half an hour and at the end of that time I wasn't even thinking about what I was supposed to be thinking about and I wasn't even thinking about not thinking, you know? And picked up the postulate at the beginning of the half hour and washed that out and looked at the clock and got up.

It is possible for you, if you're at all in control of thinkingness, not to obey the command "Think a thought." Somebody says, "Think a thought," you can say . . . "Think a thought. Think a thought." Just as I was doing this right now I wasn't thinking a single thought. All right. Not even the thought to be provocative. All right.

4

So, we have thinkingness—actually, oddly enough, only in upper-level cases can you get a blank. You may think that's peculiar, but people at lower levels never have blanks. It's just one long consecutive whir.

The psychologist, for instance, said in all of his textbooks, just shortly after the Chaldeans, he said in his textbooks, "Thought is an associative process whereby all subsequent thoughts depend on an earlier thought." In other words, he knocked out of existence and not-ised prime thought. You see?

Well, one can always think a prime thought and go on from there or just stop that and think another thought. It's quite an amazing ability here centers around thinkingness. So that if you're handling thinkingness, you're running up against—and the only people you get into any trouble with, by the way, are the people who can't stop thinking—you'll get a thinkingness out of control. And now you control this thinkingness and you may be able to do it for a half an hour or forty-five minutes very happily (and I'm talking about somebody who's real low-toned now) and all of a sudden you're no longer in control of the thinkingness. They're not thinking the thought that you told them to think at all. And so they are out of session. Now, understand that, please. They're out of session when they're not thinking the thought because they're not obeying the auditing command. And they act like they're out of session, too. And after a while they blow. So CCH 0 and a direction of attention process such as Locational—"Notice the ceiling. Notice the floor"—is absolutely necessary.

Now, you could tell anybody to think anything you wanted to tell him to think as an auditing command. And you understand that Trio is in itself a thinkingness thing. You consider it a Havingness Process, but he has to think the thought, "Yes, I can have that," and be answered up with some sort of a conviction that he can have it and have a basic agreement going there one way or the other inside himself. Do you understand that? CCH isn't just a process like SLP 7 or SOP 8 or something like that where you did one step, flattened it, did another step, flattened it and did another step. These are indicated

OPTIMUM 25-HOUR INTENSIVE, PROBLEMS, ATHLETES

processes for various levels. That's a bit different than a scale of processes which you must always climb.

Now, you take this direction of attention process, there is a pattern behind it. First you direct attention to the environment, then body plus the environment, alternately, and then run into some sort of a duplicative process on the body and the environment. And that seems to be—well, it is the best order of procedure there. So if you start directing his attention to the room and the body and so on and you're going to make a process out of it, you're not running Locational Processing. You're doing something else, you see? It's not a process. But this process, "Notice the ceiling. Notice the floor," and so on, is the simplest of the direction of attention processes.

The other day I tried to better this process. And I tried several ways to better it and finally hit on an auditing command which worked fine until it was run on somebody else and they had a question about it. And I got—the thing was run on me and I just practically blew the session. It can't be done. A variation on this like, "Touch that table. Touch the floor," and so forth. This actually can't be done the moment that an individual is no longer very closely associated with the body. It's all dependent on the earliest auditing command, isn't it? You say, "In this session we are now going to employ your body and we're going to have you touch things with your body. Is that all right with you?" Well, we might as well just halt in that moment of time because anytime the preclear changes in any way the auditing command goes by the boards; and after that he himself can touch that ceiling, touch that floor, and the auditor never notices and insists he use his hands to do it. But he hasn't been told to use his hand to do it. Don't you see? But, "Notice the ceiling. Notice the floor," and so on is a very fine process and does directly control attention and is a control factor.

5

Now, let's look at Havingness. Havingness says, "Look around here and tell me something you could have." The optimum running version on that, by the way, is the original Trio form, which is: "Look around here and tell me something you could have. Look around here and tell me something you would permit to remain. Tell me something with which you could dispense," or "that you could dispense with." That was the original Trio, the three questions. And they're run in a group. That is to say, a few of them are run and a few questions on one of them, a few questions on another and a few questions on the third. All right. That's permissive, isn't it? It doesn't direct his attention, does it? And he'll fly out of control with it. Some day, some hour of the intensive, the preclear was not finding things he could have. Don't you see? He was doing something else.

So that CCH 0 and Locational I would then use, whatever else I was using in the thinkingness or significance line of processing.

First I'd get—I'd follow this pattern, rather than follow processes: I would get his body under control; then his body and his attention under control; and then I would tell him what to think and show him he could think it and get him to change his mind to a point where he could behave in a more optimum fashion.

And that's the way I'd go about an intensive. And that is the optimum intensive.

Okay. Somebody here wants to know what the anatomy of a problem is. Seems to be a very interesting question.

You have to—the anatomy of a problem would consist, first, of an inspection of the CDEI Scale. All difficulties are entered through curiosity.

29 JULY 1957

Curiosity killed the cat. Scientology brought it back.

Now, a problem actually is at the "C" part of the CDEI Scale as a very high-toned manifestation. The individual who could have a problem would be a person in not too bad condition. The person who *is* a problem is something else. That person doesn't *have* problems, he *is* them.

The problem is intention-counter-intention. We answer the question, "What is an intention?" by saying it is an intention (since a lot of you are taking this up right now, tomorrow, and I wouldn't bust your class up).

The next question that was on my desk here was, "What is an intention?" and you'll just have to beat that out tomorrow. But the whole idea of a problem is that it's something versus a something, with a doubtful outcome. Now, it can be more than one thing versus more than one thing, but we—the irreducible minimum of factors in a problem happens to be two. Except the problem of the "only one," where the only problem is that there is only one. Problems based on scarcity, however, if you will look at it, are based simply because there's an absence of another. So problems start with the base number of two and can go anywhere else.

Now, you say, "Well, it's like a war—there's one side fighting the other side and the outcome is doubtful." All right. That's fine. That is a problem. Then any war is a problem. But to say that only two sides can fight a war is foolish indeed. To say that it would be two versus one or three versus six and that it would always have this complexion would be very foolish. There is a such thing as a three-cornered war. There was such a duel fought once: *Midshipman Easy*, the great triangular duel—if any of you ever read Marryat's masterpiece on that. They fought a triangular duel; everybody got in his shot and so forth.

There actually was a three-way war going on one time, right here in the United States. One of the sillier wars. It happened down in the Gadsden Purchase. And the Gadsden Purchase was purchased sort of over the dead bodies of the defeated Mexicanos and so on and they didn't particularly like to sell this. But we had Mexican troops fighting American patrols and Apaches; and we had Apaches fighting Mexican troops and American patrols; and we had Americans fighting Apaches and the Mexican troops. And boy, if you don't think *that* was a problem! There you had a three-cornered war going on; a real one. Didn't last very long but it was awfully confusing. The doubt of outcome is a problem.

Now basically, a confusion is not a problem. That is not a good definition of a problem. A confusion is not a good definition of a problem. In the first place, a confusion isn't a problem. A confusion is simply a disorder. It is when a problem ceases to be solvable that it becomes a confusion. When you get a problem falling apart and bewildering everybody thereafter, like some places in this universe—there's the dark horse head in Orion, which is one of the more interesting stellar phenomena visible from Earth; there's a horse's head up there, coal black and no light ever comes through it. Of what is it composed? You'd say immediately, maybe, parts of your bank, but... I dare say the thing was set up at one time or another on a problem basis. It was somebody versus somebody. Then the war disappeared and the confusion remained. Follow that carefully.

Any confusion that is in a preclear's bank at this moment was at one time or another a problem which was in the realm of handling capability. One time or another somebody could handle the thing. But when the war ceased, when there was no longer another terminal, when there was no longer

OPTIMUM 25-HOUR INTENSIVE, PROBLEMS, ATHLETES

this thing with two terminals fighting and so forth, the weapons and other bric-a-brac used in that conflict tend to drift around.

Somebody is busy plowing in France and the end of his plowshare goes into the nose of a shell that was dead when it landed, but suddenly goes *whumph!* and bits of farmer and plowshare go spattering around the Picardy horizons. All right. That's no part of his game, you see? He's busy trying to plant a field and it's quite unexpected. It doesn't have anything to do with the problem at hand—is will the crops grow and will the government leave me three kernels of wheat per bushel, or two? It doesn't have to do with any of these problems and therefore it creates confusion. Now, the funny part of it is, is when this happens to him—I'm telling you about this guy with malice aforethought because it explains a lot about your pcs—this guy, when it goes off, goes *booooo!* He's liable to have something blow up under him like this; and if he lives through it, you'll find a very confused man. Why is he so confused? He wasn't playing that game and there was no problem.

Now, soldiers were in trenches on that field. And by the way, if you've never been over there I invite you to drive through the parts of France where the US has spent so many millions of dollars and so many troops and so forth. You'll laugh yourself silly. I mean, it's one of these horrible, gruesome jokes. You could lose the whole country in the northern part of the panhandle of Texas and never find it again. How you could get all these men in there without them sleeping on top of each other, I don't know! It just isn't ground to fight in or that much to fight over. It's—has to do with—I told you when I came back from Europe a couple of years ago I finally figured out what it was all about. The Germans came down—they got short of cows in Germany and got restless and they tried to go down and raid the French cows. And the French objected and more and more people were brought in on the thing and finally, why, these cattle rustlers got driv' off. That's happened a lot of times. Anyway, it's not something that anybody would take seriously. That's for sure. And yet the number of lives that have been lost in it. . .

Well, all right. The soldier could be there in the trench and a shell could land alongside of him and go *boom!* You know? And he'd say, "*Thuuuuuh*, that was close, you know?" And so on. Well, he's part of that game, see? That's part of the expected activity, he's been given to believe. Of course, he isn't any better off for it, you understand. But it's at least in a problem condition.

Now, when problems deteriorate they become confusions. Do you see that? And now you go in to solve the US government. Total confusion! Why? It's a degeneration of all the problems that were never disposed of or solved for a hundred and—three-quarters of a century.

And they generate all this confusion and then they're all going which ways and then nobody ever knows what the solutions—or what problems the solutions apply to, don't you see? "Let's see. What problem does this solution apply to?" See? Well, you run across a perfectly orderly solution like "all soldiers while on guard shall not put potatoes on the ends of their bayonets," or something, you know? And what problem did this solve? Well, nobody knows, so that sort of thing becomes army regulations, you see? Totally composed of potatoes not on the ends of bayonets. The navy has still retained some idea of it. They say somebody sometime or another has run into those difficulties and the composite of all these difficulties is in US naval regulations. And that's true. Total composite of difficulties. Only trouble is, they took it from the Queen's regulations and nobody knew what that problem was.

29 JULY 1957

Now, you start unconfusing this thing, how would you go about unconfusing it? You'd actually simply start addressing out-of-present-time problems. You get the idea? I mean, you would start resolving problems that had existed once but which only demonstrate themselves now as debris. Do you understand that? Hm?

Very possibly the basis of this universe is a problem. It probably existed to fight some other universe or something at one time or another. And then they lost all contact, maybe, with the other universe or it disappeared or something of the sort and after this, why, you have the Milky Way and other things. And astronomers cast up vast opinions about the whole thing. It's like finding a deck of cards out in the street. There's been an awful fight and two gunmen shot each other down over eight aces in the deck or some such thing. And they've been carted away, the blood's been mopped up but nobody picked up the cards. And you come along—astronomer comes along and he looks at this deck of cards lying in the street and he makes some *terrific* theory out of this. He says, "This proves the existence of nymphs. This shows us conclusively that the interrelationship between alpha and beta particles is the square root of bull." See, he doesn't connect this phenomenon of a deck of cards or any such phenomena with the actual problem or conflict which caused them to exist.

8

Now, we're not trying to say that all things begin with a problem. But if there's any trouble anyplace, there was something to cause some curiosity to bring about a desire so that the desire could be enforced, so that it could then be inhibited. The CDEI Scale. And the problem is usually what is offered as bait, one way or the other.

Problem is a very, very interesting thing. But its anatomy is two or more intentions opposed. Opposed intentions. That's all there is to a problem. The anatomy of a problem is that it follows down the CDEI Scale. After it's ceased to be a fight, then somebody *had* to have a fight, don't you see? They haven't got a fight but they had to have a fight. Well, that ensues at the end of a fight. You know, he's got to have a fight, but he hasn't got a fight anymore, so you get "D." He can't tell you why. Then you've got to have *have*. All these little kids running around with cowboy pistols don't know it, but they're still trying to shoot Black Buck back in Nebraska. Those kids that are real serious about it have lost—have had the misfortune of killing an opponent. It was a big problem how they were going to shoot off Black Buck, you know? And they finally snuck up on him one night and stove a shiv in him. And "Black Buck," they said, "was causing problems." But you notice there was no problem until they came along and opposed Black Buck.

That's why police and criminals cause a vast problem. These two, counter-opposed, cause the problem. If the cops weren't there, you probably wouldn't have any crime to amount to anything. If the criminals weren't there, you probably wouldn't have any cops. That's understandable. Everybody realizes that. But they never look at the other side of this problem because they're not supposed to. This problem's supposed to continue in existence forever. If you didn't have any police, there probably would be very few criminals. Broken-down space opera mechanics scattered around Earth here are the debris of an old cops-and-robbers game which has now disappeared. That's just debris, don't you see?

All the preclear objects to is the debris which he is now holding, which was once a significant part of a problem. He's got solutions that no longer apply to any existing problem. So he thinks he has to do something with

OPTIMUM 25-HOUR INTENSIVE, PROBLEMS, ATHLETES

them and as you audit him he tries to find places to fit these solutions in. Or he realizes that these solutions no longer fit anyplace, so he's trying to knock them out. And all of it is for want of problems, want of game, want of contention, want of randomness and so on.

When we say "problem," then, we're actually saying part of a whole structure which would have to do with opponents, which would have to do with spectator sports, which would have to do with calculating machines and so on. There's nobody unhappier than somebody with a tremendously wonderful calculator that has nothing to which to address itself. See? Just sits there and gathers rot. That's a silly thing to have happen. It'd be like launching somebody with a 180 IQ into a land or civilization of monkeys. He goes around trying to show the monkeys how smart he is. There's no opponent. No opponent at all. Matter of fact, the monkeys probably think they're much smarter than he is!

So this whole vista of the problem should actually be viewed with intention-counter-intention. And you could have mystery or curiosity in either or any of the intentions. Curiosity about the outcome and curiosity about the actual problem.

The only horrible thing that occurs in thinkingness is to have no desire whatsoever to discover what the problem is before you start solving it. I did that one day. I took three or four of my buddies, they were—I was back home on a visit from the Orient and I was trying to make myself personable and trying to say, "Well, here I am, don't you remember me?" sort of thing, you know? They were working on a curb and they had a—in the old days automobile rims were not drop-center. And some of them were very difficult to get tires on and off of. And they had some old heap there or another and they were trying to get this—wrestling with this tire and I went over and said, "Here," I said, "I'll give you a hand." And with great expertness took up a tire iron and snapped the tire back onto the rim very nicely. And I said, "There you are." And they said, "Ohh, we were trying to get it off and we'd almost succeeded ..." I just hadn't bothered to ascertain what the problem was, that's all!

For instance, you'll find many, many cults get into this kind of thing. They go out to do good and then they never find out what's bad; and you find them doing all sorts of weird things.

For instance, there's some peanut-whistle outfit sets up a racket in the United States called the Busy Business Bureau. And this outfit would just love to squash all these forgers and cheats and all that sort of thing, but they run out of ammunition all the time because there just aren't that many people doing bad business. They completely overlooked an interesting fact: the survival value of a bad business or a person who is doing badly is very low. Very low. They get weeded out at a mad rate. Even before the Busy Business Bureau could get a good report on them, see, they're in and gone. Somebody's selling a bunch of shrubs he pulled up in the woods as ten-thousand-dollar fruit trees and he's into the neighborhood and out and gone again long before the Busy Business Bureau hears about it. And this guy manages to survive perhaps for some time, but sooner or later somebody knows the bushes and hits him over the head with an auto wrench and that's the end of that guy and that business. Society has a habit of weeding out the wooden nutmeg salesmen. Well, the Busy Business Bureau has it all figured out that the trouble with business is that it's fraudulent. See, they know the trouble with business: it's all fraudulent and the public has to be protected against fraudulent

29 JULY 1957

business. And they have this huge problem mocked up of the public versus these businesses, see?

The public's in there doing business with the businesses and the businesses are doing business with the public. And when they get into trouble with each other, they don't go to the Busy Business Bureau. They chew each other up or they sue somebody and start into this natural selection. Knock somebody out of business and he isn't doing business in that community anymore, don't you see? It's naturally selective as a mechanism. Which leaves the Busy Business Bureau out on a limb because there is no general fight in progress. Consumers are consuming and producers are producing, and it's going on all the time. And out of this terrific agreement, terrific communication level, they try to make a problem and there just isn't one.

Now, if they looked around, they could undoubtedly find something to have as a problem, you know? But they keep doing asinine things. And actually I found out the other day, much to my amazement, that they're in much more trouble than they're out of, all the time. I called up somebody concerning suing the Busy Business Bureau and so forth, and he said, "Well, that would be the 10,761st suit filed this week against the organization." All they do is fight lawsuits.

Now, the ascertainment of a problem or an existing problem or the creation of a problem is necessary for a game of some kind or another, you see? Unless one is established, no game exists. And one is in the funny situation of being out in a vacant lot and he picks up the bat and he swings madly through the air and then he runs to the first base and then he jumps over into the pitcher's box and he throws a ball to first base and goes over to first base and tags himself out. Only he isn't there anymore and it makes him feel foolish. There's no game in the absence of a problem.

10

Now, that's pretty much the anatomy of a problem. But in view of the fact that a thetan can do with more—you know, he hasn't got enough problems, which is why he's hanging on to what he's got—he doesn't release them easily until you demonstrate to him that he can invent more. And when you show him he can invent more, then he'll let go of a few of the obsessive problems. The trouble with problems is there aren't enough of them. The only thing—reason people protest against war is there isn't enough war going on. If war could go on long enough and everybody could engage in it. . . See, these big shows that they put on—Warner Brothers and Roosevelt Pictures and so forth put on there in 1941 and so forth, they were actually colossal productions but nobody was any part of them, see? And it didn't make a good problem.

Therefore, Problems of Comparable Magnitude, "dream up more problems," "invent problems," "figure out a problem you could make out of that," and that sort of thing is all very necessary. And injecting mystery into it is necessary too. "Now, can you really get the feeling that there's a problem there?" and "Get yourself figuring about it" and so forth has to be interjected into it, all of which is part of the problem.

Then another thing about problems is they're disgustingly easy to solve. Almost all problems. So we get a whole race of people known as the psychos—they're not quite like the morphos. And these people mock up only problems that nobody will ever be able to handle, so great is their anxiety about the loss of a problem. They've gotten down to a point where they themselves are neither part of the contestants—they themselves are simply the confusion residue. And every time you better their condition they go into ten thousand

OPTIMUM 25-HOUR INTENSIVE, PROBLEMS, ATHLETES

new problems. See, they just can't rise up scale on the subject of problems; they go into new problems all the time. See, they are the confusion, the debris, the leftover debris of former games and that sort of thing. And they have become the debris. And that's worse than becoming the problem, but not much.

Okay. Well, here's a very interesting question. "Ron, will you say something on an integrated way to train an athletic team? In my case, a badminton or tennis team. Cover the following: Do any of the TRs apply? How about the PE type of instruction? How rigorous should body and muscle training be? Should processing be specialized? You once stated that you could—one could not be trained on barriers alone. What do you mean?"

Well, I've just covered part of that. Somebody said that—couldn't be trained on barriers alone. Well, let's—just what I took up here: the anatomy of a problem—that's also the anatomy of a game, don't you see? Probably a problem is a game somebody's taking seriously. And you can't just keep putting up barriers, barriers, barriers. Also there've got to be specific problems.

And on any athletic team, mental training is—I was going to say as important as physical training; I would say far more important. Far, far more important. I'll give you some kind of an idea. I was gagging here the other evening, you know, about gray hairs and that sort of thing; and so I brought the gray line down here a little bit just to show you this keeps happening all the time, see? And a little later this week, I'll wipe it out, just to show you—completely, both sides.

Now, function does monitor structure. But thought, for sure, monitors both of them. And an athletic build or activity and so forth, is to some degree dependent on muscular structure, but muscular structure is dependent upon confidence to perform the act. Confidence: can I throw that ball? Fellow doesn't think he can throw it, he will actually adjust his muscles so he can't. Now, women have for so long been taught that they mustn't, can't throw anything, that they're not hunters like the rest of the he-men, they're not Dianas or Amazons and they actually have developed a shoulder joint which does not adapt to a pitch or a throw; Their shoulder joint is quite different than men's. And it has been adapted so they can't get that kind of a swinging action. So they have to pitch underhanded or straight overhanded, but they can never get it here on the quarter or the half. I don't know, I see some of you looking at me rather surprised. Didn't you girls know that your shoulder joints were quite different than men's shoulder joints?

Now, when we see that a whole body could be designed in a certain way along the line, it isn't too much of a stretch of the imagination to demonstrate that a muscle would adapt itself to not being able to throw, or adapt itself to being able to throw in consequence to the confidence a person had in his ability to perform the act. It doesn't all boil down to confidence. It boils down to willingness. And willingness is monitored to a large degree on expected wins or rewards. One has willingness to play only so long as there are a few rewards.

Now, people don't get, probably, as bad as seals. Seals are the worst of this line. A seal will not blow a horn or balance a ball on his nose without a fish. And if you ever watched a seal act, there are buckets of fish there, and every time a seal does the least little trick, he does it and then with great anxiety finishes it off and looks for his fish. And he's got to have a reward right now! And if he is not given his fish at once, that is the end of his performance and he will simply walk right straight out off the stage and that's that. Quite remarkable. He expects an instantaneous, solid reward.

29 JULY 1957

Well, lots of unions are going so far down into effort now that they believe this is very much the case. For instance, they think their only reward is cash. They have lost sight entirely of pride of accomplishment and belongingness. They would rather belong to the union. They belong to the union rather than to the business, which puts them off the team at once. And they make a game out of the worker versus the business. But the business is composed only of the worker and it must take some interesting mental evolutions to get them in there, you see, and get them to believe that they could fight themselves to this degree. It's quite an operation.

Now, a little bit higher on the scale we find such a thing as an athlete. He wants applause of some kind or another. He wants a little credit for having performed the feat and so on. And he wants the belongingness on the team, the companionship with other members of the team. This is his reward. They feel friendly toward him. And sometimes he'll reach up for the crowd to such an extent he divorces himself from the remainder of the team. He becomes a star or something of this character and he becomes very unhappy in this category. Some people are working for the pride of accomplishment and the reward of just the "thank you" or "good fellow" of *one* person, who may very well be a dead person—a gone person, you know, a departed ally. They're still in there sweating for Grandma's pat on the head, don't you see?

12

Now, when you take the goals and rewards into consideration, you have, then, the willingness of an athlete to perform. And if you have his willingness to perform, then he will tend to monitor his muscles so that he can perform. In the absence of a willingness to perform for some reward or another, there is no reward. He gets no willingness to perform, he feels there is no reward, he won't perform, he's a gone dog right away. And you'll find him deteriorating. Physically deteriorating.

Now, they have various superstitions, tremendous numbers of superstitions that go along with athletics. It's just like walking in a bunch of haunts. Somebody spilled the bats just before somebody went up to bat or somebody spat on the left side of pitcher's box or you know, it's just on—which shows you the normal mental condition of an athlete. And it's for the birds. They are frail, they are very breakable, they are mentally disturbable and they are, in essence, a very, very misbehaving type of human being. And that is the professional athlete or one who is an amateur athlete of long standing. So you go up against an athlete and you're going up against somebody who is so afraid he'll break his ankle that he normally does. They are normally, at the beginning of a game, patched together with glue and baling wire. You'll see tape on their legs and wrists and so forth. And they're like a bunch of racehorses of some kind or another. They're somehow or other pumped up to go through this particular game and they go through it and they collapse.

Well, this is minimized by a clarification of goals and expected rewards. You clarify an athlete's goals, you bring him up into a position where he can be trained. And I would say there isn't any earlier step as far as an athlete is concerned. Unless it would be the same processes you would use on a psycho. You would have to run very low processes because you'd have to be able to clarify his goals. And that's the first thing you should do with him.

It's quite interesting. I'll recite you a conversation that took place between a Scientologist and a group of athletic coaches. Scientologist was called in by these coaches—very famous coaches they were—and he'd given them a little talk on the subject of goals. You had to clarify the goals of athletes. He'd taken some of my material of an earlier time here with regard to this. And

OPTIMUM 25-HOUR INTENSIVE, PROBLEMS, ATHLETES

they all agreed with him 100 percent. And afterwards, why, he was sitting at the luncheon with them and sitting around eating—they left the assembly hall and they went and had their buffet luncheon—he couldn't get anybody who knew what a goal was.

He'd given this beautiful speech, but nobody knew what a goal was. They hadn't a clue. And so he asked a runner that was there, of some international fame and who had been brought, like a trained seal, by his coach, you know? And he asked this runner what his goal was for the following year. And the runner thought for a long, long time and he said, "Well," he says, "I'm going to—I'm going to try to equal the record of Charlie Paddock."

"Is that your goal for this next year?"

"Yes, that's right. I'm going to try to equal the record of Charlie Paddock."

"That is your goal? Yes, that's your goal."

Well, this Scientologist spent the remainder of the luncheon working this out on two-way comm with practically everybody present. And he had a Group Processing session going on, really, on a sort of a two-way comm basis. And he made a fellow try to reach his glass of water. And the fellow would reach the glass of water. And he said, "No, no, no, now," he said, "*try* to reach the glass of water." So the fellow would stiffen up and try to reach the glass of water. Finally had this tremendous cognition. Then everyone around the table did it and did it until they all of a sudden understood this: you couldn't ever *try* to reach anything and reach it. Not possible! You either reached it or you didn't reach it. But to *try* to reach it was no goal.

And they began to understand more and more of this. He finally got this internationally famous runner to dream up a goal and agree that was a goal and so forth. The fellow was going to try to improve his footwork when he was on downhill runs. Give you some kind of idea of the difficulties he had getting through!

This guy wasn't going to *do* anything! And most athletes get hung up in the ridges of counterposition to such a degree that they start dramatizing the past games and they become, therefore, problems.

So problems of comparable magnitude, clarification of goals, what is a goal, and that sort of thing, is the first thing you take up with athletes. And you follow through this with various things.

If you were trying to train them to do something, you would write up some TRs. Tennis: you'd have a TR for standing on the court; a TR for moving from one side of the court to the other; a TR for moving from the back of the court to the net and from the net to the back of the court. You get the idea? And you'd make them get each one of these things pat. Then a TR for holding a racket; and then a TR for swinging a racket. Got this? And mind you, you would take the *best* athlete to do this with. You're not training a weak one. You're not training a newcomer. And he's the one you'll have the most trouble with this—the best athlete. But he'll give you the best results in the long run. Now, he doesn't break up as he will tell you he's going to do and forget the whole thing and how to do it. He won't. He will simply get better and better at it and recover his facility rather easily. But you'll have to make him practice in order to get them all together.

Pistol practice—keeping the pistol from going away; holding the pistol still. On a pistol expert, move the person—a number of little TRs, you know? "Keep the pistol from going away. Hold the pistol still. Put the pistol on the table. Pick the pistol up." Get the idea? You just got him very familiar. 8-C with the pistol, I think, was the way that began. The fellow had about three

29 JULY 1957

hours of this and went out and broke the national record with that pistol. So it didn't upset him, although he thought all the time that his ability to fire a pistol was being blown up with a big boom.

Now, you would take what they were doing and what they were being trained to do and then, giving them wins all the way, increase them up to a point of great familiarity with what they're doing. And rather than experience, look on it as *familiarity*. They are sure that they can continue to run 8-C on the court or on the track. The track *will* be there, that sort of thing. Just familiarity, familiarity, familiarity. And then you have to work on them on a games condition and you really have to teach them games and what no-game conditions are and games. And you do this with PE type instruction.

And the rigors of training should never be permitted to get in the way of rigors of mental activity. In other words, you keep the mental line up.

The way you develop team spirit and that sort of thing is just to get the group into good communication with one another and get them to agree upon their goal. If you got them to agree on their goal before the game, you'd find there were always two or three present that had to be talked into winning it. And then your processing is usually fairly high-level processing, all of which has to do with control of objects and familiarity, location in spaces and so on. You'll find out that you'll have to run many, many assists while you're working with athletes. Many, many assists because they're always falling down. But fortunately your assists will get less and less to the degree that you bring them up scale individually or as a team. It's one of the easier things to do.

14

I have known of an athlete simply reading the Axioms—they're not stupid as everybody believes; they just don't think much. There's a big difference. Just reading the Axioms and cogniting on them at the rate of about two or three minutes apiece. Say, "Oh, yes! That's this way," and so forth. "Yeah." And give you specific examples of these Axioms and so on. And they're just laid out, "Oh, that's the way it is," and so forth. They really can be swung along pretty quick. But they have been taught to be stupid and they think they mustn't think and they think that if they think they will destroy their abilities. And you have to get them over this. Because their superstition is supplanting their ability to reason. They are as successful as they think and they're no more successful than that. They have to be able to recognize and see things. You can speed up their reaction time and everything else. Ordinary Tone 40 Group Processing works on athletes.

This is a very interesting problem. This is a very interesting subject. I could talk a long time on it but that's the end of the hour.

Thank you very much.

DEATH

A lecture given on 30
July 1957

I have a little announcement to make here at the beginning which isn't too happy an announcement. Most of you have heard this on the rumor line. And that is that an old-time DScn, Peggy Conway, whom many of you know, passed away in Pretoria, South Africa yesterday from a sudden stroke. She was doing a great deal for Scientology down in South Africa, was operating down there as my representative and was doing quite a bit of work with the government and was getting things set up. So it was a loss in more ways than one. But she was—don't know if many of you knew this, you might have—she was the original "Peg o' My Heart" in the stage play, and many other stage successes. And the war came along and she went out with the USO. She had a jacket that she collected all sorts of various regimental insignia on and she made lecture tours in the country. She finally came into Scientology and she did an awful lot of good work. All of her contacts were in relatively high places. Matter of fact, it was Gloria Swanson who phoned up and gave the information through here yesterday. The occasion was of some interest in another line. She will be cremated and her body will be flown home to Connecticut—cremated.

15

Well anyway, it brought up another point. There were two or three people who looked at me rather dazedly and I suddenly conceived that I had never given a lecture on the subject of death. Just death as such. And in view of the fact it is one of the larger interesting mechanisms that Scientology understands and what happens and what goes on, I thought it might be a very good thing if I gave you a lecture on that subject.

Audience: It's true. Yeah.

Okay, this is the twelfth lecture of the 18th ACC, July 30th 1957, and the subject of this lecture is material on death.

The whole subject of death has been one of the more mysterious subjects to man and it has only been in Scientology itself—not in Dianetics—it's only been in Scientology that the mechanisms of death and so forth have been thoroughly understood. And when I say thoroughly understood I mean of course just the mechanisms.

We know a great deal about death and we are actually the first people that do, on this planet, know a great deal about death. It is one of the larger wins of Scientology, and I rather wonder that there's been no earlier lectures on this subject except I ordinarily don't dwell on the subject very much. I investigated it, said, "Well that's all wrapped up," and dropped it in the file in the drawer and forgot about it.

30 JULY 1957

It's very easy to forget about death because that's what death is, a forgettingness.

However we do have a considerable amount of information on this subject, and you actually are entitled to that information.

In the first place, man is composed (as you well know) of a body, a mind and what we refer to as a thetan. All right. The best examples of this were only recently achieved when I told people, "Now, look at your body; have you got a body there?" And people say yes they had a body there, and, "Now get a picture of a cat. Have you got a picture of a cat?. All right, you've got a picture of a cat. All right now, that picture is a mind picture and this is the mind and it's composed of pictures that interassociate and act—carry perceptions and all that sort of thing." You could get a person to get an actual picture at that time, and then while he's looking at this actual picture you can ask him this head-wringer which is "What's looking at it?" And nobody ever asked the question before Scientology.

Quite an innocent question. There are several questions that have never been asked before Scientology. One of them is "Can you be three feet back of your head?" This particular phrasing was unknown. And similarly, this particular demonstration of the parts of man, unknown.

Now, that's—actually gives a person a considerable subjective reality on the idea that he himself is a being that is independent of a mind or a body. And there is actually a separateness there. One doesn't have to be carried along to a point of where he exteriorizes in processing in order to get a reality on it. Many people grasp this rather easily without ever having been exteriorized. But there's nothing like being exteriorized to give you a rather adequate reality on this subject, and particularly to be exteriorized with good perception.

Many people get exteriorized, see the texture of their jacket or dress so vividly that it frightens them to death and they dive back in in a hurry. But they have a reality on having been out.

Now, here is actually the first evidence that man has had on the subject of the human spirit. Man thought he *had* a human spirit. No, that is totally incorrect—man *is* a human spirit which is enwrapped more or less in a mind which is in a body. And that is man, *Homo sapiens*, and he is a spirit and his usual residence is in his head and he looks at the pictures and the body carries him around.

It's quite an interesting thing since it is so easily demonstrated. And when we realize that life has been straining at this secret all these years, to come out with this simple an answer makes it look, if anything, a little ridiculous. I wouldn't say that it made the great philosophers of all time ridiculous because sometimes their poesy was excellent, sometimes their wording was good, sometimes the way they wrote things down and so on was quite fascinating in the field of aesthetics. But it certainly made their data look very silly.

Now, when we look at the fact that man is a spirit which has a mind and a body, and when we describe man in that fashion, then it becomes extremely simple to understand what his difficulties would be.

His difficulties would be basically with his body or with his mind, and we say, "Well now then, there obviously then would be difficulties with him as a being, a spiritual being." This is—but in view of the fact that he has to think that he *can* get in a trap, has to get the idea that he can be endangered before he can be endangered, it is sort of like the United States government—the United States government can only be sued if it gives you its permission. You have to have the permission of the government in order to sue it. In other

words, you have to have permission—the thetan has to give permission to be trapped before he can be trapped. Therefore he is relatively easily untrapped. And the moment he is untrapped he gives birth to all sorts of interesting phenomena which we know as the exteriorization phenomena. And all of this phenomena is quite easily demonstrated.

I even constructed a meter once that I could make somebody be on one side of and be on the other side of and it would read differently and he'd approach it and it'd go *clang* and he'd go away from it. Made out of a little tuning tube that was manufactured in Great Britain—a very, very sensitive tube and an antenna—and a thetan actually does have an electrical field.

Most people know that living things do have an electrical field around them, but nobody had ever measured it before, independent of energy, ridges, bodies, such combinations as that. In other words, you expect that to get an electrical reading on a human being he has to walk over and put his hand on something. This is not true. You can exteriorize him, put him near a little antenna and he gets a read. Quite amazing.

Therefore, thought and electricity and other universe phenomena are quite well (you might say) entangled and confused, and we get to the fourth thing on which a man has reality, but *Homo sapiens* had no reality on this thing and we can just abandon it if we're describing *Homo sapiens*, and that's the material universe. He had no reality on the material universe. I mean just none. I mean, I couldn't say that more straightly. You get an idea of this if you just run some Locational Processing on somebody. Grab somebody off the street and run some Locational Processing on him. He all of a sudden notices there are walls and floors and ceilings. You say, "But he knew this all the time." I don't know that he did. He takes an automobile out on Sunday and kills himself dead and that's what we're talking about. All right.

What happens to him when he dies?

Well, basically all that happens is that a separation occurs between the thetan and the body. That's basically all that happens.

He, however, takes with him old tin cans and rattling chains and bric-a-brac and other energy phenomena that he feels he cannot do without and stashes this in the next body that he picks up.

Now, he does not build a body. He does not build a new body in this lazy time of manufactured items and Frigidaires and so on. He picks one up off the genetic line, and the genetic line is a series of mocked up automaticities which produce according to a certain blueprint from the earliest times of life on this planet through until now. And as everybody—even people in biology know, there is a definite succession of steps that life takes today. It's hard for us to believe that a less—a little less than a century ago a man was almost hanged for heresy for announcing the theory of natural selection and evolution. And they actually had trials after the beginning of this century on the subject of evolution and so on right here in the United States.

But this is a concept which we know today for a very good fact. We understand this rather thoroughly, that something goes through these various steps.

Well, what goes through the steps? Well, an automaticity goes through the steps. Well, where did the automaticity come from? Well, that is not the subject of death. That is totally disassociated from it.

Death is something the automaticity does. See, we don't care where it came from. I mean this idea of let's backtrack it and get earlier and earlier and earlier and earlier and earlier will finally, we hope, leave us someplace at

30 JULY 1957

the beginning of things. Well, there may be a beginning of things, there may be an end of things—I don't know. But I notice all clocks go round and round and round. Anyway . . .

There is such a thing as a cycle of action however, and this cycle of action in Scientology is create-survive-destroy. At the shoulder of the curve an individual is mostly interested in surviving. Early on the curve he is interested in creating. And at the end of the curve, why, he is interested in the disposition of the remains.

Now, this happens whether you're speaking of a building, a tree, anything else. We get this same cycle of action, create-survive-destroy.

Well, when we apply this cycle of action to this—these various parts I described, we get a death of the body, a partial death of the mind, and a forgettingness on the part of the spiritual being. Which is, in itself, again, a type of death. So we get this.

Now, actually bodies stay around for quite a while after death. Quite ordinarily it takes them a while to decompose. Sometimes as in Egypt they were embalmed. I had the medical examiner of the state of New York—no, it was the medical examiner (that's what they call the coroner) of New York City. He was a good pal of mine one time. He taught me a great deal about writing detective stories. He used to say, "The morgue is open to you any time, Hubbard." We were pretty good friends.

18

But he told me a great deal about decomposition, how various parts of the body decompose before other parts of the body, and actually the cells in the cuticle evidently live the longest, if not the cells in the hair. These little cells actually remain alive for a very long time.

Well, the decaying mechanism which is employed here is effective sooner on some parts of the body than others. On the bloodstream it's effective within about eight or ten minutes. If you stop a person's circulation then the red and white corpuscles and so forth die in eight or ten minutes. That's what people say. I've been dead for a half an hour myself and I probably haven't had my heart beating any longer.

But the first thing one learns about death is that it is not anything of which to be very frightened. If you're frightened of losing your pocketbook, if you're frightened of losing your memory, if you're frightened of losing your girl or your boyfriend, if you're frightened of losing your body, well, that's how frightened you ought to be of dying, because it's all the same order of magnitude.

Now, here we strike the first observable phenomena in death when we find out that the mind, in spite of mechanisms which seek to decay it and wipe it out, does maintain and preserve mental image pictures of earlier existences. And with proper technology and an understanding of this, one can be again possessed of the mental image pictures of earlier existences in order to understand what was going on. But in view of the fact that we have not restored—get this very closely—we have not restored remembrance to the *being*, the mental image pictures usually just continue to be pictures.

So we send somebody into a past life and he looks at a mental image picture and you might as well have sent him to the art gallery. He himself has no connection with this. And quite rightly so, because the mental image picture may be the mind of the body.

Now, the body carries around mental image pictures and a thetan carries around mental image pictures and these two combine to form the mind. The mind then is a bridge between the spirit and the body, and the mental

image pictures formed by a thetan added to the mental image—and confused with—the mental image pictures formed by the body is usually how a thetan stays in a head. It's quite an interesting mechanism. He confuses these two and so on.

Now therefore, demonstration of past existences by running somebody (quote) back down the time track (unquote) and having him look at a picture is not very convincing. Not really very convincing. Well, why isn't it convincing?

Well, the fellow always has some unreality about it. Only now and then do you strike heavily into something a person vividly recalls. So you wouldn't say this was great certainty. Because what, in essence, are you addressing with Scientology processing? You're addressing this being that we call a thetan.

Now, he, incidentally then, being mixed up with a mind, causes you to also address the mind, but also being incidentally mixed up with a body causes you to also address the body. Don't you see? So it works out this way: unless a reality has been restored to this being, he himself has no reality, no recognition of having ever been anything else before.

Now, the restoration of memory to one of these beings is of great interest to us since all that is really wrong with him is that things have happened to him which he knows all about but won't let himself in on.

Therefore the restoration of memory is done as a matter of course in almost any processing. And in view of the fact that it is part of any processing, it is impossible today to process somebody well and expertly without having them sooner or later get some sort of a recall on a past existence with some small reality. It's very hard. You process somebody after a while and then try to tell him he has not lived before and you'll have an argument on your hands. You can invalidate him, you could chew him up, you could chop him down—these things are easily invalidated. Well, why are they easily invalidated is because they are so tenuously remembered. It's very difficult to remember them so they're very easy to knock out.

Well, an individual's own will has a great deal to do with this. One should not look for outside sources as to why his memory is shut off; just as he must grant permission to be trapped, so must he grant permission to be made to remember. This is quite fascinating.

He is more or less convinced that a memory, remembering back past this subject called death, would cause him to reexperience the pain he already feels has been too much for him. Thus he is very reluctant to face up again to this mechanism, and facing death, almost always goes into a bit of an amnesia.

I'm pointing that up again because I have no slightest intentions of having this lecture go into an amnesia. Do you understand that? It could easily do so, deleting these remarks that punch it up, and playing this lecture to some people who knew nothing about Scientology would undoubtedly demonstrate at the end of the lecture that these people, not already having such as you do, a good subjective reality already—small or great, on this subject— you would find them blank. They would be the blankest people. That would be the time to make bets with them or something of the sort or. . . They would be very blank because one has restimulated blankness.

Now, one says, "Well, it's all very well to take a scientific attitude toward death, and, you know—but after all, it does carry with it a little shock and upset." Yeah, that's very true, that's very true. Until you've been dead a few times you wouldn't really understand how upsetting it can be.

We are actually indebted for a considerable amount of our material to the odd fact that I have been officially dead twice. I don't think I've ever

mentioned this very much before, but I died in an operation one time back in the 30s and went outside above the street and felt sorry for myself, decided they couldn't do this to me—the heart—body's heart had stopped beating. And I went back and I grabbed the body by the several—there's a bunch of interesting mechanisms in the head that restimulate a body's heartbeats and so forth, and I just took hold of them and then said "Come on here," and snapped the body back to life.

Well I didn't vividly remember after that exactly what had happened. It's quite amusing that I would fog around on this subject as long as I did. All I knew is that I had confronted a mystery of some sort or another that I couldn't make anything out of.

Now, I'd already been studying the subject of the mind for several years since I'd been in the university and this added just a little fillip to the sauce. And I shortly after that wrote a book which has never been published called "Excalibur" and which according to the *New Yorker* anybody can have a copy of for \$1,500. That's not true. I have never permitted it to be copied, mostly because you now have most of the information in it and because it itself is rather antique and out of date. It was merely a plot of things.

But this was an immediate bout with death which I eventually remembered—one kind or another. And the only reason I mention it is because it happens to so many people and they never mention it. They just never mention it. They go and kick the bucket and come back to life again and somebody or other invalidates them slightly, says, "Well, people always have strange dreams under gas" or something stupid about this thing, and so they shut up about it and they never say anything about it again.

Well, this fact that one has lived before is so restrained that it itself is the reason why it is forgotten. The restraining of it is the reason why it is forgotten. The unpopularity of it in other ages brought about the forgetter mechanism itself which causes an occlusion on the subject of death.

In other words, that one cannot talk about it is enough all by itself to continue to cause the forgetter mechanism. Now, we would run a poor process over a short period of time if we tried to get a fellow to do enough forgetting to forget all about death and therefore get it into restimulation again.

An easier way to plot this would be to ask somebody to whom he could tell the fact that he had been dead. Now, you could just ask somebody this, whether he'd been dead in this life or not. You could simply ask somebody this, you see, as an auditing question. You could say, "To whom could you tell the fact that you have been dead?"

Well now, that's a very fascinating sort of a thing all by itself, and it works something like, "Tell me one person in the world who does not believe you are insane." It's—has a fantastically catalytic effect upon a person. A person, you know, sort of believes he's going wog and spinning and so forth and you ask him that question. I'm telling you this seriously. "Tell me one person in the world who does not believe you are insane." You've broken the agreement chain.

All right, so you could ask a similar question, "Tell me one person in the world who believes you live more than once." And you'd get a similar concatenation reaction.

Now, exactly what happens when death occurs? I say many people have experienced this. I've gone further than that—I have plumbed into this pretty deeply. What with? Oh, E-Meters, checking up with people, checking into children and so on. It's been a rather thoroughgoing research on the matter. I mean, it was a rather tremendous effort that was put out.

Now, on a lie detector or E-Meter, you can put a person on one of these things and you get a peculiar phenomenon, a peculiar behavior of the electrical needles. That's peculiar behavior observed many times, by the way, by police detectives who could never explain it but knew they ran into it every now and then, is merely talking about a time when a being was separate from a mind and body. And it's a peculiar little mechanism—it's a little hunt of the needle, and it just hunts back and forth over a very small area and quite frantically. Now, that indicates that a person is still sitting in one of these exteriorization incidents. All right.

We know a great deal about havingness, we know a lot of other things. We know how a person would suddenly run out of havingness if he died and we would expect this much loss of possession and so forth to wipe him out. Well, let me tell you something—it doesn't wipe him out.

Most people—and this, by the way, is not true to you if it's not true. You understand that, I'm not forcing on you a "Now I'm supposed to behave this way" when you kick the bucket or something. I'm not. It would be easy to do, you see, to form an agreement, "Now we do so-and-so." Couple of thousand years ago somebody got very active at this and they became eventually very, very unpopular. They had a "Now I'm supposed to go somewhere," and that place did not exist and it got a lot of people into trouble.

Now, this is what ordinarily occurs. An individual backs out thinking of his responsibilities, knowing who he is, where he's been, what he's been doing. Ordinarily this occurs. If he's in any kind of condition at all, this is what occurs. He backs out at the moment of death with full memory. Something kills the body, an automobile, too many court suits, too much overdose of widely advertised sleep-producing agents, and the body ceases to function and the moment he conceives it to be no longer functional in any way, he backs out.

At that moment he knows who he is, where he's been and so forth. You expect a total occlusion—mind you, I'm not hanging this one on you. I'm just telling you what ordinarily happens. Usually the—a total occlusion does not occur at this point.

It is not true that a being—a thetan in excellent condition—gets some distance from the body and then doesn't care about it anymore. That is simply a phenomenon of havingness and when we first found that, we thought this was always the case. But then we were striking where thetans ordinarily were on the Tone Scale. This is not true that he gets just so far from his dead body and his last life and so forth, and then forgets all about it or cares nothing about it and so forth.

He's actually gone into the Subzero Scale. He is below apathy. In support of this, you can pick up on the track times when a fellow backed out of his head and was mad as the dickens. And just kicked the stuffings out of the fellow who killed him. Made spirits and this whole theory of spirits very unpopular. People tried to forget this, so when they run around killing people they would get no immediate kickback. Basic reason why one would want that out of the way, isn't it? When one committed a crime, why, one wouldn't have to suffer for it. I'm not saying this is the basis of Christianity but it is true that man has capitalized on this phenomena enormously—the phenomena surrounding death. He'll capitalize on it and capitalize on it. You look around in a neighborhood and if there is a building which is well kept, why, it's normally an undertaking parlor. You look at the average pay of a medico who gets paid whether the patient dies or not and you'll find that pay is very, very high. It is easy to capitalize on this. Why?

30 JULY 1957

Because people, when they think of death, think of loss and grab something. Have you got this? This explains the behavior of relatives after one of their number has died. Everybody gets in there and tears apart all of the person's clothes and fight with each other over the possessions and so on.

They're still alive, but they have experienced a loss of havingness and they pour in on this particular person's effects and they're really to some degree trying to get the person back. They think if they can grab enough dresses they'll get the person back.

It actually is not quite as greedy as it looks, it's just obsessive. They don't know what they're doing. I've seen relatives, for instance—I've been around this many times—I've seen them pick up some of the weirdest things. I saw an old lady one time just screaming over the fact that they wouldn't let her have a fellow's meerschaum pipe and I pointed out to her that she didn't smoke a meerschaum pipe, and she looked at me sort of dazedly and came out of it and said, "So I don't" and handed it to somebody else. It was a token, it was a symbol of the person who had just left. Well, this exact behavior could vary from person to person.

At a certain level a person who had to have, tremendously, would get just so far from a body and he's liable to just say, "Well, I don't care, I don't care, honest, I won't care anymore, I just don't care about it. I don't want anything more to do with it, I just don't want to live anyway and I have—very unhappy during that whole life and I'm awfully glad—I don't care; I don't care." Don't you see?

22

And somebody else is liable to just say *h-h-a-a-a* and not even think about it, see, and just say *huhh*. But that person was so little alive when he was alive that his aliveness after he has died is also negligible.

All right. Now let's take a person who is fairly well up, who is fairly strong, who's fairly capable and somebody knocks off the body. Well, I'll give you a rather interesting reaction on that. "I'll show them they can't put me out of the game," and he did a dive halfway across the country and saw a maternity hospital and grabbed a baby just all in a *bang!* you see? *Rfffff!* Made him mad. Upset him.

Somebody higher than this would not have been in contact with bodies in the first place, so we don't know anything about that—upper reactions.

All right. We're talking about death and *Homo sapiens*. Now, we get an exteriorization here, it's a very fascinating exteriorization because it is totally cognizant. The person knows who he is. He usually has perception, pretty good perception. He knows where his friends are, and for somebody to come around and point out this fantastic spiritual phenomena that somebody appeared to them after he had died several thousand miles away is something like being terribly surprised because a waitress came to the table in a restaurant. Of course, I admit that it's unusual.

But for people to wake up during the night and so on, and realize somebody has died in battle or died a death of violence of some kind or another is only the amount of confusion which is thrown into a being when his body is killed. If he is killed with sudden violence and he's very surprised about the whole thing, he is sufficiently upset and unphilosophical about the whole thing that he is liable to go around and see his next of kin and the rest of his friends in an awful frenzied hurry, you know, trying to reassure himself that he hasn't gone to purgatory or someplace. Because he doesn't go to any purgatory. That's a total myth, total invention to make people—a very vicious lie which was invented just to make people unhappy. I don't like things that are

invented to make people unhappy. I'm peculiar, I know, but I just don't like things like that.

He has suffered the loss of mass. Now, if an—if an individual had an automobile—if you had an automobile sitting out here on the street and you came our totally expecting to find this automobile there and it's gone, it's been stolen and so forth, you'd be upset. Well, that's just about the frame of mind a thetan is usually in when he finds his body dead. It's quite interesting, but he is upset, he's disturbed about it. He's below 2.0 on the Tone Scale, and his main thought is to grasp another body. Well, this he can do finding a young child or something that he could bring back to life. Thetans are pretty good at this, by the way. People wanting to heal things are quite interesting. People who have to heal things and so forth are practicing up, I guess, in case they have to bring a body back to life.

But the ordinary entrance is sometime around what we call the assumption, and the assumption occurs within a few minutes after birth in most cases. The baby is born and *then* a thetan picks the baby up. That's the usual proceeding.

However, this thetan could have hung around for a long time. And you say, "How do people behave?" You ask the same question of how do thetans behave when they suddenly haven't got a body. They behave like people. They'll hang around people, they'll see somebody who's pregnant and they'll follow them down the street. That's right. They'll hang around the entrance to an accident ward and find some body that is all banged up and the being that had that body has taken off or is about to or is in a frame of mind to, and does so, and pick up this body and pretend to be somebody's husband or something of the sort.

They do all sorts of odd things. It isn't necessarily true that all of this is taped, measured, laid out and so on. I'm telling you what is standard about this behavior and what is not. When a new body is picked up, if a new body is picked up at all, is not standardized beyond saying it usually occurs, most of the time, unless the thetan got another idea, two or three minutes after the delivery of a child from the mother. Then about the time he first—the baby takes its first gasp, why, a thetan usually picks it up.

Now, would the body go on living without a thetan picking it up? Well, that is beside the point. That is beside the point. It's a case of how fast can you pick one up before somebody else gets it. So there's a certain anxiety connected with this.

Now, thetans often say very interesting prayers at the moment they pick up a body. They do. They dedicate themselves to its continued growing and they're so pleased with the whole thing and they dedicate themselves to the family and go through all kinds of odd rituals of one kind or another—they're so happy to get this. But the odd part of it is, they don't shut their memory off until they pick another body up. And the shut-off of memory actually occurs with the pickup of the new body.

Now, there *is a* phenomena, a series, known as the between-lives series, and people have some sort of a thing mocked up whereby somebody goes back through a between-lives area, it is called, and so on. This can be plotted. It is not unusual. The phenomena connected with it, however, is so questionable and so variable and the places people go makes one think that some thetans belong to one club and some belong to another club. But it's not that "Everybody does this" and "Now I'm supposed to," it's certainly not a constant.

Now, until 13 or 1400 the between-lives area operations weren't thriving at all. They got very few customers. That's right. And then they started to

pick it up more and more. They had to knock witchcraft totally out of Europe before the between-lives area clubs or whatever they were, started thriving. They had to knock out any idea of demons and spirits. In other words, they had to make one feel guilty for hanging around, admiring the trees with no body to look through. And they succeeded in doing this. And if you look it over carefully you'll find out that you could make a little kid sick just by talking to him about this sort of thing. You could have done it more easily a few—couple, three hundred years ago than you could do it now. But just start talking to him about ghosts and spirits and how bad they are and how fearful they are and the kid doesn't like it. He gets upset. He can be scared very easily. Why can he be scared very easily? One, you're restimulating times when he's exteriorized, and two, you are invalidating him and throwing him down tone like mad. He is a ghost, he is a spirit, he is a demon. Got it? I mean he is all these bad things they've mocked up.

Now, in view of the fact that two exteriorizations take place, this could get very complicated as one looked at it—because the *GE* exteriorizes. And I have never followed a *GE* where he goes to go someplace else, to do something else, to pick up something else and so forth. I don't know anything about it.

There is something that mocks up bodies that we call a genetic entity, and it skips from life to life. Incredible, but it does. It skips from life to life as neat as you please. In other words, a body doesn't even live once—just once.

24

Now, it's a funny thing what I'm saying to you because it is so obvious once you look at it. If a body lived only once it would never have learned how. I mean, it's just one of these sweepingly stupid things to tell people that a body just lives once. It just couldn't be. I mean. . . Very weird. Somebody would have to be standing around mocking them up all the time and teaching them, and they'd have to have a full college education and more than that before they were ever fit to cry and wet their diapers. That's right, isn't it? They'd have to have a terrific amount of know-how. The intricacy of a body itself is something that has developed over a long period of time. Bodies learn how.

Well now, what do you mean, "learn how"? Well they become storage places for data, and we have to assume the simplest explanation—there are several explanations for this—we have to assume one, that a body is a collection of little things called cells, each one of which is a spirit. That's kind of goofy, isn't it? Or it is something which some spirit somewhere continues to imbue with life. And if you've ever seen an army of ants on the march and seen their coordinated behavior, and then if you've ever taken a microscope and looked for anything in an ant that could ever have done any thinking or anything else, you have to assume there—they can't even communicate with each other. I have bedeviled ants in one way or the other. I have even got in their heads and tried to run them. Something gets awfully mad at you when you start monkeying around with an ant. It's quite interesting. You won't let him walk along in his machine fashion and certain way, and something gets awful mad someplace or another and it isn't the ant.

So when a body dies then whatever made the body, developed it, operated it mechanically and kept it going otherwise, evidently does it all over again.

Now, there's another explanation for this and that is that a thetan decays to a point where he becomes a body cell, and one eventually becomes a body cell and knows his place in the whole thing and has been thoroughly educated in how to perform as a body cell.

This is totally valid as an explanation. It says you sooner or later would not be able to get out of your head and you would go into the body, crunch,

and you would remain there forever carrying along from body to body and so forth with your experience and so on.

It's a very wonderful way to frighten people. And *totally* impossible. The mathematical computation involved would require as many lives back as there are cells in the body and we have so grandly exceeded the half-life of this universe (which is rather easily computable in numbers of ways)—we've gone back so many trillions of trillions of quad-trillions of quad-billions of years, that there is no such concatenation of life and there couldn't be any such operating activity. We count the number of separate living cells there are in a body one after the other and we come up with the fact that if each one got trapped in the body and lived a lifetime, we just went back—it's an uncomputable thing. It doesn't even work if you picked up one every minute from here to the beginning of eternity. It's just still—they are utterly countless.

You just turn a microscope on and you look at the numbers of them and you'll find the main trick of the universe, how the universe absolutely cows us, each and every one, and that is under the whole subject of quantity. They make us look at quantity, and that in itself is a trap.

Each of us is one. And each of us looks at the many and sees that it is so many that we ourselves are rather staggered by the whole thing and feel ourselves inadequate. But when we realize that some preclears are dead in their heads and some preclears are exteriorized rather easily, we see that there's a difference amongst beings. Well, I don't know why we're so egocentric that we believe there could be only one type of thetan. I don't know why this would be the case at all. Why should we assume there's only one type of thetan? Be kind of a silly thing to assume.

The way you lick this quantity thing is very interesting, is when you look at a tree, look at one leaf. Odd things happen to you if you do that. But it is not true, as far as I can determine in any way, shape or form, that the body is composed totally of trapped thetans or that the wall over there is composed totally of trapped thetans. See, it's just not true. It's not easily established, but it certainly doesn't hold water. Doesn't make sense in view of the fact that it is so numerous and the body's cells are so numerous that we come a cropper at once. We say, "Well, there's something someplace mocking up a lot of something." And when you realize that you have the capability of endowing with life, things, why then we don't even know that the genetic entity is alive.

We don't know that it's alive at all. It might be just a machinery or a computation of one kind or another that goes on, that you continue to endow with life to some degree until you separate from it. In view of the fact it's impossible to trap you in the first place, it must be with your consent; you certainly wouldn't consent that far. All right.

However this may be, it is quite interesting to note another phenomenon of death and that is that a thetan will stay around a body until it is disposed of properly. And you can take an E-Meter and any preclear and you can find times when he's been left out on a cliff and nobody even put the lid on the coffin and there it is exposed to the wind and rain; and he'll stay around there until that body is totally dust. How very fascinating. Decomposition: phenomena connected with. Bodies left out in the open decompose. Bodies buried in the ground go to pieces in a hurry. However, there are certain parts of the body that can be preserved. But these cells that have been preserved are no longer living cells. Most hair that is expected to grow after death—you dig up a dead body, and—I don't know what other kind there is—but you dig

up a body and you'll find that the dehydration of the skin is such as to have caused an apparent growing of the fingernails and hair. In other words, the skin receded so the hair and fingernails got longer.

Now, a body—rate of decay of—is not really a point in question, except a thetan will try to accelerate it if the body isn't cared for. You leave a body in an open field or something like that and nobody takes care of it, they just say, "Well, that's an old body over there. There's a dead man over there, there's a girl dumped down there in the crick. Who cares?" you know, in some advanced society such as 1984—and you'll find that a thetan will sort of hang around and say, "Well, let's see, can't we push this thing in the crick?" or "Can't we do something with it? Can't we get it out of sight?"

Now, a thetan doesn't much care concerning the actual disposition of the body as long as it isn't given any more indignity than it suffered in the lifetime. But he is apt to be very upset about indignities rendered to a dead body. Even while he is (quote) "in a body, alive," when the body is apparently alive and he's taking one around, he gets upset, if he's in any kind of shape at all, about bodies being abused and mistreated. See? But he gets upset about this a little bit.

But much lower on the scale, he's still upset about indignities to dead bodies and dead things. "Well, we mustn't speak harshly about him after all the fellow is dead." He has subscribed to this, very thoroughly subscribed to it.

26

Very well. A thetan exteriorizes rather easily from a body when it kicks off and dies. Exteriorizes with total recall, but sometimes with a great deal of confusion. He starts pulling mental image pictures apart and he doesn't know where he is and his perception won't turn on right away and he has an awful time and he struggles through it and he eventually picks up another body one way or the other, somehow or other gets himself there and gets himself going again. Some thing—kind of a condition like this is liable to continue; he's liable to live several lives in a fine state of confusion, with bad perception and so on. One day, why, he crashes into the high-tension line. You know what an airport is—it's a body of land surrounded by high-tension wires. And he crashes into some high-tension wires or gets thrown out of an airplane, and steps on the third rail, something of this sort and something happens to the energy masses that have been obscuring his sight; which is a loss of havingness again too. But it isn't havingness which makes the thetan. It's his relationship to havingness that makes him. He has certain relationships and when he gets rid of that then he gets rid of certain mass that was causing him to be blind or something of the sort, why, he takes a look around and there he is.

Sometimes a thetan's gone for several hundred years without any clear view of anything and one day wound up on an electric fence, pitched there by Farmer Brown's worst bull, you know. And he's stone-dead, the body is, and all of a sudden he's thirty-five feet behind it, looking around—it's a very bright clear day. "What am I doing here? Oh! Well, I can't get that body off the wire again." And he's liable to hang around, wait till somebody shuts the current off, gets the body off the wire, at least wraps it up in a blanket or gunnysack or something like that and dumps it in a hole in the ground.

He associates the body with his own identity to the degree that every time an indignity is rendered to the body he thinks it is to some degree being rendered to him. Therefore he hangs around a body until it's properly disposed of. When people make wills in which they declare a certain disposition of the body, it's a very, very wise thing, if you want the fellow to go on and live a happy life

someplace else and so forth, to carry out those wishes. I don't care what they are. "Dump the ashes seven miles south of Oahu." All right. Dump them seven miles south of Oahu. So what? That's the way he wanted his ashes. That's that. Because it's his idea of what is proper care. See, that's his idea.

Now, the Egyptian had the idea of living forever. They wanted their bodies to live forever. They thought that was very complimentary so they'd wrap them up and mummify them and anoint them in oils, but don't think that a thetan hung around just because his body had been mummified.

Now, because he had gone away and gotten lost someplace, as far as he was concerned he was on some other genetic line, he never would be particularly upset about his body or something of the sort because it had been hauled out of a tomb and left to rot someplace or been put up in the Metropolitan Museum, you see. And take a mummy out of a tomb, let it rot and go to pieces in the sand or something or put it in a museum and put a tag on it—he already would have been too far away from it to worry about it.

One very worrisome case—a thetan whose skull was used by a carnival and the carnival had put a motor in the jaws and made the jaws keep operating and the thetan just couldn't take it—the fact that the jaws were moving. And then some sort of a speaking tube had been run through the back end of the skull so that all the time the jaws wiggled, why, words were coming out of it. And I actually had to unwrap a preclear from that particular skull. He still had a finger on that skull even though he had another body.

People become curators of museums just to keep a finger on a body they might have had once. This is no respecter of persons; I mean, one person isn't more interesting or peculiar than another, they're all interesting and peculiar on these lines.

27

Every once in a while some fellow will go into some area and go completely berserk and not know quite what's wrong with him. Well, he's gotten killed there, he's left something there or something like that. He goes into an area and he says, "I don't feel safe here. I have a terrible feeling like something awful is going to happen." Well, he very possibly has been killed in the area under similar circumstances. But usually it's in the area; it's much more accurate than that.

Now, don't confuse this with prediction. A thetan can actually predict the future. Since I, two and a half weeks ago, even before I received any word about Peggy I knew that she was going to go and about when. Told several people this. This is prediction. It doesn't have anything to do with that.

But one predicts rather easily on the subject of death because it is so all-embracing as a concern. Someday something is going to take your mock-up away from you. Well, because you've lost many bodies without knowing what took them, then it is very easy for you to mock up heavens, hells, angels, all sorts of things that are going to grab your body. You can even mock up something—the old man with the scythe, and there are many people who believe this utterly, that there is a fellow named Death who comes along and takes the body away. Oh, undertakers take it away or other people take it away—garbage-disposal units. But there is no such being.

Now, of course a thetan could always mock himself up as such a being and be such a being and go round and whisper sweet nothings in people's ears about how he was Death, and sometimes it works. Got rid of an insurance agent that time—once.

The subject of death is never a very serious one to a Scientologist beyond the fact that he feels kind of sorry for himself sometimes. There was somebody

of such terrific elan, somebody who made him real happy to be around and so forth, and this person was thoughtless enough to dispose of a mock-up and go out of communication. And a person feels pretty unhappy about it. It's a thoughtless thing for a friend to do.

Now this, by the way, was a very early concept of death. You've no more nor less than you've progressed back to death as it was regarded very early on this particular track in this universe—a person didn't regard it very seriously. The Roman never regarded death very seriously. He probably had a very accurate idea of more or less of what happened to him, then he went into idolatry and then he kept going and he finally hit bottom. Anyway . . .

Death is, in itself, a technical subject. You can, with considerable confidence, reassure some husband whose wife is dying or has just died, that she got out all right and she is going someplace and pick up a mock-up. If you got there while that person could still talk, still communicate MESTwise with you, in the last moments they usually have something spotted, something planned.

Now, the person doesn't just back out ordinarily and forget all about it. They back out of it with full identity, they hang around for quite a while, they're usually there for the funeral, certainly. They very often hang around their possessions and so forth to see that they're not abused. And they can be given considerable drops in tone and given upsets if their wishes aren't carried out with regard to certain things. I wouldn't go so far as to say that any thetans in this day and age outside of Scientology had any force or ability to punish people for not carrying out their wishes after death. But certainly it used to happen, and people then said this was superstition, and science was against superstition. Well, it's quite interesting that we have turned around the other way and we find out what's science and what's superstition and we find out that a being is capable of almost anything, providing it is within his ability to execute.

Now, sometimes a thetan gets so furious that he gets hallucinatory. He goes round killing his enemies in all directions and they don't even exist. Motto: have your reality in good condition before you die.

There are many processes which exteriorize people and give them a high level of reality on this. Amongst those processes—the key process that produces the phenomena without any great shock is old Stop, Change and Start—produces the phenomenon of exteriorization rather easily. Even on somebody who was terribly dead in his head you can ask him to keep his head from going away and he's liable to blow out. Next time you run it on him he's liable not to. But I've taken people who were terribly dead in the head—this is the clincher—thetans do not become body cells. Thetans do not become walls. Thetans can get out of any trap they're in but sometimes it's better to be in a trap than nowhere. That's true of most people.

And a thetan does back out. He very often carries with him a theta body: he's got some sort of a mocked up body on the past track which is a number of facsimiles of old bodies he has misowned and he is carrying along with him and which—control mechans [mechanisms] of which he uses to control the body he is using. That's all there is to a theta body. It's facsimiles of old bodies he's had and controlled and he uses these same sets of controls on any new body he picks up, and he eventually develops quite a heavy, thick automatic control theta body. They're quite interesting. Many times they have electronic claws and all sorts of things. Usually the theta body structure has an electronic beam that goes down each of the fingers and he opens and closes his hand with sort of beams. This is going off into structure. But he sometimes pulls out with this theta body complete and simply takes it along.

DEATH

He can also pull out of the theta body but he hasn't got a prayer of ever becoming a cell. Not a prayer. You can hope, but it won't do you very much good.

Now, I have made an actual test of this and I can assure you this is the case. I have taken people who were totally dead in the head, had no perception of any kind, could not possibly have gotten out of their heads, would have been the people, as weak as they were, that would have gotten stuck in bodies and gone on the genetic lines and had very many disastrous things happen to them, and I have fed them such things as ipecac, which is very vile material which made them so ill that they thoroughly hoped they would die. And in each and every case when they would get very, very low and very close to the borderline, why, they would go out—one fellow went out and sat on a bell buoy and just sat there for a long time feeling very sad about the whole thing, and then came back and noticed the body was getting better so he picked it up again.

This was done to him again and he did more or less the same thing, but he knew he was being fooled this time so he didn't go so far and he came back rather rapidly.

But one way or another I've managed to exteriorize anybody had anything to do with, and they have known who they were and what they were doing after they got out of their heads, and this rather demonstrates conclusively that a person does not get trapped and that death is just another phenomenon and it's about as dangerous and upsetting as losing your family or your pocketbook or some other possession. And a person loses his body and after that behaves accordingly and out of this a great mystery is made. But that is death, the phenomena of. And I hope sometime or another you may have no use for this whatsoever.

Thank you.

SURPRISE-THE ANATOMY OF SLEEP

A lecture given on 31 July
1957

Good evening. It's a very good thing that you've had a nice, relaxing day with nothing to do because we have some things to take up this evening which will require a great deal of your attention, run your energy down a great deal.

Therefore I think it's a very, very good thing that you've had a nice, quiet day and you've not gotten anything done and you're not tired.

I notice there are a few cases present of what they call "Upper Indoc voice." This is a malady which occurs occasionally when students go into an Upper Indoc Course and it's just a matter of course if it's a little hoarse.

Audience: Oohhhhhh!

It wasn't intended to rhyme.

Now, I'll tell you a cure for Upper Indoc voice, if you care to have one.

Audience: Yeah.

Cure number one, step number one: you get the effort necessary to restrain the student from yelling while coaching.

Audience: Huh? Go over that again.

The effort to restrain the student you are coaching from yelling. Now, you just get the effort to restrain him from yelling. Probably has nothing to do with your voice at all, see? Nothing about the yelling you did.

Then the second step is: "Whom could you reach with your voice?" And make sure it's "whom." We might have a Boston preclear on that and he wouldn't understand "Who could you reach with your voice?" You know? And this will clear it up nicely. And on the other hand, there's another way to clear it up and then that's just flatten the process.

What is this? This is lecture thirteen, isn't it? Lecture thirteen, 18th ACC, July 31, 1957. And the subject of this lecture this evening is surprise. And as soon as we get through with that, why, we will take up these questions.

Now, surprise is the *modus operandi*, evidently, behind aberration because the first thing that a thetan wants to have anything to do with—and as Jan Halpern once said, he mocks up a little black box and looks into the little black box to see if there's anything in it and there's something in it, why, he's surprised. In other words, he works out surprises on himself all the time.

And what is a surprise? It's a change of pace; it's something one did not predict. Technical definition: a surprise is an occurrence which one did not predict. Got that?

Audience: Yeah. Yes.

31 JULY 1957

Well, that means an awful lot because it means there's no future. You were busy predicting a future and suddenly the future that you predicted was gone. That would make a surprise. You said, "I'm going to sit here all afternoon and drink lemonade" and somebody comes, gives you a birthday present. Well, you might have gotten a birthday present, but for sure you didn't get the rest of the afternoon drinking lemonade. You follow this?

Male voice: Yes.

It's a change of pace. You don't get the havingness you bargained on.

Now, when surprises become insidious, something like a cannonball hits you in the torso and de-torsos you—and you haven't got a torso but it was an awful surprise.

Death, of which I spoke to you in the last lecture, usually has bad repercussions only when attended with surprise. Give you an example—this afternoon a fellow walking down the street in Washington, DC and he's hit with an Indian arrow between the shoulder blades, which kills him dead.

Tightrope walker—once every matinee, twice every evening he walks the tightrope hundreds of feet above the ground, thousands of feet, balances there on a hair trigger of nowhere, ready to plunge to his doom for the edification of the entire audience. He goes home, sits down in the kitchen, drinks a cup of coffee and dies of glass poisoning. It's a surprise. He didn't predict it, but there it is. Change of pace.

Now, an individual who has experienced many very arduous shocks gets to a point where he cannot change pace. He will not change pace. No matter what hits him, he will not change pace. And this is what we call "no effect."

Now, there's an experimental process that runs like this: you mock up somebody and have him experience a surprise. Go on and do it. I'm not going to flatten it; just do it. Mock up somebody and have him experience a surprise. Good. Mock up somebody else and have him experience a surprise. Good. Mock up somebody else and have him experience a surprise.

Were you able to have him experience a surprise the first time or did he just go on about his business?

Audience: No. No.

He really got a surprise.

Audience: Yeah.

Well, that means you're in pretty good shape.

Now, mock up somebody and have him experience a surprise. Do you see what's necessary to have him experience a surprise?

Audience: Yeah.

Hm?

Male voice: Surprise!

Second male voice: Change of pace.

His future has to have shifted. A fellow's walking down the street, his future is the remainder of the sidewalk. But a coconut falls on his head and he only gets just that much sidewalk that he is lying on. Do you see this?

All right. Now, to those mock-ups you made, why, okay! Right! Fine. Thank you!

Now.. . Come out of it. Come up to present time. Look at the front of the room. All right, end of process. Now, it's all right with you if I ended the process that abruptly, isn't it? Yes, I knew it would be. Thank you very much. I mean, nothing like running a smooth session.

This is a very important anatomy. We've known about this anatomy for a very, very, very, very, very long time. But in an effort to explain what

SURPRISE-THE ANATOMY OF SLEEP

control is, it has become absolutely necessary, vitally necessary to understand surprise, prediction and change of pace. Do you see this? Vitally necessary. Because you're looking at the anatomy of control and why it works.

Individual has been surprised, he's been surprised and been surprised and been surprised and some more surprise and some more surprise. And every time he got surprised, he resisted it one way or the other. There was a moment there that he resisted it. He tried for an instant, at least, to control it. No matter how tiny the instant was, he still tried to control what was happening if he didn't want to lose his mock-up or something of that character.

So we find people who have had too many shocks—a serious sort of surprise, that's a shock—and other such things, we find people who have experienced too many of these with large ridges and warning systems and all kinds of weird things around by which they seek to do some controlling themselves. Because those threw people out of control, didn't they? Well, wonderful thing to use those to throw people out of control. But the final result of all surprises is: out of control. You notice when you were doing the mock-ups, you had your person go out of control, right? All right. Other words for out-of-controlness are hysteria, anxiety, fear, misemotion in general. Those are all out-of-controlnesses.

Now, every time a person who has large numbers of these things stacked around finds that something is seeking to control him, he misidentifies the thing and he says, "This is the explosion that knocked my head off in 1812." See, it sought to control him, too, you see?

"Control is very bad." In other words, anything that inflows must therefore be an incipient surprise. Something is going to surprise him. If he permits himself to be controlled, if he permits his "no effect" ridge to be broken up, in other words, he is going to get a surprise and he's not going to like it.

All right. Why does Tone 40 "Give Me Your Hand" work? Why does Tone 40 8-C work? It is directly opposed to a games condition and therefore should not work at all. But it works best on those cases which are way down south on the subject of games conditions and which have flipped. Works best on a flipped case.

Now, I talked to you about that the other evening. Every time they tried to make an effect—they are going to have a total effect on others. Then they drop below this point and when they try to—they think of terms of effect it's going to be a total effect on them. Well, you're looking at the same anatomy; you're looking at the mechanical anatomy of surprise when you're looking at effect and no-effect and so forth.

All right. Now, the individual is allergic to any effect because they are so surprising. And all these surprises add up, to him, to no havingness. Which means no future. When you start to audit him with "Give me your hand. Thank you," or some such auditing command, or Tone 40 8-C, not consulting at all with him, he becomes quite sure that he's being controlled. He gets sure of that. And all of his resistances to control, which are the resistances to the masses and surprises, rise up and smite him—pass on through, dissolve. And their common denominator is *stop*. And he's trying to say "Stop." Got that?

So the more he's hit with, the more he conceives he must stop it and the harder he tries to stop it. But eventually he discovers something very fantastic that he never noticed before: that you are simply asking him to extend his hand. And you've been doing it for some little time and he is still alive, he still has a body and he has a future. You in essence give him back all the

future he has lost because of shocks and surprises, when you control him directly. Then he can straighten out his own sights on this. He has been terribly fixated on past bursts and controls and upsets and these past bursts and controls, upsets have thrown him. He's gotten to a point of where he says, "Nothing must come my way, nothing must control me. I know what would happen if something started to control me. It would kill me. It would finish off the future; there'd be no more future." And his immediate response to it is, "Stop. Don't do it anymore." You understand this?

So Tone 40 overtly runs out these various miscontrols by simply putting a good control along the line. Therefore the control has to be very good.

Now, I'll tell you something amusing about this. If you freeze the process—you've said, "Give me your hand. Thank you," and—whatever auditing command—and you then freeze the process and you ask the preclear how he's getting along, if you catch him just after one of these restimulations has gone through, one of these enturbulences, one of these out-of-controlnesses, he'll say yes, he should continue.

But let's say we keep on running it and he starts to scream or get upset or get agitated in some way and at a high point of agitation we freeze it and we ask him how he's getting along and whether we should continue the process or not, he will tell us, "No! No! Don't! Don't!" He isn't talking; that isn't he. That isn't his motivation at all. You continue it a few more commands and get that particular peak level so that he's merely gasping or sitting there with a glassy-eyed brace, you ask him if he should be audited any further, he'll say, "Definitely, yes." That's him talking. "You think this is doing you any good?" He'll say yes.

Now, it's very funny, you don't have to get these peaks very far down to get the person saying yes. Little Tinny-Tin, ill, processing him a second time, properly open session, processing—he started to go right on out the window. "You want to process me?"—he's going to go right on out the window. He was quite ill and it was more or less at a peak, his restimulation. And I didn't have to argue very hard to get him to sit down and then I started the process. And at three years of age, a few minutes deep in the processing, why, he said, yes, he needed some processing, yes, it was doing him some good. Not because he was propitiating. A little further along the line, he was crying at high C and very upset and his fever fluctuating all over the place and he said no, he didn't want any processing. And on the very next command, again extended his hand—himself, all by himself without any prompting—and did this throughout the process. Came down to a very interestingly high peak; that is to say, it came down to a high peak. He was crying very hard and he slacked up just a little bit and I froze the process and I said, "How are you doing now?"

He stopped crying, he said, "I'm doing all right."

I said, "Do you think I ought to keep on with the process?"

And he said, "Yes!"

So I said "Give me your hand" and instantly he went back into the same crying, you see? After it was all over he said that did him some good.

In other words, he was perfectly aware of being controlled. And while he was in control of himself in any way, he was perfectly willing to go on with the process. But when he was totally out of control, he said "No!" In other words, he'd identified the process at such a peak with some old energy mass, some ridge, some experience. They would have called it, back several hundred years ago in the days of Freud—several thousand years ago—they would have

called it "you're experiencing psychic trauma." And when he is experiencing a psychic trauma, he didn't want any processing. But when he could breathe all by himself without something strangling him, just barely breathe, you see—he could barely get one eye out from underneath whatever was attacking him, he said yes. That from a three-year-old. Older preclears are seldom this sensible.

Now, the more shock there is on the case, the more frozen the responses. Now, how do you keep from getting surprised? Well, you could probably list a half a dozen ways of not getting surprised. Common denominator of all of them is "control everything in the whole universe." And if you control everything in the whole universe, nothing is going to surprise you. There are other ways of getting sideways from control. One of them is being apathetic about everything, not caring what happens so that nothing affects you in any way. That's a method of keeping from getting controlled. Any misemotion is a method of not being controlled. There's another method of not being controlled: that's not living. Very interesting method of keeping from being controlled.

But the common denominator of it all is, under no circumstances can anything in the whole universe get out from underneath control. All right, somebody—we see a little—a ball, a kid's ball rolls across the sidewalk. Now, a person who is hypercontrol, you see, has been surprised too much. Get the same thing, you know? He's—hypercontrol, been surprised too much: same thing. This the entrance point on all of this, is the far-south case. Catatonic schiz is just *rigidly* "no more surprises."

All right. This ball rolls across the sidewalk, this supercontrol case says, "*Nnnnyaah!*" Why? Why? Well, the ball is demonstrating that it is not under his control.

Little kid runs in the room and says, "*Nyaaa, nyaaa, nyaaa.*" The super-control case says, "*Dzzz, nyaaaaa, ahhhh, ruuuh, uhh, uuhhhh, uhh!* I get so nervous around children!"

Well, what's this nervousness? It's one of these ridge masses which was—had an out-of-controlness in it and it's starting to throw him out of control, don't you see? So he sees something he doesn't control, he starts to go out of control. He just Q's-and-A's with it at once.

If you wanted to make a person who would not control anything control something, along the Pavlovian, Russian, Stanford University type of abuses, you could actually use this datum and advance their technology up to a point of where at least some of it worked. And that would be something on this order: you would take a fellow who was going to control an awful lot of people or who had to or something of the sort and you would get him walking along and everything he touched would explode, except some things wouldn't—except some whistled. And you just give him large numbers of unpredictednesses, all of which had some jolt and all of them connected with people in some fashion. And when you got through, he would be exhibiting what *Homo sapiens* call leadership. He would be obsessively controlling everybody.

Hitler—Hitler on the Western Front as a corporal, this young Austrian upstart had a few too many shells land too close, had a few too many fellows blow up in his vicinity and at the end of it he had enough of it on the track so that if there was anything in the entire world not under his control, it would have driven him berserk! Some thirty million human beings died because of Adolf Schicklgruber but he was a "great leader." Millions, eighty-five millions of people followed him practically to their deaths. There were people all over

31 JULY 1957

the United States saying, "Well, you can do business with Hitler; I don't know why we're going to war with Hitler. He's probably doing all right for Germany. Great leader."

This tells you how to handle a general if you ever have to handle him — he's getting uppity, getting too "generalized." When you talk to him, just keep waving your hands in front of his face, like this. Just use your hands lots. Speed it up, get it up above the motion of Italians, you know? And say, "Well general, I tell you—it's like this. Well. . ." and so forth. And at first he'll just seek to tear your head off. And after a while he'll just sit back in apathy. And if you were to reach over and close his eyes, they'd shut. And you said, "You're now a dog. Bark." His next general order would be, "Arf, arf, arf."

Leadership. Leadership in *Homo sapiens* is based upon necessity to control for one's own safety and security. Therefore we have a bunch of only-ones in charge of the show. We give them an atom bomb and say, "Go ahead and blow our heads off, that's a good big surprise. That's just the way to run governments." Go find all the has-beens that can't stand up to any more surprises and who get nervous every time a piece of paper rattles, and then put them in charge of all of us. That's the way to do it. Only you never really find any leadership until an individual is capable of taking an awful lot of surprise. I mean real, effective leadership can't exist until somebody can stand up and—to surprises.

36

Because the whole business of being an executive is having surprising pieces of paper shoved under your face. Always they're very surprising because people you have in organizations quite often specialize in handing out surprises; they dramatize them. Knock water coolers over, get them to leak down into the files where all the precious documents are kept and "Wonder how that happened!" Hide the keys to the doors you're trying to get into.

The fact that a president of the United States would look older at the end of his term of office demonstrates in the first place that he couldn't stand a surprise. Must be a terrible shock just to associate with the United States Senate. Be something on the order of being shot up with siege guns twenty-four hours a day. They consider as a high priority of business the appointment of the postmaster of Fairhope, Alabama, you see? That's the only thing that concerns them because he—after all, he brought in his whole family and he has thirty-two people in his family and means a lot of votes. And these people think up all sorts of things in order to get attention. They find out the only way you can get attention is to surprise hell out of somebody.

There's a lot of shock connected with leading anything, this is for sure. An individual shouldn't be stiffly proofed against this shock. He should merely be able to handle it. He should be able to be surprised and still have a future. You see that as a necessity for any such activity.

All right, you're looking at the common denominator of most of the blowup reactions that you get on the part of pcs. Now, everybody's got a few too many surprises. It's not true that everybody's gone to a point of where they have to control everybody in the whole universe before they themselves are safe. That's not true.

But it is true that individuals at any level to some degree keep a finger on loaded .45 automatics when they're in the room, you know, they're—just keep the finger away from them, push them away. I remember a federal marshal came in waving one under my nose and I pushed the muzzle away, took it away from him and put it back in his holster. I didn't like the idea of the thing being pointed at me. But my adjudication was fairly sane. The fellow

SURPRISE-THE ANATOMY OF SLEEP

was too nervous; he didn't know very much about guns. Well now, if the muzzle had been pushed away with violence, on a reactive level, he would have fired it. You see this? Well, you see a slight difference here. It would be necessary to handle the things you handle on a line that will handle them. That sounds awfully simple, doesn't it? I mean, if you're going to handle something, handle it. Don't misemotion it.

There's various ways of handling comm lines that handle things. You can extend a comm line in a certain direction or put comm lines on certain vias that handle situations for you. It's no more than tactics and strategy. It's quite another thing to be totally obsessed on control. Because you will not plan or plot a comm line at all. You will just try to get the other person to explode; they don't explode, so you explode. And that is the cycle of a rage or an upset or an apathy. See, you try to get the other person to explode and he doesn't and you do. Well, he didn't explode because you couldn't communicate an explosion very well.

If you're not allergic to surprises and not upset about surprises, you can blow his silly head off. You wouldn't get yours blown off. So it's quite the contrary—on the upper scale a person could hand out surprises without much liability as long as he could communicate. But if he couldn't communicate, why, any surprise that he tries to hand out will be a reactive one that he doesn't even know about and then this surprises *him* and he explodes.

So we get the usual day of such a case would be something on this order: gets up in the morning, decides he'll kill his wife, realizes he can't, cuts himself with a razor; goes in and starts to eat breakfast, decides he'll shoot the cook, realizes he can't do that, chokes on an egg. Get this? Little inverted cycle. The overt act becomes the motivator at once. Thinks he'll hand out a wonderful surprise to the office when he gets there but—that is to say, he'll drop a hand grenade on the floor. Doesn't have one. Instead of that, why, gets gas pains. This is the way it goes. This is the cycle of his day, hour by hour, minute by minute. It's enough for such a person to decide to surprise somebody some way or another and get awfully upset himself.

Now, it isn't just a thetan that gets in this frame of mind. Actually, the body has enormous numbers of retained surprises of one kind or another. And a thetan can pick up a body that has a lot of surprises in it he doesn't know anything about. And then he starts wondering what's wrong with *him*, and this misowns the whole works. And after that he's a complete wreck. They weren't his in the first place.

Now, Tone 40, with the extension of the hand, Tone 40 8-C alike blow up the body's antisurprise machinery, see? It blows up the body's reactions as well as a thetan's reactions. But the body probably has thousands more than a thetan. So nearly every blowup that you look at is a body blowup. Then the thetan is liable to say, "I wonder how come I blew up about this." Well, that's a misnomer. He didn't ever blow up about it. The body blew up and he went out of an ability to control the body and he had a hard time getting back into control of the body. And that's the usual cycle that occurs.

A fellow who's dead in his head of course is just thinking of himself as the body. The body reaction is his reaction, his reaction is the body's reaction and that's all there is to it and there's nothing you can do about it anyhow because we all know we're men from mud. "The men from mud"—hey, that's a—that's a—hey, that's a good science fiction. . . "The Men from Mud." Ah, well. . .

Well, okay, you got this surprise pretty well taped? Hm?

Audience: Yeah.

Now, use the phrase like "counter-control" rather than control. You're not really controlling somebody with CCH 1, CCH 2, so much as you are counter-controlling blowups. The blowup is seeking to control, you control, then boom. What blows up? An individual is convinced that he cannot be controlled because everything—anytime anything controls him, one of these blowups starts to occur; you control him and that's a counter-control, see? And he finds out the blowup didn't kill him and he's still alive and he can still function. That is, most of the time he finds it out.

The divine doubt of whether or not the process works will enter your mind, many times. You'll be processing some person that's been in an automobile accident and all of a sudden they start to moan and scream and it's obvious that the more you process them, the more they moan and scream. You say, "Well, I'm probably doing wrong; undoubtedly they're getting worse." If you were to put a thermometer in the hands of a—in the mouth of a sick man, you put a thermometer in his mouth and—so that you could watch it while you processed him—you'd see your processing taking his temperature right on down. It's quite interesting. Usually a case of you knowing where to stop. Don't take it too far subnormal. Ninety-six and a half is about as far down as you want to go on something like that.

Understand more about this now?

Audience: Yes.

38

Well now, this is the counter-control process, see? An individual gets into this obsessed control simply because he dare not be surprised. You understand that? And his answer to never being surprised is to control everything and this is irrational and he can't have any fun if he's controlling everything because he'll never get a surprise, because he can't have any surprise and we get one of these good old $A = A = A$ equations going. Nice rat race. And the way you break up the rat race is to demonstrate to him with a control process that he *can* be controlled without serious consequences. Explosions run very bad 8-C and so he doesn't like them. You run good 8-C so he finds out that he can live. Okay?

Audience: Yeah.

Here I have a few questions which I will take up on this, because they're sequitur, one or two of these. Here we have: "What's the anatomy of sleep?" Restimulative subject.

Now, we've talked all about the heady essence of surprise and here we have this news about sleep. Well, actually to a large degree they're the same subject. One can be surprised at night much more easily than one can be surprised in the daytime. The best thing to do is sleep through it. Body has lots of considerations about how it ought to have so much sleep and so forth, and you'll find the use of counter-control with CCH 1, 2, actually cut down the amount of time a person has to sleep.

When a thetan cannot control or handle any part of anything, he goes anaten. Anaten and sleep are not quite the same thing. They are based on exactly the same mechanisms, however. But they are slightly different. Now, an individual originally had some other use for sleep. A thetan could put a body to sleep and go off and have a good time. Go down to Ditty-Wah-Ditty. That's ten miles on the other side of hell—that's where the people in hell go to have a good time. Harlem jive anatomy. Ditty-Wah-Ditty.

An individual then had a use for sleep. As a matter of fact, there are in the brain some little mechanisms that if you squeeze them or put a black

SURPRISE-THE ANATOMY OF SLEEP

spot of energy in them or something like that, the body shorts out. For a period of time it shorts out. Actually after a while that becomes automatic. A person puts it on automatic, the body goes to sleep. A thetan thinking he is the body, why, after a while begins to consider that he ought to go to sleep too. He's totally dependent on the body for communication so he goes to sleep too. All of this in the ratio of confidence in controlling one's environment. It's very hard to control an environment at night in the blackness and so on, and so why do anything but be totally introverted during that period?

Actually there is a cellular background to sleep which is fascinating. Plankton floating on the sea is unable to get any sunlight during the night and the sunlight storage which it thinks it has to have doesn't last all the way through the night. So you'll find people feeling pretty ghastly if you wake them up around 2,3,4 o'clock in the morning. Shake them up and say, "Come on, boy." They don't.

The body, evidently, on the genetic line, has retained all the lessons of algae, plankton, monocellular behavior. And part of that behavior is when the sun is up, one can have some sunlight, therefore one can have energy so he can move around. And when the sun is gone, one doesn't have any more energy so one shouldn't move around. And you can turn on in most preclears—you can make him find around the body horrible facsimiles of dark, dark night, little algae bobbing on the sea and horrendous waves coming up and some shore with the breakers roaring, and he doesn't like that. Obviously the plankton couldn't handle that, right? So it was just too much to handle so when one doesn't handle anything one doesn't reach out at it. And if he doesn't reach out at it, then he—it reaches in wholly at him. And if this is the case, then this thing we call sleep results.

39

So you'd say there's such a thing as a thetan's sleep. This is just a restimulated thing because the body's asleep and he hasn't got anything better to do. Be such a thing as a body's automatic sleep, by which it merely takes a certain portion of the dark hours and believes it has to be comatose during that because there's no food, because the sun isn't shining or something of the sort. But that is just patterned sleep. And then there's something else called anaten, which is body sleep while the thetan is still awake. And that's real anaten.

A person who is experiencing analytical attenuation is actually sitting there unable to get through the fog which has settled down on the body. And it's a funny, funny experience. If you as an auditor think your preclear is all the way gone, you've made a mistake because he's perfectly alert, usually. And he's just sitting back of all of these comatose ridges and he cannot make the body talk or move and he's just sort of looking at all of it.

Well now, once in a blue moon *he* will flick out for a moment. He'll have a little dream a millisecond long or something of this character. He'll invert on this sleep basis himself. But what we refer to usually as anaten is—the thetan still has some awareness. We tell somebody to mock up some blackness and push it into his body. Now, ordinarily he will go to sleep underneath this impact in some fashion, to all appearances. But actually he's merely gone anaten. He's gone *duuhh*. If you kept on repeating the auditing command, the thetan would keep doing it. And it's a very bad error not to continue to repeat the auditing command when it is of that type of command, when your pc is apparently anaten. You guys understand that?

By the way, you'll never really permanently turn off anybody's blackness unless you run the process that way. "Mock up some blackness and shove it

31 JULY 1957

in." We don't say "to the body," we don't care what. "Mock up some blackness and shove it in. Mock up some blackness and shove it in." Pc usually in that kind of a condition where he has to have this thing done will, after a while, go anaten. The funny part of it is, is he keeps right on doing it if you keep on ordering it. He might not even remember it afterwards. But I have taken a careful check of this on E-Meters and things like that and the person does go right on doing it. And they come out the other side of all of this anaten, boil-off—slight difference between anaten and boil-off too, by the way. A boil-off is a person is just fogging through an awful lot of it and it gradually sort of recedes. Boiling off is the action of anaten disappearing off the case. But a person can boil off for hours at a time. All right.

Now, an individual then, in remedying havingness—in having havingness remedied with blackness, will usually go anaten. And if the auditor keeps giving the auditing command, the preclear will come up on the opposite side of the anaten with clear visio and no more blackness even though he didn't remember finishing it all the way through or not.

Now, sometimes we have preclears who are chronically fogged up. We have them sit down in the auditing chair and it doesn't seem to matter what we do to them, they continue to be foggy and dopey and drift off and all of that sort of thing. This is the same mechanism. But the thetan is being very upset about this very often when the body keeps doing it and he is misowning it. And the only real difficulty he has, if you run him on CCH 1, CCH 2 and he does not respond and this doesn't come out and doesn't work off, then you can assume that he is misowning it. He thinks that he is doing something to the body, whereas the body is simply doing it. There's a misownership of the anaten there. But it will work off in any event and simply asking him to reach out toward things, talk toward things, or think of things he could say or do to various individuals, will gradually knock this anaten out. Anaten is something a thetan himself does when a thetan goes out. Only a thetan can turn off his own attention; a body really can't turn it off.

Okay. You know what sleep is? It's the same manifestation, more or less, only it has a lot of tremendous conditions and training mechanisms and automaticities mocked up with it. It's quite ordinary for people to get along on less and less sleep in Dianetics and Scientology. They don't have to sleep as much. They sometimes make an awful effort—ho-hum—they make an awful effort and they sometimes, just to hold up their reputations and so forth, don't sleep. And that's silly. That's silly.

There's another oddity: you get going along a certain pace and you've got it mocked up that you can go along under such and such a strain and you mistake the strain for energy. And then one day this strain folds up and you feel exhausted. I do this very often after a congress. Quite amusing. I've been four days in there pitching like mad, you see? I get myself wound up. I can sleep all right, but I quite often mistake my ability to keep going for this mocked-up—an automaticity, see? It's just four days' worth of it has been enough to get me wound up, see? And I have to sit down, differentiate between me doing it and using up the facsimiles of me doing it. Got the idea?

If I don't restrain the body from running on the mocked-up four days, it'll all of a sudden run those out into exhaustion. In four or five days, well, all of a sudden will feel terribly exhausted. Boom! Well, what happened is, is I just got going and I decided to burn it up on an automaticity; didn't pay any attention to it at all. I never sat down and readjusted. There is quite a change of pace in anything like that. There's changes of mass, numbers of people.

SURPRISE-THE ANATOMY OF SLEEP

Actually the sudden loss of that many people at the end of the four days, the sudden acquisition of that many people at the beginning of the four days of a congress alike have their effects upon anybody who is handling that large a crowd.

Now, sleep is a necessity to a psycho and if somebody does not sleep and cannot sleep, he can be counted upon to get more and more and more agitated and to go up the spout further and further and further. He'll get in worse and worse condition if he can't sleep. When a psycho cannot eat and cannot sleep, he's had it. Don't process him. Don't process him. Got that?

Your processing is going in on a complete—below exhaustion—exhaustion that's probably even below degradation. And the thing for you to do is to make them get something to eat and make them sleep. Got that? Don't keep auditing them. I'm telling you, I've got experience on this and there's lots of kids around got lots of experience on this. We'd never look for a psychiatrist to give us any experience on this, that's for sure. He runs an "everybody knows," you know? But they know that. They know that people, when they get crazier and crazier, why, they at length get to a point where they cannot sleep at all and this ruins them utterly.

I'll tell you a good cure for this—for sleeplessness. This is an excellent cure for sleeplessness. Also an excellent cure for exhaustion. What's the difference? And that is, walk around the block until things start to look solid to you. Don't go on any method about it. Just walk around the block till things start to look . . .

You say, "Now, wait a minute. You mean you're totally exhausted, you can't even drag yourself along and you're supposed to go out and walk around the block?" That's right. And the first two turns around the block, you know absolutely that the third turn is going to be so gruesome that nobody could possibly make it without putting one of these package trucks under his heels. He just couldn't do it. And somewhere about halfway along that line all of a sudden things start looking solid and the exhaustion goes *pphhhhhh* and you start coming up scale and next thing you know you feel nice and relaxed. And after a while, why, you *can* lie down and go to sleep. You got that? It's quite weird. I mean, an individual can get below the level of tiredness, you see? Down to exhaustion, and that's a very definitely gruesome level to be at.

The actual cure for it is walk around the block, as given in *Problems of Work*. It's rather terrific as a process, by the way. It's one of the better processes. But it is so simple that it's almost impossible to convince anybody that it is one of the better processes.

If you're exhausted, you have no business getting very much auditing. One, you start sticking in the session. You get introverted. You'll find you're jumping at Auditor Code breaks the like of which you never heard of. Thing that you should do is to go out and walk around the block. I know, you're tired. I know, walking around the block will make you more tired. That's all right. After you've been at it for a while, you'll run out and be able to walk around the block.

I'd say if somebody was auditing all the time or sitting at a desk all the time, aw, he'd be a fool not to walk around the block until he was no longer tired after he had finished work.

Sounds real funny. You walk around the block actually until you're no longer tired. And then you can relax. And that is the best cure I know for sleep.

Now, hypnotics, taking hypnotics—Nytol, amphibinol, snooze-all, drowse-all, those things don't work. They don't work. I don't know what it is about

31 JULY 1957

them but these sedatives have a kickback that—don't give you very much about sleep. There isn't anything connected with sleep. They're hypnotics and I don't care what anybody calls them, they're hypnotics.

I was wondering what people were taking—you call this "tranquilizer" so I took a couple of handfuls to find out what was happening about them, so forth, and I—instead of going to sleep as one was supposed to do, or feel relaxed, something of this sort, why, I felt my eyes *snakk* and *pow-w-w* and the diaphragms dilated like that and I put the body in a chair and went over and sat on the molding for a while and let it get over it.

It was just an hypnotic. It's an oddity that the medicos, the drug boys—the drug boys, by the way, these—this day and age have too much money and buy too much advertising, that's for sure. Because these hypnotics and these various quote "cures," drug cures for psychosis and neurosis and all these tranquilizers and all of that sort of thing actually produce almost identical effects. They are all poisons. And any known poison can be administered in sufficiently small amount to be an hypnotic.

There's a common denominator on this thing. You can take strychnine and you can administer just enough strychnine to make somebody feel peppy. Well, that's a stimulant then, isn't it? Heh-heh! See? Stimulant, obviously. Now you can give them just enough strychnine to make them dope off. Obviously it's a depressant, isn't it? Now you can give them enough strychnine to kill them dead. Well, that's a poison, isn't it? Veronal works the same way. It, in various dosages, is a stimulant, a depressant and a poison. Opium, same thing.

So I think you could take grass and eat enough of it and you would get a stimulant, a depressant and a poison. But nobody has tried it because it's in bales. One bale would be a stimulant. But I actually did make this test on what they call rabbit pellets. They press grasses into rather large, solid pellets that they feed to rabbits and they put these in sacks and sell them to people who have rabbits. Some people have circuits and others have rabbits. Anyhow—and we had people chomping on these around and they did the same thing. They really did. You could take these pellets, which were pressed alfalfa, and you could do various weird things with these tablets. And it all amounts to how much strychnine is havingness, see?

Now, you've heard of the werewolves haven't you?

Audience: Yeah.

Close off this subject of speech. You didn't know it, you know, but a werewolf is somebody who turns into a wolf. You got that? He's a werewolf.

Now, actually they have such a thing as a weretiger described in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, which is somebody who turns into a tiger. See, during the night hours instead of going to sleep like other people do, why, they turn into a tiger and roam around the countryside. That actually is people dramatizing a fear of thetans who can put bodies to sleep and then go for a walk.

Well anyway, werewolves—werewolves are fascinating creatures because the only way a werewolf can be killed, of course (as everybody knows), is while lying in his coffin, to have a stake put through his chest and driven home. Part of the original formula was "by a virgin at midnight."

Well, the name of this subject, by the way, is *lycanthropy*. That branch of psychiatry which does not treat of anything else. And this business of roaming around while asleep and drinking blood and so forth goes over into vampirism and numbers of other things. These are just the things that go

SURPRISE-THE ANATOMY OF SLEEP

boom in the night that people keep mocked up to keep people in their heads at night. And there's quite an industry going on of things you mustn't do at night. Probably nightclubs and bars and that sort of thing are part of the same industry. They collect everybody into the nightclubs and bars so they won't roam around at night.

You can always get a church to compose some night social group just to keep people from going out at night. There's all sorts of operations then—but there's a definite fear of things that roam in the night.

Speaking of werewolves, you know, we've got a test mocked up about—the silver bullet test. And it's supposed to be that a silver bullet kills a werewolf too, you know. But the Lone Ranger's got all the silver bullets and we haven't been able to get hold of any to carry out the test. But we definitely would like to know whether or not a silver bullet would kill a werewolf. Of course, plotting this the way they plot psychological experiments, why, it isn't necessary to find out if a werewolf exists or not before one makes tests concerning one. Always observe on a big via and you got it made.

Now, the subject of sleep is simply the retreat—is the subject of how far can one retreat from being surprised. And you can actually make people very, very groggy by startling them. They get very agitated and then they get very groggy.

Now, if you can get a person sufficiently agitated, he won't sleep. So below sleep there is no-sleep and below that there is exhaustion and below that there's a hectic thing that we quite often call a manic state. And below that is degradation, which is a harmonic of exhaustion. And below that is "Oh, to hell with it, let's exteriorize and go our way." Death. Death puts in its oar down below this point.

When a body dies or when somebody is killed suddenly with a great surprise, he passes through these lines so fast on the scale that he doesn't recognize them. But you start to run out a surprise and you'll find each one of the steps I just gave you is there. First all the steps are there jammed together, then each one articulates and you bring him back on up.

It's quite interesting, the one thing you have to know about sleep definitely, that it's just the retreat from that—a person retreats and it means "can't handle." That's all it means, sleep-can't handle. And the only thing you've got to be careful of is not to audit people who cannot sleep. A person who cannot sleep at all is dynamite. Now, how do you get them to sleep if they cannot sleep? Well, don't audit them, walk them around the block. Well, how do you get to sleep if you cannot sleep? Well, walk around the block. Well, how do you take a person in good shape and get them to sleep? Well, walk them around the block. Well, how do you get somebody who's all the way north, exteriorized, in beautiful condition, how do you get him to sleep? I don't know, that's what this universe is all about. It tried to solve that problem and look where we are now.

Thank you.

Thank you.

THINNIES

A lecture given on 1
August 1957

Thank you. Thank you.

You'll be very glad to hear tonight that I'm not going to lecture on anything that would be of any use to you anywhere and that'll take the strain off.

Male voice: Good.

So don't bother to listen. And just relax, just relax.

We have here a very interesting subject for tonight's debate: the rise and fall of the Atlantean Civilization. *The Rise and Fall of the Atlantean Civilization*. This is a very interesting book here and it says that this country got bigger and bigger—this country called Atlantis—it got bigger and bigger and then after a while it got so big that one side of it was mad at the other side and somebody invented an H-bomb and that was the end of Atlantis.

45

Well, that's the end of that book. All right!

And then we have this other subject tonight—we have this other subject tonight which came in my—these books come in my office and I'm always happy to receive them but sometimes I wonder. Most books I'm very happy to see and read, but sometimes they come by, and I'm just showing you an example, and this is *Atomic Suicide*. It has some material in it which I'm sure that you will be very, very glad to hear. This is—"We Define God" is the name of the chapter. Page 119, section nine.

"God thinks in electric impulsations which are recorded in motion as four pairs of rings which are compressed into spheres. Each cyclic pulsation is manifested by the projection of four concentric light rings in one plane from the point of the magnetic mind-light in which the red half of the spectrum is on the outside . . ."

Male voice: I don't believe it.

The whole book is like that! The whole book. You can just pick it up anywhere.

So anyway, we won't lecture about those.

What's the—this is the fourteenth lecture of the 18th ACC, Aug. 1, 1957. Tonight we're going to talk about thinnies.

Thinnies. Title of the lecture.

An electronic computer, if it did all of the recording of the human mind, would require enough tubes to burn enough light—as much light as would be generated by Niagara Falls, and another Niagara Falls would be required to cool that computer. In other words, something that would do all the recording, filing and analyzing that is done by the mind would occupy many city

1 AUGUST 1957

blocks and it would use just billions of electronic tubes and it would require Niagara Falls to cool it. It'd use as much power as is consumed by the ordinary small town by modern electronic standards. Pretty complicated stuff, providing you suppose the human mind is a computer.

Now obviously, although you sometimes may think to the contrary, your head is not that big and it doesn't generate that much heat.

Now, a small experiment in obnosis will demonstrate this. I don't care where you make the experiment. You could make the experiment right now. The point is, viewed as a computer, as a picture-taker which files the pictures, the human mind is impossible. Now, I've known that for twenty-five years. But just how impossible it was was not the point. What it *did* was first the point. And you will discover a dissertation on what it did and what it does in *Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health*. Fairly good coverage—that, and *The History of Man*—fairly good coverage, but how it does it actually is something I've been awfully quiet about. I sort of glossed over it.

I glossed over it so well that I don't think any of you even asked the question very hard because I dared not ask the question of how it did all this, because it wasn't possible. The human mind couldn't possibly store these pictures. The human mind couldn't possibly reanalyze by inspection and cross-inspection of pictures. The human mind couldn't possibly store fifty-three perceptions per picture and then a running fire of pictures at the rate of about twenty-five per second for many years. No machine could do these things. Therefore, it must be that there is a simpler explanation. That simple explanation would be this: supposing the physical universe itself thinned down and with you still standing there, looked like a picture. In other words, you look at the wall and the wall looks solid to us, right here and now, and then it—in that instant of time that you first looked at it an instant ago — now is thin, with a remote viewpoint still in front of it. And you're in communication with the remote viewpoint—then we'd be running a sort of change of space not-thereness, so that the physical universe itself, which we can observe, is to some degree, one way or another, moving forward in time—is evidently a very large computer all by itself.

Now, this merely puts the burden on the physical universe to be this complicated. But that makes *one* complication for the many of us, rather than a complication for each one of us. There's no particular reason to choose the simpler. But when we think that the human mind stores these mental image pictures with fifty-three perceptions per each and twenty-five pictures a second, on everything that is viewed—when we think of this in terms of storage, we're not going down any very probable course. In the first place there's no place to put them. All kinds of absurdities come up the moment we view the whole idea as "mental image picture." So we might as well take this as a whole and look at it on the basis that these mental image pictures which we see of yesteryear are actually the physical universe still there in another instant of time, now past, in front of which we have parked a remote viewpoint with which we are in communication and with which we can get into communication.

Now, there's several things in support of this theory—it is a theory. First, any wild change of environment—such as a person dies and comes into another life—leaves him confused as to the past and his confusion as to the past is such that he knows nothing about his past as could be told to him by pictures. He's been displaced too widely and therefore cannot easily get in

touch with these old remu—remote viewpoints he's left parked around. But when we run him on the process known as Then and Now Solids, we rather easily steer him back along these courses and have him pick up these old viewpoints. The only reason Then and Now Solids works is because we're taking over the automaticity of the physical universe making itself solid again. And the person starts picking up these old viewpoints he has left parked around.

Now, this gets to be an absurdly simple mechanism after a while. Providing you don't look at the complexity of the physical universe necessary to have it work! It means that the physical universe is a concatenation of pictures which are solid in any given instant for all of us—they're solid in any instant for all of us—and an instant afterwards that set of pictures is no longer solid but a new set of pictures is solid. It means somebody's working overtime mocking things up. But the point is we have a very wide agreement on this.

Now, the only reason we'd be studying this at all is quite an interesting one. The only thing wrong with a mind is a mind. I'll go over that again. The only thing wrong with a mind is that it is a mind. That is all that is wrong with it: it *is*. Because it's so rigged up that every action an individual undertakes, every action undertaken is then held in suspense. Everything he's done bad and done wrong is held in suspense to the end of time.

And somebody talks about karma. They're talking about—without knowing what they were talking about—this series of pictures retained by the mind. All the pain and agony of yesterday can be carried in this mind and can be turned on again against the individual. This mind may have use. Who knows? But for sure it has liability. It has kickback. It is a sort of a trap. An individual is never free of his acts of yesterday. Well, maybe this is desirable in the other fellow but it's not too desirable in you, is it?

47

Retribution, the mind, conscience, guilt, restraint. And this would be all very well, providing anybody could prove that an unrestrained being is always damaging. And yet in processing we find out that the more we do for somebody the easier he is on his fellow man and it's only those people who are totally plowed into these minds who commit crimes, are criminals, lead countries . . . Only such people as are totally trapped with no hope of ever getting out are reactively engaged in the commission of crimes.

Quite amazing. The more complexity developed in the mind—it seems to us with our tests and our processing—the greater liability to the society. That sort of makes it a devil's universe, doesn't it?

An individual goes along and the more he lives, the more experience he gets, the more he knows he better not communicate and associate. And the more he refuses to communicate and associate, the less he'll find out about his fellow man and the less actual restraint there is upon his doing things. And the more restraint he gets, why, the less restrained he acts. It's a wonderful thing. This is a philosophic enigma.

An animal has one of the most complex minds you ever cared to have anything to do with. You get into a cat's head, you don't find much brain but boy do you find lots of mind. You get into a rabbit's head—the same breed of feline almost—cats and rabbits seem to have no trouble associating with each other. But this rabbit, in great terror, sees a wolf behind every rock and takes a fixed picture of every rock. He has one of the most obsessed, mystery-infested minds that anybody ever had anything to do with. Quite interesting.

You say, "How do you know about the mind of a rabbit?"

1 AUGUST 1957

Well, I could tell you I've put them on an E-Meter and tell you a bunch of lies. As a matter of fact I've looked at rabbits' minds. Also senators' minds. Also wolves' minds. And I find out that it is almost a scale here—that the more mind there is and the less that mind can be handled by the person who possesses it, the more craven the conduct of the individual and the less good he does his fellows.

Well, one could say then it must be the devil's universe. It isn't—and this may be news to you—the content of the mind that is bothering you. It is the fact that you have one.

That's a large bullet to chew, as a matter of fact. And we went in with Dianetics to clean up somebody's mind, we went in with Scientology to get them so they could handle one. There's a further step, and that's a mindectomy.

You could characterize somebody as a mindless saint and you could characterize somebody else of less optimum behavior as a fully minded devil. And everything that we have learned on this would seem to indicate that the mind itself, rather than prevent evil, creates it. It forms an insulating mass beyond which a thetan cannot experience and in view of the fact that it does this, he therefore cares little what he does to his fellow being because when he strikes pain into a man he feels it not. If you were in very good shape and you hit somebody on the head, you'd feel it! Not with your fist but with *his* head. But if you can be totally introverted about the whole thing and not feel anything more than your head, you can safely hit him on the head, can't you? So a mind acts as a restraint of feeling and it may have in it a great many things which deter one from proceeding against one's fellows on a conscience basis, but for sure it insulates someone from ever feeling what happens to his fellows.

48

About the most that *Homo sapiens* does is occasionally get a headache because somebody else has a headache. Now, he thinks this is a counter-restimulation. It is not a counter-restimulation. He's already identifying himself with that person and feels his headache. It isn't any headache anyplace else but in that person. Getting the somatic from somebody else is simply the mechanism of solving a problem. As we solve a problem over and over and over, get more and more solutions to a problem, we'll find out we get closure with the problem. And as we get more and more problems of comparable magnitude we see that space opening up between the individual and the problem. You could ask anybody—you're running problems of comparable magnitude on him and you ask, "Where is that problem now?" and oddly enough he'll always—usually—spot a location. Now you run a few more problems of comparable magnitude and you say, "Where's the problem now?" and he'll spot a location further away. Pretty soon it disappears way out there somewhere.

All right. We take the same problem we've just solved and we say, "Give us a solution." How fascinating! "Give us a solution. Give us another solution. Another solution. Another solution. Another solution. Another solution. Where is the problem now?"

"There."

"Give us another solution. Where is the problem now?"

"There."

"Give us another solution. Where is the problem now?"

"Right where I am."

Now we can say, "Give us a problem of comparable magnitude to that problem. Another problem of comparable magnitude." And out the problem

moves again. How fantastic! This is weird! It's an interesting phenomenon which you should be acquainted with because it's one of the major phenomena you use in auditing. You know that separation is taking place the more problems you have somebody dream up; and the more problems you solve the more closure you get. One of the reasons for this is the solution is more or less one side of an existing problem preserved and the other side gone. So the thing snaps in on the body, missing its own terminal.

The process of solution is the process of knocking out one side or the other of a problem. You can generalize to that degree. When you knock out one side of a problem of course it has to snap in on something and so it snaps in on the individual's body.

But this tells us a great deal. This gives us a lot of philosophic bait. Just exactly what is going on here? You mean we solve problems and we go snap into them? And we invent more problems and they part from us? Well, the enormity of space of this universe obviously indicates that it is an enormous problem.

Space seems to be created in this fashion.

Now, see here! Nobody could possibly believe that mental image pictures are so valuable that nobody could possibly let go of any of them. You yourself would think this was a silly idea. And yet right now at this moment your mind is still manufacturing them and storing them up. Well, that's fine. Of course you can say they're an aid to memory, like a pencil and paper. A person who takes notes on everything he hears and can't remember every— anything himself would do this.

Let's see if we can't find and examine a system on the subject of mental image pictures which might work in a more simple fashion. Let us assume this complexity: that the universe is a parade, through time, of pictures. And any given instant all those pictures at that instant are solid, and those ahead of it and those behind that instant are thin. So actually time is a parade of solidity through established pictures.

Yes, but we do have a power of choice, so therefore we have some means of altering what part of the universe we're going to take a picture of. Now, we could alter what part of the universe we were going to take a picture of by altering our position in the universe. But the forthcoming pictures of the universe, on a very gross level, would be where they are. In other words, the forthcoming pictures of Earth will be in predictable positions in the vicinity of the Sun. But your automobile, pictures of, will not be in predictable positions. You get the idea? And as we go from great to small, why, we see that we get less and less predictable positions in proportion to the mass. The greater the mass, the more predictable the position; the less the mass, the less predictable the position. So you could always move the small things of life. And the smallest thing I could think of at the moment would be a remote viewpoint. That's pretty tiny.

Now, are they—are they facsimiles or are they actually the universe, thinned down—not pictures of the universe, but the actual universe thinned down—that we see as pictures?

This is a very vast—this is a very large datum. A vast question. How would we see these things? Well, when we stand before them, an impression of ourselves looking becomes our communication with the picture. In other words, we leave bits and pieces of us-ness on the track too, and so we can see these old pictures.

Now, if that theory were correct, a method of erasing pictures would at once become manifest and would work. All you had to do was take over the

1 AUGUST 1957

automaticity of remote viewpoints in front of the scenery. Or erase old remote viewpoints parked in front of the scenery. And if either of these two things worked I would have a tendency to believe that we were dealing with thin-nies, not with pictures.

Now, you could still call them facsimiles if you said, "This, gotten thin, is a facsimile of what it was." And you could preserve the word *facsimile* on this dogleg piece of logic.

Now, if you were looking at that wall you would leave in that moment of time a remote viewpoint from that position in space. In other words, it's a location in space. Now, I presume that most of you had supper. Now, can you get a picture of any part of it before, during or after supper this evening?

Audience: Yes.

You can?

All right. Very well. Very well. Now, just get the idea of putting a remote viewpoint in front of that picture.

Now, what happened? It went away partially or wholly, didn't it?

Audience: Yes.

Well, those of you that didn't get it to go away fully just put it—do it again as another action.

Did it swing away?

Audience: Yes.

Well, isn't that a fascinating thing? Did it swing away or did that part of youness come here?

Male voice: The latter.

You think it came here, huh? Isn't this fascinating.

I want to know what you're doing leaving pieces of you scattered all over this universe! In other words, we've caught you off base haunting the past. *If* this is true.

Now, we have tested many things in the handling of pictures. And any one of the methods, if successful, could have been understood through the handling of the remote viewpoint which was looking at the picture. We of course could go through a thoroughgoing erasure of the thing providing one was in one's own valence—which would only mean, "Let's assume your own viewpoint."

Now, Dianetics made the individual assume that viewpoint again and then look it over and look it over and look it over. Now, the oddity was, is occasionally the thing didn't erase. Occasionally it just got sticky. That perhaps is because we didn't thoroughly understand what we were doing. We were trying to erase the picture, whereas as a matter of fact, all we had to do was erase the viewpoint.

Now, Lord knows how much disturbance we have created in the past because it's totally possible that there is another wave of present time following this one. And everything's all solid for you here and now, isn't it?

Male voice: Yeah.

Maybe it's all solid for a lot of other people a little later. But they'd feel haunted, wouldn't they, if you've gone before? Maybe the universe is a number, a vast number of successive waves of viewers of the thickness. And maybe as we go by we make it just a little more solid for an instant but maybe the first wave going through is mocking it up. And then each successive wave adds to it. This building, to a wave coming ten years after us, would be also thick to the degree that we thickened it up. It might be solid concrete to them, see? They might have the wildest idea of what solid is—"a teaspoon weighs a ton"

sort of thing. Well, all manner of fantastic explanations occur to one when he looks at all this phenomena. It's a wonderful philosophic jigsaw. But the only interest we have in it is the separation of the individual from the concatenation of pictures which victimize him.

Look, there is no reason, when an individual has been sick, for him to be sick again by remembering having been sick. And yet that is what the mind does for one. An individual has been si—*is* sick and then a little bit later, a few years later, he suddenly remembers having been sick and gets sick again. In other words, he more occupies the old viewpoint than he does the present viewpoint. He's running viewpoints and change in space and he is leaving something behind him to look at it in each new consecutive position he occupies. Him, a thetan. Now, this is evidently more or less the way it is. Certainly it is a mechanic.

Now, exactly how we go to work erasing this, how we go to work amputating this and so forth, I hope you understand is an entirely separate thing from the very lovely philosophic enigma of "What Is It?"—how you handle it.

Now, we already know lots of ways to handle it. We know most of the picture mechanisms, as a matter of fact. I'd be very surprised to run into a new picture mechanism. And I *was* very surprised when I ran into this thin-nies deal. It was simply, though, a new idea about *how* one has pictures. It was a new idea of howness—how does one have pictures? Well, if you can separate them simply by expressing a willingness to occupy various viewpoints in front of sceneries, we could see how 8-C would work like mad. You walk a fellow around and have him look at the wall—and in other words, occupy viewpoints—and if he could knowingly and willingly occupy these various viewpoints, he of course would blow an awful lot of pictures. And when 8-C starts turning on somatics an individual is actually running out old pictures.

Now, there's no mass to you as a being. There actually is no time in you as a being, except as you consider or postulate it. Therefore you can get yourself very easily entangled with some past you. And thus you can get stuck-on-the-trackness and restimulation and so forth. There's no difference whether you're here or there. It is a remote viewpoint and you are a remote viewpoint in front of the wall. There's more of you in present time than there was in the past. There isn't just a finite quantity of you. There's a feeling on your part, however, that you are willing to look at just so many things at a time. And when you find yourself occupying too many past viewpoints and the scenery getting too jumbled up and you can't make it out completely, why, you decide to just shut it all off and you get most of these occlusions of one kind or another—for whatever reason you decided to shut it off.

Well, this makes an interesting view—the idea of thinnies.

Now, the howness of it would then have to do with either taking over an automaticity of leaving remote viewpoints parked wherever you park—you park in front of that wall, when you walk away from it you leave a remote viewpoint in front of the wall. All right, if you ever get a picture of the wall, that's what you must do, evidently, to get it. Therefore study along those lines would indicate what one had to do in order to take over this automaticity. Well, in view of the fact that *you* and the youness of you, parked in the past, might as well be parked in the present, we can evidently slide these pictures all over the place but the pictures never move. Pictures never go anyplace or do anything. You just slide back and forth on change of space through time. Your theory is that you can occupy any position you have occupied. And sure

1 AUGUST 1957

enough, we find only those areas of the track are stuck where a person was unwilling to have stood there. So we have somebody be willing to stand in front of things. We get a certain new condition of mind with regard to things. But supposing we made him dramatize "unwilling to stand there."

"Look at that wall and get the idea of being unwilling to be there looking at the wall." You'd sure strip off a lot of walls. Well, here'd go the mind. Therefore the mind is capable of being erased, providing one wanted to erase it.

Now, before one would erase the mind, however, he would have to be able to perform the services which the mind pretends to perform: the services of experience, the services of control, being able to take a number of bodies and stack them all together and then control our present body. We controlled a bunch of bodies in the past, therefore we could control the present body by putting things through this.

It has uses. An individual would have to discover, one way or the other, that these uses were—these favors were obtainable or doable by himself before he'd be totally willing to give up the mental image picture system.

But I think the mental image picture system is one of the sillier systems and I think probably—"Invent a system by which to retain the past," "Invent a system of incomparable magnitude to the mind"—various processes apparently open up in front of us. Then and Now Solids is the most reliable, up-to-date process we have which straightens this out. The individual does change space and does move back into the past and then moves up into the present and moves into the past and moves into the present and moves into the past and moves into the present. And he is taking over the king-sized automaticity of all, which is "make it more solid." He must have lost track of how to make things solid if he's still making those facsimiles on the backtrack slightly solid. There's something wrong with his solidifier if he's still got pictures. So we could take over this automaticity of solidities of the past—as represented as pictures—and we would find these things doing two things: some of them, obsessively made solid, would key out. And those that weren't visible at all, we would suddenly have the facility of making them solid again.

The funny part of it is, is a preclear can make them almost totally solid. And there have been instances of preclears walking around inside these pictures of the past, doing things and looking at things which he didn't see when he was there the first time. There's an incident on record of a fellow reading the back side of a newspaper he only saw the front side of.

Now, there's—Then and Now Solids does not tack itself down to the present, you know. Then Solids you would interpret offhand as being the past, but they might as well be the future and a person doesn't hold to just the past on this. He'll go up into the future and start doing this in the future. Lord knows what the mysterious consequences of it all are. Maybe if somebody went up into the future and made it all solid from all possible viewpoints, why, we would suddenly get to the edge of the ocean and fall off into the mouths of big fish the way Columbus said. I mean, almost anything could happen.

Well now, running the process Then and Now Solids is a very interesting experience for both auditor and preclear. Where the person has experienced sudden and surprising shifts in space, he has facsimiles which will not compute. Individual went to sleep in Utah, woke up in Honduras. When he went to sleep in Utah he had no intention of going to Honduras. When he wakes up the following morning he's puzzled. A few years goes by, he meets a Scientologist, Scientologist starts running him. He's erased all this. It was just so incomprehensible to go to sleep in Utah and wake up in Honduras

that he just wiped the whole thing out. He says, "Dickens with that. Nobody can live with that kind of stuff!"

Scientologist is running him and he's—"Get a picture and make it a little more solid" and, "Did you do that? Thank you. Look at that chair. Make it a little more solid. Thank you." Back and forth, and the first thing you know, the fellow falls off into this sudden shift. He stops going back to Honduras, which is where you thought he came from, and all of a sudden starts landing in Utah. And Utah to Honduras to now, to Honduras to Utah, to Honduras to now. And all of a sudden he says, "Well, look! There was a change between these two places." He picks up these two viewpoints and he understands that there was this sudden shift and the moment he understands there was a sudden shift—just that and no more; he doesn't even have to understand why there was a shift—he'll get computational data. That is to say, he'll say, "Well, well, well! This is a very strange thing, but I've often wondered why high, dry places were upsetting to me because I had never been in one! I had always been in wet, wet Honduras. But when I'd get in a place that was dry, why—like a room, you know, or something like that that was awfully dry, I'd feel upset and I never could understand that. And that's Utah. Well now, let's see. I went from Utah to Honduras and . . ."

Then he goes back on the track further than that and finds out that it was actually—just before Utah, why, it was north Alaska. Now he's going back through Honduras, through Utah to north Alaska.

"Oh well," he says, "lookee. I'm the same fellow in North Alaska, Utah, Honduras and now. Hah! Computes." And he'll tell you some sort of a computation off of this thing and all of a sudden with a *whir-clack* his time track straightens out. Instead of being sections of track, each section an only-one, it is just one track. He's one person on one track.

Now, individuals get these life computations, which is a fascinating subject. They get subject computations and life computations. They get person computations and so on. The life computation is the most fascinating one; a person's later life doesn't agree with his earlier life—that is, in this lifetime. This fellow has been going around, he's—owns a series of bars. And he goes around, he's rather unhappy in life and he just doesn't feel right about it. He owns this series of bars and he feels he's making money but he just can't kind of reconcile this and he doesn't—he just feels uncomfortable about the whole thing. You start running him on Then and Now Solids, he falls through. He gets into a section of his life where as a little boy he signed the pledge—his mother was a member of the WCTU and so on. And he just—this just doesn't add up with the fact that he is now an owner of bars. See, the two things will not compute. And in view of the fact that they won't compute, he abandons one or the other of them. Now, quite often he'll abandon his modern activity because it won't compute with the earlier activity.

Now, reliance on an object to preserve havingness is one of these computations—reliance on what preserves havingness. Early part of his life he depended utterly on his father to preserve his havingness. Middle of his life he depended utterly on his first wife to preserve his havingness. But the last stretch of his life has brought into his life somebody who is identical to his father who did nothing but steal from him. This just doesn't make sense and he doesn't make any sense out of it and his remark to you, an auditor, is that—"My life doesn't make sense."

I had a rather elementary one. When I was a little boy I never went anyplace without a rifle. Montana, there's just a rifle; rifle—Montana. They

1 AUGUST 1957

just go together, see? I'd go out and there'd always be a rifle stuck in a saddle boot. A saddle was not cinched unless it had a rifle in it of course, you know. A wolf jump up, something like this would happen, why, you took a rifle and you blew his silly head off. People left you alone because you had a rifle. You wanted to preserve your possessions, why, you had a rifle. You get the idea? It was a reliance on this item, see—big reliance on one item. And a little boy that doesn't like to bite wolves because of his immaturity on the subject feels safe on such a thing.

All right. All of a sudden, out of this highly wild, barbaric area was suddenly—move "over into what's laughingly called civilization, see? You go down the street in New York City carrying a rifle, you're liable to be tapped on the shoulder. You'd have to explain to somebody that a rifle was—the rifle was intended to go out to the rifle matches, not to shoot any wolves or shoot any people. This is a protection of havingness, though. What system do you use to protect havingness? A rifle!

Later life, no rifle is permitted to you, you can't have one, you'd better not shoot one in the city limits. One fine day, why, some tough kid in the teens you know, walks up, takes your car away from you and goes over the hills and far away. Where were you? You were just standing there. What were you supposed to do to him? You're supposed to take a rifle and say, "No!" and have him put the object down and go away. See, that's the system.

54

But that system no longer works. It doesn't—can't do that. It's not done. How do you protect your havingness? Well, you're supposed to go to court. Heh-heh-heh! So this finally winds up into the computation that you couldn't possibly have. You got this?

So here's this dogleg, noncomputational thing. Had subjective reality on this and it's a very pat example of this. In other words, one protects havingness in *this* section of life with an implement, and in *this* section of life the implement is not allowed. Well, one has not moved up into this section of life with something else to protect havingness, don't you see? So he feels like he can't. Then and Now Solids all of a sudden took these two areas and went *clank!* All of a sudden it was very obvious it was merely the lack of a rifle. Well, what's a substitute for a rifle? See? That's easy. I don't know what I was using a rifle for. Anyway . . .

Protection of havingness is not terribly difficult unless you have a total investment in an implement. And this total dependency, being so great and ceasing so suddenly, will then not let you be inventive. Now, the kids of tomorrow will think of entertainment in terms of television sets. They're not—won't be inventive on the subject.

The engineer of early aeronautical times had a dependency on nothing; he didn't have anything to work with, he couldn't have built anything anyhow, he figured. It was all impossible and therefore not very serious, so he dreamed up all the forms of flying there were. There's seventeen or eighteen—I've forgotten how many now—methods of flying which have never been used! It just happened that the airfoil—stable airfoil—was buildable at that time with his equipment. Aeronautical engineer graduates from Cal Tech or some other of the people's schools, and engineer starts in and you say to him, "Build an airplane."

And he's, "All right. You take an airfoil and some kind of fuselage and you take a tractor propeller or the reactor-type motor and there's your airplane."

And you say, "Where did this thing come from?" The airfoil is not necessarily an efficient thing at all. A tractor-type propeller, particularly one run

by a Wright Whirlwind engine, is taking 50 percent of its power to cancel the other 50 percent of its power, and how it flies at all Lord only knows. The lift-drag ratio of rotor planes, for instance, is so incredibly bad that how anybody keeps up with rotors—I don't know why they'd keep up with rotors, but everybody's married to these rotors! See? They get an airfoil or a certain type of airfoil—a rotor is just a rotating airfoil—and they get certain types of things. They get a—earlier people get a dependency on them. First they invent them, then they get a dependency on them. People that come after that have a tendency to pick this up as a matter of course. It's an "everybody knows." What is an airplane? Everybody knows it's something that has an airfoil. That's silly. That's silly. It's not even safe to be up in the air with an airfoil. I know. I've had a couple of them go *whap*. It's very uncomfortable!

How about antimagnetic devices, antigravitic? What is gravity, anyhow? Well, there's a fellow down here, Henri Coanda, that's done a considerable study on that and it's so baffling to the US Air Force at this moment that they think Coanda is a very brilliant man, but nobody else can grasp it because the things he builds fly but don't have any airfoil. You see? They're not real, then.

Well, a thetan probably comes along and he says, "Well, this thing called a mind is just part of what I need to get along with—just total dependency on it" and so forth. Now we think up a way of living; well, there's a mind and a way of living would be to take a mind and you do so-and-so.

And you say, "No, no, no, no, no. No!" You say, "Come on now. Now, dream up some kind of a method of living a life."

"Well," he says, "you take your mind and you start—and then you . . ."
 "Zzzrrr."

Now, that's nothing more than a whole track computation. It's a method of having. Some kind of a method of having that somebody picked up in a silly moment. But it doesn't work. And it doesn't work the way it did. And it isn't useful somehow or another and it's made a dogleg and so he can't understand it. And although he's still got it he places no real dependency on it and he's trying to live anyhow and you get noncomputational. Well, that's why the mind is noncomputational, because everybody starts out to think with first the mind, and then he—and it's not necessarily a mechanism that's useful in that category at all. As a matter of fact, I think it's quite the contrary. A mechanism that stops you from thinking every time you start to think is hardly a mechanism with which you should think!

So you could pass to a whole race's computation from this first little life computation, see? The thing doesn't equate. You've had something that you depended on, then you didn't have it or didn't need it or couldn't use it or it's against the law or something of the sort and you had to live thereafter, so that left you without any method to what? To do something you could do before you got the item that you first were doing with. This is very fascinating.

About the only thing I know that would be allowable in that category would be Scientology. It solves itself. You are aware of the fact that Scientology does rub itself out. This is a rather interesting thing. It is a self-solving science.

There are two processes that run themselves out, for instance, today, which is quite interesting. All the Axioms run themselves out. "Give me that hand. Thank you," and Tone 40 8-C, if run long enough, run out all the times they were run, regardless of who ran them or how poorly or how well. As a matter of fact, if a person doesn't need it very much, he runs it out in the first hour. He runs out in the first hour the first half-hour of it being run on him. This is quite remarkable. It just runs out, that's all. Same way with Tone 40 8-C.

1 AUGUST 1957

Now, Scientology as a whole runs itself out, too. It won't leave you stuck with it because it is its own solvent. But that isn't true of any other science or item that's been on the track so far, if you can remember it and if it's still around.

For sure aeronautics don't run themselves out—they run themselves in. Automobiling is getting more and more complicated. I imagine if you were to take somebody today as an automotive engineer and tell him to build you an automobile, he'd build you an automobile and it'd be an automobile just like any other automobile. And he'd say, "Well, this is the safe thing to do." Funny part of it was, shipbuilding went almost the same route. Now, they got dependent on an iron hull. And you say, "Well, iron hulls are quite *recent*—*Monitor* and *Merrimac*. Oh no, they're much earlier than that. But they got dependent on an iron hull and today you go down and try to build a sailing ship that sails and you get something built by Alden and you fall off of it and get drowned and the masts come out of it. (That's libel because there are a lot of Alden ships that will sail across a calm sound on a calm day.) You say, "What are these . . . ? The old boys building them and so forth probably have some memory of something or other." And you say, "Well, why not, instead of that funny spoon bow, why not put something up here that'll throw the spray *off* not *on* the deck?" They wouldn't know why.

56

So arts even get lost to a point of where they don't even remember what they knew. You got the idea? Probably Christianity had an awful lot of technology connected with it when it first came out which is no longer present, because it was the principal method of healing for about twelve or fourteen hundred years. Medical science leaving in the laws of the country that healing can still be done by the churches, is quite amusing; very, very amusing because the only healing they had after they wiped out the witchcraft was Christianity and ministers. Ministers apologizing today for healing is something like they—the same thing as their apologizing for Christ's crucifixion, see? They're apologizing for their own religious skill. If they themselves can't heal, well, they certainly skidded someplace because the early missionaries that were sent to here and there and across the world to heathenize the barbarians for sure depended almost totally on healing. They used to bring along religious relics. And Lord knows what they did with them. They did accomplish some results.

But regardless of this, the whole subject is still there; but evidently there's a little something missing. There's no unity of thought on the subject, certainly. There are tremendous schisms on it. Well, there's still a tremendous dependency on it. So somebody in the United States says "religion" and immediately everybody says "Christianity." This doesn't even follow. Let me assure you that there are dozens and dozens of religions in the United States that have nothing to do with Christianity and they are nevertheless religions. Buddhism is one of them. There are quite a good many Buddhist churches in the country and they have nothing to do with Christianity. But evidently, according to the government, religion is Christianity, which I think is quite interesting. You get this narrowing down of what a thing is, until it isn't anything else and then no ability to view that anything else could exist. Don't you see?

All right. Quite amusing. The US Navy—the US Navy admits that Buddhism exists and there are other religions than Christian religions.

There was a very hard-boiled commander on a South Pacific island and he didn't like chaplains, and chaplains had come and gone and come and gone off of his particular post. And one day, why, he got a new chaplain and he

said, "Now, be sure," he says to the new chaplain, "and preach all of the services for the men here and I'll dismiss you if you don't."

And chaplain came back and fellow says, "Well, have you preached all the services?"

And the chaplain says, "Oh, yes. Yes I have."

And he says, "Well," he says, "you're fired. Return back to your base." He says, "Because I'm a Buddhist and you haven't preached any Buddhist ceremony."

Now anyway, a breadth of view and an inventiveness is the only safe thing a thetan could have, if we want to speak of safety and security. An ability to view something broadly, an ability to see something new, an ability to invent and an ability to shed dependencies which are no longer serviceable; and the mind won't let a thetan do any of these things. Therefore it must be some kind of an antique mechanism.

Now, how did the mind get into that condition? It's because life to life, and parts of lives to parts of lives, you get noncomputables. An individual knows how to live. The way to live is to be a hotel keeper in Boston. You own a big hotel, you are very snooty with the rich, you are very mean to the people who come in and don't pay their bills. You get the idea? You run this hotel right down the groove and that is the way you live.

And then one day he falls downstairs or kicks the bucket in some fashion or another, eats too much Boston baked beans, goes into a Boston restaurant and dies. Next life, why, he's got a father that has a successful rock quarry and the old man says, "Now, you want to learn how to run this rock quarry" and the kid can't get interested in the rock quarry and he can't do anything about the rock quarry and he doesn't know anything about the rock quarry. And the old man dies and the kid can't even run the rock quarry, and it all goes to pieces and so forth. Well, why? You say, "Well, he just had an allergy to rocks. That's—must be it." No, that wasn't it at all! He knew how you made a living! You made a living by managing a hotel in Boston! And sometime during his early life I am sure that he would have told his father to buy him a hotel so he could live. Got the idea?

Now, after that he knows what happens if you get mixed up with rock quarries. You kick the bucket! You starve to death. This is the sort of things that the mind teaches one. Noncomputables, you see? How to have. How to live. But from one lifetime to another, one carries the mind along with him and lets it teach him, sub rosa, on a 1.1, sub-1.1 basis what it's all about— only that doesn't compute with anything he's doing now. And in disgust he forgets everything he was doing before, but it now influences everything he's doing. Therefore it is some interest to us to have processes such as Then and Now Solids and know how to run them well. But it's much greater interest to know what the entire mechanism is all about. If we knew what the mechanism was, very precisely, we could knock it out or reequate it or make it more usable very easily, and I'm sure all of us would agree this needs to be done.

Thank you.

Thank you.

ABILITY - LAUGHTER

A lecture given on 2
August 1957

How are you this evening?

Audience: Fine!

You're apparently still alive.

Male voice: Yep!

I've been busy all day. My office is very often used—when all other parts of the country have no place to put certain pieces of confusion they get into my office, and various confusions have been happening, one kind or another.

Now, I have been a very bad boy here the last few lectures and I haven't answered all of your questions. But I've got them all here in a pile and I'm just going to run them off with the greatest of rapidity, and we hope not stupidity.

This is lecture number fifteen, 18th ACC, July . . .

Male voice: August.

August—what's the idea of sticking me on the track? August the second, 1957. And we have some questions here which have been asked and we will take these up in very rapid-fire order.

First one: "Have you now accomplished a sufficiently high training procedure so that you would be willing to recommend a gold or red wafer auditor? I have been given the datum that in the past it was the policy of the FC staff to recommend only auditor processing under your supervision."

This is correct. The last is correct. The fact of the matter is, you are about to see an entirely new policy on the part of the FC with regard to referrals—we call this referrals. People write in and say, "Is there an auditor in my area?" To understand this completely you would have to realize that the basis of war comes about through the fact that a third dynamic isn't a terminal. The government in Finland isn't a he or a her. It just isn't. The government of France isn't a he or a her. It just obviously isn't. So the government of Finland and the government of France, in trying to communicate, snap terminals with two "isn'ts" and this results in war.

It takes an individual to communicate. It takes a being to communicate. It takes something that can understand and bleed and understand suffering and problems and so on. It takes, in other words, something which is accustomed to living in order to handle the living. Right?

Well, the FC staff was first a little bit shocked and then quite exhilarated, several staff meetings ago when I suddenly told them they weren't an organization. I told them they were individuals doing certain jobs. But after

2 AUGUST 1957

that we saw things brightening up on all fronts. You see, an organization is just a huge irresponsibility. Any government is the composite irresponsibility of any people. Definition of government: the compounded irresponsibility of the population. Nobody's willing to take the responsibility for crime so they send it over to the government. Nobody can take the responsibility for educating any *single* child so they form a department of education which does very little educating. And they have to put more and more people in and more and more materials and more and more this and more and more that, and it's just like pouring it down a hole. The bigger department of education you've got, the less education you're going to get.

Now, they used to tell me that the US Navy was too *big* and that was why we had all these flops—battle lost and they'd say, "Well, the Navy's too big. Ha-ha-ha." And I was mad one day—I was real mad. And the CO of a ship that had been present told me, "Well, the Navy's too big, and they..." and I said, "What are you saying? That you are too *small*?" He said, "*Nyaaaaa ...*" He says, "This is peacetime. We court-martial officers like you." They did, too. But in the war it was all too big.

Now, you might say then that the composite irresponsibility of staff would become the organization. That's for true. In defense of this, a theatrical company, ceasing to be a company, will all of a sudden realize that they are a bunch of individuals who are doing work in the theater. And they work together to the degree that they can communicate. It isn't whether the company is good or bad. It's whether the individuals in it can do their job and communicate with one another, and this communicating with one another does make a semblance of what then becomes an organization. But it never is an organization! It is just a combined ability to communicate amongst us terminals, any one of which is able to communicate.

60

Now, when we look on it that way, we will see a brand-new form and shape to organizations, at least that I have anything to do—this is no news to you, that the organizations and I are inveterate foes. I think organizations get so big that they forget that the individual can bleed. And now and then you have to make a decision for the good of several people at the expense of one or two people. Now, that's just about as far as you would go toward deciding on an organizational basis, and you can go too far in this direction, let me assure you. You normally shake the thing out and talk to the person involved and you find out you didn't have to fire or shoot anybody.

Now, looking this over we find out that the main difficulty with the Foundations, in enfranchising field organizations to do anything, was the same difficulty I have just outlined between Finland and France. Neither the organization in the field or the Central Organization was actually there. People realized this so they wrote me.

Now, we have found that those auditors who have been consistently successful have operated as individuals. They need, because the law requires it—the law tries to foster this whole error of organization—the law requires that you have some corporate name or something of the sort.

I gave a talk here in, I think middle of '55, at the congress in Washington. The last talk in the congress was on the subject of how organizations were something that we could easily get along without—if we could get along without them perfectly.

There would be nothing wrong then with somebody in the field having something he called the such and such Scientology group or such and such Scientology Society or the such and such Church of Scientology. Do you

understand that? There'd be nothing wrong with this at all. The law requires this. But if he continues to do business only as that, and if he expects that then to be *him*, he is making a gross and serious error and this is the kind of an error we can get into with a referral. There was a good auditor, let us say, in Kokokomo. And this auditor was doing very well and he had an organization called the Kokokomo Church of Scientology, see? So we knew this and we refer a preclear to the Kokokomo Church of Scientology.

And then we get an *awful* heart-rending squawk and we say, "What's wrong here?" Well, we find this auditor has moved on. The pc and other things, they were turned over to people nobody knew anything about. Do you understand that? Now, even somebody processing under the supervision of this auditor we *knew* about would have come off all right. But this auditor has moved to some other area and this thing is left sitting there, which has—it's like a pie with no filling. Do you see that?

Now, I'm not invalidating any organization which any of you have thrown together. But all of you know this to be true: that it is only your sweat and your investment of understanding that keeps that organization going, regardless of its name. You know that.

All right. Then why should the FC, calling that as an organization, refer anyone to the Kokokomo church? That would be a very silly thing to do. And so by policy, which is now changing, we're going to take a list of all auditors validated, as they go down the line, with their names and addresses—and as individuals be very happy to refer people to them—as individuals. You understand that? We're going to be very happy to encourage individuals to run PE Courses and all sorts of things. Let me tell you something about a PE Course. A PE Course run by a good auditor is a *highly* successful thing, and run by his assistants is usually a dismal flop. It's not just it's not quite so good, it's just that it *isn't!* It isn't at all! Ireland almost folded up here in the last many weeks. They were letting anybody teach the free course. Fortunately I caught them at it, and an auditor is now on deck. Their income trebled and that was that.

61

Now then, myself or those people who have this in charge here—that's their hat, you see—be very happy in the future to recommend individual auditors throughout the length and breadth of the country and be very happy to publish rosters as to their whereabouts and be very happy to grant them some beingness, something that has been lacking a bit in the past. And that is the current policy of the organization, and I hope it works out. Okay?

All right. So much for that question.

Here's another question—highly technical: "When doing Book Mimicry and pc does command wrong but does not want you to repeat it or do it again, how would you handle it?"

That's quite a question, isn't it? You got that? You reach over for his little paws and you put them on the book and you make his little paws go through the motion and then you take the book back and thank him for it. That is exactly how that is done. That's the proper way to do that. Got that?

Now, that looks evaluative, huh? Looks very, very evaluative.

Now, he's done it very, very wrong or has refused to do it at all, you would do something like that. That is necessary to keep him from going out of session. And in view of the fact you're going to be running this on low-toned people quite often, you're going to have to learn that that is part and parcel of it. The fellow says, "Well, I just couldn't do anything like that. It's just impossible," something like that. Put his hands on the book, make him go through the motion, thank him for it. Now he says, "Oh . . . there."

2 AUGUST 1957

You say, "Did you do it right?"

"Well, no."

"Well, do you want me to do it again?"

"No. No."

Put his hands on the book, make him go through the motion. It's a mistake but it is not as bad a mistake as letting it go.

All right. Somebody says here, "What study, if any, would you recommend outside Scientology for a Scientologist?"

Male voice: That's good!

Poor Rosina! She used to beat this into heads of auditors in London. She used to beat this into the Comm Course and so forth, and I feel like I'm exposing a secret weapon that she had, to give you the answer to this. But the secret answer to it is *life*.

Female voice: Good.

Okay. Now, here we have another question: "What are the mechanics of restimulation in terms of thinnies?"

I love this word "thinnies." Actually you can go right on calling them facsimiles, pictures. It doesn't matter what you call them. Mechanics of restimulation are very, very simple. It is an identification of one remote viewpoint with another. Got that? Got a remote viewpoint sitting out here in front of that wall—then you get another green wall someplace, and this remote viewpoint's looking at a green wall, this other one looks at a green wall, and a person is too easily identifying things anyway and he snaps these two together and they both occupy the same point and that's restimulation. You might say restimulation is lost location—you lose the location of an anchor point or where it is.

All right. Here's another one. Got that one?

Audience: Yeah.

All right. Oh, this is an embarrassing one. I don't think—I don't even think it needs answering or that I should answer it or anything of the sort, but it says: "How does 'handle' relate to 'have,' 'permit to remain,' and 'dispense with'? How does *handle* relate to this?"

Well, it takes that part of "possessiveness" which is right up close—have, possess—a person has to be that close to it in order to have it or handle it, has to be right in it or be it. And when it's in that close you could say that's "have."

"Permit to" would be communicate *at* it or permit it to communicate— out or in. Now, just be able to look at it, to flow out toward it, is to handle it: permit. In other words, I can flow toward that thing without changing it in any way. You ask the preclear, "Look around here and tell me what you would permit to remain." And he says, "That air conditioner," and this means then that he can have the air conditioner be there with all alteration. In other words, he'd just as soon it *was* there and he would feel competent to have it there, or in some fashion to handle it. It's an inference that handling is possible without change.

Now we get "dispense with" and of course that becomes very easy. The way you would dispense with—why, to handle it that's obvious. That's just throw it away. To kick it out the window. To push it over the cliff. You would have to outflow against it again. That answer it?

All right. We have here: "How many hours should be given to teaching a validation course in the field?"

We have not been able to teach one under three weeks full time at the Academy.

And here's another one: "TR 0 and TR 1 do not leave much two-way comm between the coach and student. Could this be changed and should it be changed?"

Now, the truth of the matter is that there is as much two-way communication between the coach and the preclear in any TR as is necessary to get him to do the process. And most coaches are far too reticent and talk far too little, and if they talk too much it's too little point. There is two-way comm between the coach and the student. If you have felt that there is not, then you have excessively curbed yourself while coaching or curbed yourself while being an auditor. There is nothing in the book says that an auditor can't cut loose and say to the coach, "Boy, you're really giving me a hard time!" There is nothing that says that the coach cannot say, "Well, we've been going over this and over this and over this and you still stink."

There is nothing in the book that says these remarks could not be made or any other similar remarks. But a coach who sits there—and I think this is where the mistake that "there isn't much" is made—is we do try to prevent too much *how* to do it. The coach shouldn't sit there and go on and on and on and on about how this is done and never give the student a chance to do it. You got that? That's the only thing you're trying to prevent.

You can give somebody the steps which have to be done in order to achieve something, if these are known. You can use an idea you have about what he is doing and you can correct these things. There actually are no brakes put on it. Not really. But the Instructors in this ACC have been very, very strongly against too much "how to do it" with too little point, which confused the student. And if they felt a student was getting confused by a coach they were liable to chop it. That's what that's all about, okay?

63

Now, somebody says here: "Is there such a thing as disability? Is it a gradient scale, gradient level of ability?"

Well, it's odd that this question would be asked, but I realize that the person that asked it couldn't have heard the 17th ACC, and neither have any of you—many of you.

But listen! There is no such thing as disability. The government pays money for it. Insurance companies are always paying off on it. People are always using it as an excuse. As a matter of fact, it's the one thing that prevented me from asking embarrassing questions of certain people that came up to me in the street and asked for a dime. They were obviously *unable* to do things. You don't say, "Why don't you go out and get a job?" Obviously he's "unable" to hold a job.

And this is so obvious that everybody has overlooked it. If we can turn on a full-scale mock-up on that wall in complete, solid 3-D on anybody, including a black eighteen, in about ten to fifteen minutes of auditing, which he will then take five days, sometimes, to get rid of, we can realize that there's nothing wrong with his ability to mock up. There is everything wrong with his *willingness* to do so. Willingness is the monitor of ability. Everybody can do everything he could ever do.

Now, if anybody here has been a member of the planet builders, they can undoubtedly still build planets. Mock up a bunch of stuff whizzing around in space, chunk it all together, throw it into a ball and kick it into an orbit. He could probably take Earth and swing it around his head like one of these hammer-throw gadgets. But he's not willing to do so!

Now, as I said, you could throw Earth around your head. You immediately said, "Well, no—think of all the people that would suffer." You didn't

2 AUGUST 1957

say, "That's impossible!" See, all of the people that would suffer if somebody disturbed Earth in its orbit.

Willingness to do is the monitor of ability and is the only thing that monitors ability. But this is so condemning that very few people like to have anything to do with it. It is on this premise alone that the 18th ACC is being taught. If you see somebody doing a job very, very badly, you are perfectly willing to assume that he is unable—but that's charity. The point of the matter is, he is not *willing* to do a better job.

Now, auditing in this direction we can straighten up job difficulties with considerable ease. We find out what part of the job it would be all right for the fellow to do. Then he finally finds some part and then we can increase this part and all of a sudden, he's "It'd be perfectly all right to do this job—I just don't want to," or something of the sort. We could go over it and flatten this out and he would then be able to do the job. But he was able to do the job all the time anyway.

Now, your preclear can do anything he could ever do—but he's not willing to. To a large degree, it is up to you to improve his willingness. When you do a bad auditing job on it, you deteriorate his willingness. But a good auditing job will increase his willingness. Therefore, that whole line of techniques: "What wouldn't you mind (blank)?" Those techniques that went, "What wouldn't you mind ...?" "Is there anything in the room you wouldn't mind having?"—had considerable bite.

64

Well, it's quite interesting, though, to occasionally run into somebody who tells you rather triumphantly, "Well, the auditor was only running 'What wouldn't I *mind* having?'—I didn't have to have anything." This is so much hidden that it's hidden from most people. And they say, "If only I had the ability to paint, to write, to act, to sing—if I only had these abilities." *Aaah!*

Let's say, well, a fellow with a broken leg is not able to dance a jig. Well, that is certainly pulling a long bow! The truth of the matter is, he wasn't willing to have a sound leg and we come closer to home. This whole subject of willingness versus ability is so condemning that people do not like it very well.

Now, in cracking through, we actually need only to disclose to an individual at his own rate of advance that he *can* recover. We disclose to him at his own rate of advance that he can recover. If we make him recover too fast, it is beyond his rate of advance. This tells you there is nothing really wrong with the preclear except his unwillingness to be right.

But of course, if you look it over you find that it's impossible to be right and be human. That is *not* possible. It is not possible to be human and be right. One goes down the street being wrong, wrong, wrong, wrong, and that's called manners—called politeness—called all sorts of things. Want to look that over someday. It'll give you a lot of laughs just arguing that out in a bull session, you know. Can you be right and be human? Becomes very amusing.

But if you turn on ability *faster* than the preclear is willing to have it turned on—in other words, if you exceed his willingness—he'll be in the horrible condition of not remembering or being completely willing to turn it off, and yet he'll manage it in a short time. Day, two days, three days, five days; he'll get it off again.

If you had that one button—this is what's wrong with the one-button process, don't you see—and you had just one button and you just pushed that one button on the case, *bing*, and the individual at once stood forth like Jupiter or something—Apollo, no less! It would be true; the individual would stand forth like Apollo. And he'd be walking down the street complete and

ready to make the sun rise. But you see him two then three days later and he would have fallen in the tar or something and then made pretty sure that he cut this ability to be Apollo back. You got the idea? He would have—he would have worked!

And to see people work on this—I have watched several people work on this because we have several processes that do this—and to see somebody working to get off an ability is really one of the more amusing things. They argue—and they've lost the route; they've lost their way, they can't deteriorate it fast and it's just terrible. It's an awful strain. Terrible thing to do to somebody.

This we sometimes see as a manic. We run somebody; all of a sudden they feel tremendously good! Of course they could feel tremendously good all the time anyway—they're not willing to feel that good. It's liable to do something terrible to them, they say—another thing. They're just not *willing* to feel that good and they will go two, three days and then all of a sudden *thud*. And boy, when they thud, they usually over- or underestimate the landing field. Quite amusing.

The process, by the way, which turns on the mock-ups might interest you. It's "Get the idea of putting a clear mock-up there as big as the wall." "Now get the idea that that would spoil the game and not do it." And you just get them to think that cycle. In most cases—those that will think the thoughts you tell them to—all of a sudden it doesn't matter what the visio field is. All of a sudden there will be this tremendous mock-up up there, totally solid, you know, and they'll be looking at the horses champing in it, and everything going on beautifully, zzzzzzz. They just sit there and sweat trying to get the mock-up down, see?

65

You can run that usually ten or fifteen minutes. The auditing commands are, "Get the idea of putting up a mock-up as big as that wall." "Now get the idea that would spoil the game and not do it." That similarly works this way: you say, "Decide"—decide can be also used—"Decide to create a man in full form in the middle of the room that everybody could see. Then decide that would ruin the game and not do it." And the next thing you know you'll get a shimmer in the middle of the room. That takes a little longer than the subjective mock-up but not too much longer.

Of course the way to ruin anybody is to get—tell them, "Now decide to mock up a pile of money here that everybody would recognize as money. Now get the idea that would spoil the game and not do it." The individual, just really—that really would spoil the game, you see? And he's suddenly realized he could shoot the works just in no time at all, and he's carrying on this game he's got very tenuously. So we have to admit that too great an ability spoils all games.

The willingness is monitored by the games he could have, by the way. That's the—what the willingness is monitored by. What game can he have? Well, if he doesn't think he can have any games then he's not willing to get good enough to—if he doesn't think he can have any other game than "sick man" (that's a game, by the way—"invalid" or "sick man"), if he can only have that game then he must keep his willingnesses down on all other levels of progress.

"Invent a game," or "Now, come on. Tell me a game you could really play," as a very persuasive question, actually does more for a case, as crude as it is as a process, than this: "Mock it up and then decide not to," you know, "because it would spoil the game." Got that?

2 AUGUST 1957

I think I've wogged a few of you. What's the matter here? Don't you believe this? Well, you don't have to believe it. Just after the lecture, try it! There are aud— there's some auditors present that'd run it on you.

All right. Here's a question—got that one now, huh?

Audience: Yeah.

All right. "Does confront mean confront *with* something, like a body, or can a little old thetan confront all by his lonesome?"

I hate to have to answer that question, but it turned up here—for this reason: when you confront *with* something you're in a no-game condition. Now, let's get this—let's get this. I tested this very carefully: "Mock up your mother and make her confront that wall." Boy, does that sound good. Now, we'll find out that isn't a game—making Mother confront that wall. "Mock up Mother and refuse to let her confront the wall," and boy is that a games condition!

So if you *use* something to confront other things with, you'll spin in after a while. You've no choice. If you always use a body to confront things with, your body will deteriorate.

Now, you can *stand* a body there and confront somebody yourself, and that's what you'd better do.

I notice people running confrontingness with eyeballs. They sit down in front of this—front of the coach and start confronting with the two eyeballs—turn the eyeballs out and confront the coach with the eyeballs. And after a while their eyeballs get sort of glassy, you know, and they start to smart. They'll cave in after a while.

It's very easy to confront. All you have to do is put your body in a chair and then confront the preclear and don't pay any attention to your body. Of course, if you look at the preclear as a thetan, you're then conceiving a static—so you better be able to.

But, it's an interesting thing that the process, "Mock up your mother and make her confront that wall," or "Mock up your body and make it confront that wall," and so forth, is highly limited, and on any wide test at all, just spins the fellow right in. You're giving them wins! See? You're giving Mama wins! See, if Mama could confront utterly, why, she could ruin you. You've got to cut her confrontingness down. You've got to say, "Mama, it isn't really true that you're willing to confront me, is it? Mama, here's a couple of things that are pretty horrible and the schoolteacher couldn't confront them, the minister couldn't confront them, Daddy couldn't confront them, nobody could confront them, I haven't been able to confront them and I'm sure you can't confront them, Mama. Isn't that true?"

She says, "Yes dear. That's pretty horrible."

That's the whole game of "how bad it is over there," see? This doesn't meet the eye at first at all. In order to get any reality on this you really ought to get the process run or run the process, "Mock up your mother and make her confront that wall" and then you'd see where you'd get making your body confront everything. People that take their bodies out and make them confront racing cars and things like that—make the *body* confront racing cars; just don't let the body ride, see—after a while, get all exhausted and nervous. The body gets all exhausted and nervous. They're making the *body* confront. Well, a body can't confront all that. I don't know why people are using bodies to drive racing cars except to give the crowd a thrill anyhow.

Anyway, here's another one: "What considerations and disabilities chiefly stand in the way of exteriorization and stable exterior and OT?"

Operating Thetan. First mention we've had of OT this year. What stands

in the road of it? I've just told you. Unwillingness. You ask a person, "All right now, what game could you play as an Operating Thetan?"

Funny part of it is, if he flattened the process he might become one. See? What game could you play as an Operating Thetan? If he finally found for sure and positively that he could play one, why, he'd have some willingness to become one.

Now, as far as exteriorization is concerned, an individual who goes around losing bodies all the time—every few years he loses a body. It's getting a longer period of time—he has one that's half dead for half a lifetime now. But he used to lose a body about every twenty or thirty years and it's gotten longer, but not much body.

Yeah, you go down to these cemeteries and so on, it's quite remarkable to read the tombstones. This girl—this girl is a mother of seven children, departed and dearly beloved. And read the dates of demise on the thing and you say, "Seven children!" It was an old woman of twenty-two, see? You look over these tombstones here in the East and it's quite wild. This fellow was an old man of thirty and so on. Why, you read these characters that signed the Declaration of Independence and so forth. The schoolbooks teach you that they were all old men. I don't know what their average age was but it was pretty young.

As a matter of fact, in some effort to cut down the number of candidates for various offices they put some ages in the constitution. Remember? Well, that sure cut down candidates like mad because there were very few at that time that old. They'd die off before they got that old, on an average. But they lived very short but happy ones, as the saying goes.

Well, an individual keeps losing mock-ups one way or the other and he begins to get superstitious and he starts to hang on to them harder and harder and closer and closer. You got the idea? Less and less trust in the fact that it will stay around. So he develops various mechanisms to keep mock-ups in close—and that's exterior—interiorization. See? Keep losing mock-ups, you'll say somebody's stealing them and you start keeping them in closer and closer and closer and playing it up closer and closer and closer, and the next thing you know, why, you're in the middle of one.

Now, you have to get a fellow over the idea of the scarcity of bodies before he will exteriorize with comfort. If—actually if you just had him waste bodies—waste healthy bodies for a while, like I told you way back when—PAB 1, I think it is—why, he'll exteriorize and stay exteriorized. We have so many exteriorization processes today, I haven't even bothered to keep a catalog of them. I just keep telling people this: that there's lots of exteriorization processes. But I don't give them any list of them.

And every time I start to write a list of them I know exactly why people don't exteriorize and so I say to hell with it. I stopped worrying about exteriorization when I found out that *a fellow couldn't* stick in his head after he kicked the mock-up off, and when I also found out that the thetan loves pain. He protests against it like mad because he can't have it, but he actually is unhappy without it. You give a guy a steel mock-up that won't give him any pain back, and he'll invent a machine in it that'll give him some pain.

He'll invent some ridges. He'll invent a mind. He'll do something. So it's a rather snide attitude I have regarding this particular manifestation. There isn't any particular reason to exteriorize anybody. We've found out in Scientology that an engram is a moment (in Scientology)—engram in Dianetics is a moment of pain and unconsciousness, recorded with full perception. You understand?

2 AUGUST 1957

That's a Dianetic engram. A Scientology engram is a moment of pain, unconsciousness and exteriorization. You start running something on—I'll tell you a honey of a process! You want to hear a real honey of a process? This is a killer! This is a killer on the subject of exteriorization. I say there are thousands of them. There really are. But this, amongst all others, is an easier one for the preclear to swallow and carry along with and it's quite interesting. Is, "Recall a time you were in a body." Oh! You're just recording on this one, huh?

"Recall a time you were in a body."

"Good."

"Recall another time you were in a body."

"Good. Fine."

"Recall another time"—or "Recall *a* time you were in a body," more correctly.

"Good."

Next thing you know, *wham, wham, zoom, zing, zoom, brrp*, facsimiles, *zuh, rrup!*

And you say, "What happened?"

"I don't know! (*sniff, sniff*) I was a perfectly happy shoemaker sticking to my last, and a nail flew off the shoe and went in my right eye and killed me dead!"

And you say, "What are you talking about?"

You're running out his last exteriorization and that recall process goes right down the line and hits it just as neat as could be.

By the way, a postpartum psychosis probably is a moment of exteriorization. A accident—an accident which doesn't contain a moment of exteriorization probably wasn't very severe. Individual went *way* off and said, "Well, shall I go any further, or did it live?"

That's a tricky process, "Recall a time you were in a body." There's a direct process which doesn't necessarily work a half-a-dozen times and—that is, if it works once. Somebody gives you a real—this isn't therapeutic—somebody gives you a *real* bad argument, you know, they say, "Well, you're talking about thetans. All us psychologists, we all know..." I know, I'm sorry to have to rant and rave about the psychologists again. I try to give them a break. I pretend they're not skunks. And I—somebody's ranting and raving at you and saying, "What is this exteriorization? The idea! You're a cult because you have a bunch of thetans and you know nobody's a soul or a spirit. It's all been disproved by modern communitomy!"

And you say, "Well, that may be and that may not be. But what I'd like you to do right now—having *nothing* to do with that subject—is just take hold of your head and keep it from going away." It's hardly anybody can do that for ten minutes without yo-yoing.

All of a sudden he'll be out there looking at the back of the body and he'll say, "*Eek!*"

How many of you have tried that on people, by the way?

There's almost any process that'll exteriorize these days. Old Start-C-S, just run that way, interspersed with Connectedness—by the way, that makes a good intensive, just old Start-C-S and "Find something you wouldn't mind connecting with you." Those two make a fine intensive. They give very good results but they quite ordinarily result in exteriorization. In the course of twenty-five hours you'll have somebody out.

Okay. Somebody says here, "Can an auditor who is rather severely near-sighted greatly increase a pc's willingness to confront the environment?"

Ha! I'll say so! I'd hate to give you any examples. Actually, it takes a near-sighted auditor to be a complete beast on the subject. He's usually obsessed on it.

Aw, case doesn't have much to do with it these days. Somebody who has a terribly low trust level, who is in perpetual doubt or something like this, who can't really say yes or no to a circumstance or situation, would probably have an awful time trying to coach anybody to do anything. You know, I mean he couldn't say, "Well, the auditor in this case, in the training drill, is supposed to do so-and-so"—and this individual would be so doubtful about everything under the sun, moon or stars that he could not say that the auditor had done it. Supposed to sit there quietly in the chair—the auditor sits there quietly in the chair. The coach couldn't make up his mind whether or not the auditor had sat quietly in the chair and he'd sound doubtful all the time and so on. And this would be very bad in the final aggregate because it would stack up, apparently, an enormous number of loses for the auditor, so he couldn't do it. Beyond that, I'd say that was about its only real limitation.

This person also wants to know—this person thinks I'm a walking encyclopedia: "What tape is PAB 111, on eyesight and glasses, taken from?"

Heh! I'll bet you thought I couldn't tell you, huh? Well, it's not from a tape at all. It's from a question and answer period of the 15th, 16th, or 17th ACC, and probably the 17th.

Male voice: Sixteenth.

Sixteenth?

Male voice: Yes.

It is. The sixteenth. But it's a Q and A period after an ACC lecture and it's not a lecture at all. And I don't think it's even available in tape form as far as I know.

"Any more news on pressures?"

Well now, this seems to be requiring a last-minute bulletin here as though we were putting out bulletins on this subject. Well, as a matter of fact, there are very few hurricanes gathering in the Gulf at the present moment. The president has, as usual, played a couple of good rounds of golf, and the news on pressures is that they're building up.

You saw pretty close to the ultimate in pressures, at the congress, as far as the processes are concerned—as far as knowing what to do with these processes and so on. Pressures can be added to any process. We have somebody touch the wall with the right hand. We could then say, "Now adjust it to an acceptable pressure." You could throw it in there. You could have somebody touching his body or confronting a body part or something like that and then make him do it with an acceptable pressure. You could throw this in almost anywhere. It's quite workable.

It's a thetan's experience of havingness. Of course there are other things connected with havingness than pressure, but it's an experience of havingness and an important one. And therefore is quite important in auditing. Very much—a lot of work has been done on this but there isn't any particular news. You saw the two processes—actually two hours of tape in the congress just past, the Freedom Congress—contain about the hottest processes developed out of pressures. There've been no hotter processes than those. That I would suddenly cut loose and without warning and with malice aforethought, run this on a whole congress at Tone 40, most of whom had never heard of it before, you can just assign to my cussedness. It's an adventurous thing to do. The truth of the matter is, we were blowing people out of their heads around there like popcorn coming out of a shallow pan.

2 AUGUST 1957

I simply determined to give these people some reality on what we were talking about. And people found the floor and found faces and found that ground was ground, more than they ever had before. You see? But it's actually an individual process and I wouldn't essay to run it on a group if I were you. It's something you do on a wholly individual basis. There were only four hundred people at the congress—you can get away with that.

Boy, were there casualties!

Of course, part of the insouciance was just having the ACC staff monitor it, having everybody else sit down and do it. That was actually in the interest of putting the people under control. You realize that? Truth of the matter was, I should have had four times as many seminar leaders, but it obviously was not anything that was going to be that destructive because we had so few. Don't you see? But if you'll listen to that tape again—by the way, that tape is available all by itself.

Hm?

Audience: Reel three.

Mm-hm. It's reel three. It's available all by itself. Its commands are as they are. It's just a good Tone 40 individual process, is all it is. That, by the way, was a piece of high adventure which maybe some of you missed. It's an individual process. It's not tailor-made to run on groups at all.

"Please give the current definition of the sense of humor."

Any of you seen the most recent *Ability*?

Audience: Yep. Yeah. No.

It contains the reviews contained in *Newsweek* magazine about a book called *Beyond Laughter* by Professor Goofwoofle, a psychiatrist from Woofwaf-fle, Beverly Hills, California. Published by McGraw-Hill. Six dollars ill spent.

"Laughter is a manifestation of *severe* neuroses and anybody should be watched carefully who does any laughing." After years of study he's come to the conclusion that it means a deep-seated psychosis has been setting in.

Now, you think I'm kidding you. But there is a great, big, thick book of about 296 pages on the subject of why you shouldn't laugh, and in view of the fact that the only psychotherapy known by the Italians, as a cure of melancholy (or any psychosis) was laughter—for some modern witch doctor to fumble-dumble along and put something off on the public and then to get a serious review in *Newsweek* magazine, tells me it's darker than I thought. It is the wildest book you ever wanted anything to do with.

Laughter is normally considered to be rejection. It actually is that mechanism which handles and as-ises surprise. Now, I talked to you about surprise the other day. And an individual who can take a surprise with a laugh is in good shape, and an individual who takes a surprise with shock and great seriousness is not in very good shape. And an individual who resents everybody laughing (that he tries to give a shock *to*), is psychotic. I say that with seriousness, not just as a quip. It's a serious subject.

No, laughter is a mechanism by which one as-ises surprise. If you'll notice, nearly all humor is based on a change of pace and it's based on the zigs when they should zag. And comics, for instance, come out and do something that should be done quite another way, and people simply reject or register their surprise, you might say, with laughter. The fellow's going to step on the tight wire. He steps over it and goes down with a crash. Well, this is perfectly silly because they didn't expect him to do that.

Now, if it gets very serious—such as a fellow on a high wire and he purposely has the wire suddenly slacken so that he can catch it eight or ten

feet down, you'll hear people in the crowd scream. It is serious to them to the degree that somebody's liable to lose his life over this situation. And this sudden change of pace elicits a scream. So you could say that laughter, to some degree, follows the gradient of seriousness, according to the individual.

Now, if a person laughs for the whole gamut and laughs at anything that happens, regardless of what it is, he probably isn't laughing at anything. And this is possibly the laughter that this psychiatrist was talking about. He probably is around insane asylums and so forth. And he heard people laughing (not at or about anything, they just went on laughing) and he decided this was very serious. If he'd gotten out of an insane asylum, (if they'd let him) they would have—they would have discovered in no uncertain terms that there are very few such cases on the loose—very few. As a matter of fact, it's rather a rare case.

Now, you'll see somebody laughing at a moment that everybody else should consider very, very serious. Now, let's say his girl just jilted him. I can tell you how serious this is, see? An individual, actually, had a girl jilt him—that is to say, she just threw him over. When he came to call—everything was all arranged, they were going to have wedding bells and et ceteras—and when he came to call there was another man there, in bed. So the fellow who was going to get married went out and got a pistol and came back in and sat down on the porch, waiting for the other guy to come out. He'd been sitting there for about five minutes and all of a sudden began to laugh like hell and he just laughed and laughed and laughed. And finally this other guy did come out, and he looked at him and he laughed hysterically and could practically not walk down the road. Got home, threw the pistol in a drawer. And I audited the incident out of this individual several years later and there was *nothing* on it!

71

It was the love of his life! He'd gotten rid of the whole works. He just blew it! It was supremely funny to him. He suddenly found himself sitting there in the dark of night, an assassin, with a pistol in his hand. And he couldn't take it!

I saw a fellow one night in a cafe reach into his pocket, pull out his wallet to pay a very fancy bill—this was a New York night club bill, when I was a writer up there—and his wallet was totally empty! And he sat there and he looked at it, and the waiter came over, and the headwaiter came over, and the manager came over, and he looked at them and he looked at the empty wallet and he looked at his girl that he was trying to impress, and all of a sudden he just broke out into howls of laughter! And they couldn't get him to stop laughing! And practically collapsing and weakly—the last I saw of him he was staggering out the door, howling like mad. I'm sure nobody had to run that out of him.

No, laughter is not just a release. Laughter is a definite *type* of response, physiological and mental, to a situation which contains a zag when it ought to contain a zig. And people who are in pretty good shape, sooner or later, in any situation, will find that it has just gotten just *too* serious. And you'll find oddly enough that only those circumstances where laughter is socially forbidden produce aberration.

So much for *Beyond Laughter* and the subject of laughter. It is quite a mechanism. When you can no longer laugh at something, watch out. Get it audited out.

The mechanism of line charges is quite interesting. It's never been discovered exactly how to trigger a line charge. I normally can trigger a line

2 AUGUST 1957

charge and get a release of a whole bunch of locks—just get a guy laughing all the locks off. But it is so unreliable, we have never said anything about the technique at all. It is so seldom done. But the basic mechanism is, is just keep it making more and more and more serious until it becomes too serious, and the fellow all of a sudden revolts from this being too serious and springs into a line charge. Like the girl who was nervous on the stage, and Lyle told her, "But isn't it your fear that as you walk away from the mike you'll knock down all the scenery? Isn't that your fear?" And all of a sudden she line charged and it wiped out her stage fright.

The mechanism is, is make it more and more and more serious until it becomes utterly and completely ridiculous and the person will explode the whole thing off in laughter. Man, if sane, is a child of laughter and only when he begins to look very gloomy and glum—watch out.

Thank you.

FACTORS BEHIND THE HANDLING OF IQ

A lecture given on 5 August
1957

Thank you. Thank you.
How are you tonight?

Audience: Fine!

I want to compliment you on almost everyone having survived into and including the fourth week of the 18th ACC. And this was not looked for. I am very surprised. Very surprised.

Male voice: Fire the Instructors.

You're not going to have to fire the Instructors on the 18th ACC. They're expended probably at the end of the unit.

Okay. This is the sixteenth lecture of the 18th ACC, Aug. 5, 1957. AD 7.

Male voice: Amen.

We are covering here—going to cover here intelligence. IQ, the handling of.

Male voice: Good.

This past week has been an eventful one in research. It has culminated a four-year search for the factors which lay behind what is called IQ or intelligence quotient.

We have been taking pc tests here for many years. And these tests were used mainly to establish change. We care nothing about the significance of a test. We do care about the fact that these tests mirror change.

Now, someone can say that a test taken twice will of course get a better answer than one taken once. I don't know why this is true since everybody in the MEST universe is on "it mustn't happen again." You automatically figure that a test taken twice would get a worse grade the second time. That's beside the point.

They have tests which have different questions, and they call the B section and the A section and so forth. And you give two different tests, really, which are supposed to give identical results.

Now, I have been waiting for people who did this testing originally and so forth to come up and say, "Well, they don't—these tests that you're doing, you can throw the result in any direction that you want to." And I've just been waiting with this one right behind the gun, see. I've been waiting with this one in a holster, tied down low. "You mean your tests are no damn good? Huh-huh!"

But we have given a considerable amount of testing to a considerable number of people. And we do find that a test will hold constant on a given person in the absence of processing.

If a person is not processed, the variability in the profile and variability in the IQ is very slight. Over a period of years this is true.

Somebody who is getting no results whatsoever from any treatment or processing will register the same, test after test after test, which is quite unusual.

Now therefore, our failures have been of some benefit, and naturally there have been failures since experimental processes have been run. And the process was not intended to do anything but to find out what the process would do. And those processes that don't do anything of course didn't do anything and you got the same test back again on the A or B type.

Quite interesting, the whole subject of testing. Particularly interesting since it is a very old subject. It is not a subject developed in modern times. Testing is so aged, so ancient that it probably has longer hair than the long-hairs. It's—one of the first examples of testing that we find is in the early Chaldean times. Testing of all kinds and sorts and descriptions as to honesty, intent, reliability, ability and so forth have been with man almost as long as man has been around. It is not a new subject at all.

In modern times these tests have been reduced to writing. I'll give you a guilt test I heard about from the eighteenth century down in Georgia. It's pronounced "Jawjia." This test, throughout its use, was always very successful. It was a guilt test; and somebody had stolen something, they would have all the Negroes on the plantation line up and they would put a rooster underneath a big black kettle. And he was a witch rooster or something of the sort, you know, and they'd say, "Now, the man who stole it—the man who stole it, when he touches the black kettle will make the rooster crow."

74

And all the line of Negroes on the plantation would go by the kettle, you know? And then the overseer would merely have to go by and look at their hands, and the Negro who didn't have any soot on his hands was of course guilty.

There have been tests by fire even earlier than that. All you had to do to prove yourself innocent was to put your hand in the flame.

All tests, however, have had an end goal, and they are, of modern times, more or less covert. They're as covert as this rooster under the black kettle. You're supposed to answer a certain number of questions and as you answer them you get a certain grade. If you answer more questions in a given period of time, why, you're supposed to be better off than fewer questions in a given period of time. This is a very interestingly complex subject, modern testing, for this reason only, is: it was originally devised in the total belief that man could not be changed.

From year to year people would get changes of one kind or another from childhood on, which would demonstrate the year IQ, you might say.

And it could be higher and lower than other year IQs. They thought that people advanced in IQ because of age and so forth, and yet they maintained at the same time that IQ or intelligence quotient could not change, would never change, and could not be influenced by any particular factor.

I am rather astounded to discover that when a person is happy and takes the test and when the same person is unhappy and takes the test, he gets practically the same curve and practically the same IQ. Quite interesting.

He can get up with a horrible hangover and he will get only slightly less. Not a significant amount less than when he got up after a good 48-hour, round-the-clock sleep. It is quite amazing. That is what is peculiar about testing, is it does have a constancy.

It was this constancy in testing and an inability to understand the mind prior to 1950 which made people say that it was not possible to change man

FACTORS BEHIND THE HANDLING OF IQ

and he could not change. His IQ couldn't change. If he—a stupid man was a stupid man, a bright man was a bright man and that was it. And of course all men were stupid and there were no bright men except the testers, so this sort of made it unanimous.

Well anyway, we come down now to definitions. The history of testing is fascinating, but what's more fascinating is that anyone would have come along and have said, "Now look, there is such a thing as personality, and this is distinct and independent of intelligence. Intelligence is one thing, personality is another thing. And people actually had this idea, and although they had dozens of other categories which are less factual, these two categories are distinctly different.

A person—intelligence is not his personality. And so tests exist to measure personality, and tests exist to measure intelligence.

Now, this is one of the easier things to observe. One of the ways one would observe this, quite elementary, he would take three or four fellows who had more or less an equal personability. These people were all bond salesmen, they were more or less charming and hail fellows or whatever bond salesmen have to be, and they would test these fellows and they'd find their personalities were the same, but their IQs were different.

Then they'd find several people of the same IQ and they would find that they had different personalities one from another.

This could not have failed to be observed. It's one of the more elementary things.

Now, imagine our original interest in Phoenix, Arizona, when we were really going all out on testing—very early times we were in Phoenix—to discover that we process somebody with Scientology, and we gave him before that a personality test and IQ test. And after we had processed him we'd give him another personality, another IQ test, and we were not so amazed that change had taken place. We'd known that ever since 1950 when the first testing was done. But we were amazed that these things—for a while it sort of looked like they went either this way or that way. In other words, we either changed their personality or we changed their intelligence. Very often, in a very successful case, we changed both. Improved both. But these factors were changing independent of each other.

Well, this created a mystery, and I'm a sucker for mysteries. And this mystery invited my eye, and I gazed upon it with some astonishment because I said, "Why is it that we run an intensive on Joe and change his IQ, and run an intensive on Bill and change his personality but not his IQ?" Very mysterious.

In view of the fact that all of our processes were to a large degree mixed—they'd include Havingness and they'd include 8-C and they'd include thinkingness processes and significances and so forth—in view of the fact that auditors were different from one auditor to another, we had a sufficient number of factors in each one of these test representations to make it impossible to sort out which was which. What process or attitude changed IQ? What process or attitude changed personality? It's just *bthaaah*.

And every time I'd spread a lot of these tests out and start to go over them statistically in any way, and I'd try to do it by symbolic logic and by woman's intuition and other mathematics and I could not certainly isolate this. As—a time or two actually asked people to just process one sort of process. And this would radically alter. In other words, we'd process a certain type of process on one preclear and change his personality; another—same type process on another preclear and change his IQ.

5 AUGUST 1957

Well, in view of a brash statement I made the other day to the government of the United States (that's a place down here at—well, it exists, I suppose) anyway, I wrote a letter and it got somewhere, I think. And in this letter I was offering to change the IQ of defense scientists by a lot of points per scientist. And—this was part of the rendition, anyway. But—there's been a lot of chatter back and forth about this project's going on. Anyway, I stuck my neck out and I said, well, we could change the IQ of scientists anywhere from 15 to 75 points. Of course—and could absolutely count on changing them 10 or 15 points. Well, we could. Our averages show that. But, I don't know why—it may be that my left medulla oblongata does not know what my right orbit is doing—but I started out an entirely different project with the HGC auditors last week and wound up with the answer to this thing I'm talking about. With no intention of winding up with the answer at all—it's one of those things. Accidentals.

Now, what happened was this. We wanted a process that we could write up in a book and send to ministers so that they could counsel easily and well. Ministers of any denomination. And they, in counseling this way, would get a certain release and result amongst the congregation since the minister is doing a tremendous amount of personal counseling anyway. And if he could just sit down and according to these rules, as he would read them (which would be rather sloppily), get some sort of a result, we'd be very happy. And we were simply trying to tailor up the question. What was the best question on this one process? That was all we were trying to do.

76

And we call this Process July. Now, we knew one thing about Process July, and that was that it was slanted in the direction of getting people to unburden their souls. That was all it was. That was the only direction it was slanted. We wanted to get the overt act-motivator sequence off the case. Smart, huh? So we'd have the minister sit there and write down the names and—of everybody that the person knew. We'd hardly dignify this person by saying "preclear." Probably a lot of these cases it'd be pre-butchery. But he'd write down all the names of the people he knew, endlessly, you see? And then pick out the most likely candidates and then just ask this one question about each one of those until we got this person straightened out and cleaned up.

Now, there's a communication process which would put these people into better communication. The communication process would be "something you could do or say to so-and-so." We'd ask that as sort of a Straightwire or present time basis. "Tell me something you could do or say to (valence)." You know, Grandpa or somebody like that. That was about all this process was going to consist of, but we did know this: that an overt act-motivator sequence is a reach-withdraw situation. See, I knew that. All right.

Therefore, we had to test "withhold." Obviously we had this withhold thing. Now, earlier processes already had given us this one. It's Recall a Secret, and that's from two years ago right here in Washington. "Recall a secret." And "Recall a secret. Recall another secret. Recall another secret." But don't get that process too confused with this process because they're not the same process at all. We just wanted the fellow to open up and talk to the auditor when we were recalling secrets. And if we did anything with Recall a Secret, it was totally by accident, we learn here on "withhold."

All right. So the first auditing question which was asked in this particular project, written here, "Think of something you could withhold from." Now, it was—all we did was take the preclears . . . And we knew this would do them a lot of good and that we were not doing anything—as a matter of fact,

FACTORS BEHIND THE HANDLING OF IQ

the results are—well, they got tremendously good results. But we just took a list of people and then started down this list. We found that was too arduous right from scratch.

But we asked them then this auditing question, "Something you could withhold from." And then we turned around and ran "Recall something you've said or done to (that valence)." Made it a Recall Process, and "Invent something you could say or do to," and ran those processes. In other words, make an inventiveness one, or "Think of something you could say or do to."

Now, one of the discoveries that led to this—it might fascinate you—and that is that divulgence and confession, we'd already learned, had nothing to do with raising anybody's IQ or improving his case. It wasn't the fact that he confessed it. It wasn't the fact that he divulged it. It was the fact that he'd erased it. See? I mean, big difference. Big difference.

For instance, there's an organization over in some foreign country—I've forgotten what it is—and they have little boxes, and they put a man in a box and members of the congregation come up and whisper something through the curtains of the box and they think that this is the stuff, you know? Now actually, they must have cut their therapy down because their early record demonstrates that they did a great deal for people, and their later records don't demonstrate they're doing very much for people.

As a matter of fact, they lost one of their leaders recently. He also wore glasses. They couldn't possibly be producing too much in the way of result with this. And I learned some time ago that to confess something or to divulge it in some fashion had nothing to do with psychotherapy. But this was borne out in this Process July, like mad. Because you understand, the auditor was not saying, "Tell me something you could withhold from Grandpa." He was saying, "Think of something you could withhold from Grandpa." You got the idea? And the auditor would just sit there and acknowledge it and the pc would think of something else he could withhold from Grandpa and the auditor would acknowledge that. You got the idea.

All right. We started in on this on the "withhold" side of it for a couple of days, and then we went over to the "do or say something" and we varied that question around for a couple of days, and then came back to "Think of something you could withhold from (valence)."

And when we got back to that, why, we knew we were in the chips on that question. That was the question that was producing the results. "Think of something you could do or say." "Think of something you could do or say" might unburden it, might rehabilitate something and very possibly (yet to be discovered) may have some workability when crossed over with this withhold question.

But the truth of the matter is, as one of the HGC auditors pointed out, this withhold is a games condition on communication and is a partner to this process: "Mock up somebody and deny him communication." Now, that's a games condition process, don't you see?

And people who are in a games condition—obsessive games condition, got to play a game with everybody they meet and don't even know it—on the subject of communication, are naturally going to be obsessively withholding. Well, you'd think that this was the thing we were trying to break. But the entire framework of research here, aimed as it was originally in giving ministers a nice little process, wound up with these rather astonishing results. This was run on five preclears. One of these preclears is incomplete. Actually, two of them were considered incomplete but one of them particularly was

5 AUGUST 1957

incomplete because we walked right up to him in the case, trod all over his toes and were all set to break his case, and there was the end of the intensive. So some more work had to be done on that by another auditor.

So his results here are invalid. We did, however, walk right up to the point where he became terribly agitated about answering the question, and then it couldn't be flattened because the twenty-five hours were up. That test, therefore, is invalid. Another test at the end of this week will complete this one. In other words, this was a more-hours case.

But let us take the remaining four on which this was run, and let us read, completely aside from the personality changes (which, by the way, were minimal—minimal APA changes; they're very, very small—they're all beneficial but very tiny) read these IQs. The original here, well, we'll just read the final last week on which this was run—159 to 184. This is a lady so old that everybody knew that everybody's brains atrophied, and I imagine their brains don't—do atrophy, but this has nothing to do with a thetan. And her IQ went from 84 to 105.

Male voice: Wow.

Now, this is an impossible jump of IQ for this age which is—I don't know which one this is. One of these girls is 50-some which is not very old, but the other one is about 70-odd years. And they're not supposed to change at that level. Eighty-four to 105 running that process that I've just described to you.

78 Here we have the other case, very—this person very well advanced in years—109 to 133. The 84 to 105 is a startling one though because the 70s and 80s are the impossible shifters. We've shifted them that way before, but we seldom with—suddenly say, as we could now, well, we're going to change this person. We change him, change his IQ.

All right, now we have this one, and this is 121 to 143.

And this one, as we say, is invalid. The person became awfully stupid the moment that he ran right straight in. As a matter of fact, dropped his IQ practically out the bottom—134 to 118. Now, he had, as you'll read here on the end of this intensive, the last of the auditor's report, "Think of something you might withhold from valence (blank)." And that was run for an hour. And the auditor says, "No big change, occasional comm lags; pc not facing problem of (blank), and having told him (blank), process above pc's reality level unless our case diagnosis inaccurate. Mentioned more control mechanisms he uses on (blank). Protested some about running this after he had been on it for a while." This was disclosing a present time overt act on the part of this person.

Now, the auditor adds here—I'm not sure why—"I did not want to make this pc an opponent." Oh, he has a good game going with auditors as opponents and no effect. This is a terrific no-effect pc. All right. We'll see that one at the end of this week. That was not flat, so it couldn't be included in the series. But look at those terrific gains on IQ.

Well, we figure it this way. This theory behind it seems to be this. The individual gets his mind so involved with the problems of some game with some valence or some person, you see? He's doing this and he's doing that and he gets his mind so involved and his computers are all tied up on that particular subject, that when you restore self-determinism on this particular level, you free an individual's ability to think. Got that?

An obsessive games condition is to withhold communication from somebody. Now, when we take that off automatic and put it under the control of the pc so that *he* is doing it and he can do it, then all of the involved mechanisms start working out. Well, that isn't all we discovered about this particular line.

FACTORS BEHIND THE HANDLING OF IQ

We found out that psychotherapy has never worked, couldn't work, and the basic theory of psychotherapy is something somebody ought to be shot for. And I say that all the time just because I want a good game going. That's the only reason, of course. I don't feel anything for my fellow man or anything like that. I raise the devil with the brain surgeons and so forth simply because I just need something to raise the devil with. Actually, it doesn't matter. Like hell.

Anyway, found out these characters were total frauds. And had never—I'd had some evidence that this was the case and it seemed to me this was the case, that Freudian analysis and other things was the case. But I know now why you've never seen a set of figures on Freudian analysis. Why you've never seen a before or after IQ on a Freudian analysis. And that would be the first thing that Freudian analysis would have tried and would have produced if they thought they were doing anything to anybody. Did it do anything for anybody's IQ? And I'll tell you why they never released a set of figures. Because it must depress the IQ out through the bottom. They must be able to take somebody with an IQ of about 150 and shove it down to about 70 in the course of a couple of years of psychoanalysis.

Now, I have many cases of record on this. I keep neat little files on the subject in case someday I find that somebody's got a knife in my back and I think that it ought to be in his back. Knife transfers. And I look through the little files, and there are a lot of supportive evidence on this.

For instance, an advertising executive in New York City who was very, very successful, one of the most brilliant men in his firm, was yet a little *quaaked* in the *traahk*, you know? He was wound up the wrong way. He'd take swigs out of his inkwell at regular intervals, you know? That sort of thing. Always marrying somebody else's wife on weekends, couldn't get to work on Monday because he was in the divorce court. Anyway, this guy was a brilliant man. Very brilliant.

And after some years of psychoanalysis, during which he took a total vacation from his job, he was returned to his firm as the *janitor*. No longer able to do any advertising executive work. Furthermore, there was no evidence that his psychosis had been cured. But it certainly couldn't manifest, because that required some brilliance.

Now, I didn't understand what had happened to this man, but the Freudian analyst believes and teaches this: that individuals who are brilliant must be neurotic. You got that?

Audience: Yeah.

Well, here we've got them in a box! Because it must be that every time they run Freudian analysis on somebody they decrease his IQ out through the bottom. Well, how fascinating! Because we find it isn't the case at all. What we did in this particular line is we moved those people who were below the line severely and so forth, up away from it and up above the line on personality. In other words, we took care of, to some degree, some of these worst incidents here.

For instance, we had a minus 55, depressed and unhappy, which was about the same, maybe, as this advertising executive in New York. And that changed, on this process only, to 79 plus, happy. We ran nothing but this process. And this person's IQ, understand, went from 121 to 143. In other words, we made him more sane and brighter at the same time, which gives us the clue on Freudian analysis. They have never at any time dared release an IQ pattern taken before or after an analysis because I'll guarantee you that it has always dropped. Why? Because they're on the wrong kick.

5 AUGUST 1957

Now, get this. This is the only thing that makes this work, and this is the only thing that makes it exciting news. The ability to withhold a communication is an ability which is restored by auditing. And it is the ability to *withhold a communication* which advances IQ and makes a person feel better, *not the ability to divulge it*.

Now, that's a switch, isn't it? This is wild. You've been told all your lives that all you had to do was go to somebody and confess! If you just would confess to your mother and father that you did those dirty, nasty, little things, you'd feel so much better. And that is nothing but a control operation from beginning to end and isn't true.

You probably felt better to the end of getting your pants tanned. This is an enforced communication. And as an enforced communication, would break through a games condition in which a person found himself and would demand that he communicate with the enemy. And would depress him accordingly. And obviously it isn't true that divulging it or confessing it did anything for anybody because the only improvement he got would be if he regained the ability to withhold that information without being upset about withholding it.

All right. So you took your old man's car. That's how it got that wobbly wheel. And you put it back in the garage just as nice . . . And he came out the next day and he looked at that wobbly wheel, and he says, "What—what—what—I wonder how that happened!" And you stood there innocently and said nothing at all. But you felt guilt. And at length you kind of felt like you went out of communication with him when these things got too many.

80

And psychotherapy's answer to this whole problem was all you had to do was throw yourself upon the breast of truth and you were all set. And that wouldn't have done a thing for you. Not a single thing for you.

What the bent wheel did was overcome your ability to withhold communication by making you feel you ought to communicate. And so interrupted your self-determinism on the subject of communication.

Now, we have tested and we have in our testing files many, many intensives run on this one: "Mock up your father and say something to him." You remember that old process? It didn't do any great shakes for pcs. "Think of something you could withhold from Father," however, would have cracked it to smithereens. The process is flat when the ability to withhold is regained. The ability to withhold on a self-determined basis is regained, the process is flat.

Now, this is the reach and withdraw mechanism. You all know this little oddity about reach and withdraw. Must reach-can't reach, must withdraw-can't withdraw are two pairs which create the sensation of insanity. You can take a preclear and just have him get the idea that he must reach the wall, that he can't reach the wall, and if you can get him to hold that sensation, he will feel what insanity is. That's dreams: you must run away from the bogeyman that's chasing you through the treacle. And he is coming at a mad, express-train speed. And there you are, stuck. That's a nightmare, you see? You *must* withdraw, *can't* withdraw.

The glee of insanity is only composed of this. People in the asylum are only stuck in this, that they must withdraw, can't withdraw or must reach, can't reach. I imagine electric shock turns on more psychoses than are in the heads of psychiatrists. And that is some fantastic amount. And that would be on this basis: you take somebody who *must* get away from the electric shock machine and you make him approach the electric shock machine, and you've done it. You've laid in another insanity ridge, you got it? And you lay in enough of those, boy, do you stay solvent and boy, can you take dough away

FACTORS BEHIND THE HANDLING OF IQ

from the government and boy, can you maintain things in big style. Yeah. We're not much crazy.

And then people can come around, you know, and they can say "Well, one out of every fifteen Americans is crazy." I could have told them that. Fifteen out of fifteen. Well, that's true. It must be the diagnosis of it if they haven't shot psychiatrists yet—they're all nuts.

Now let's get back on this because this is up to my favorite rant. My very, very favorite rant is just this: that psychotherapy was a swindle. That it didn't intend to make anybody better. That was not its goal. And all of these psychotherapies are aimed at getting somebody to outflow. And what do we find here? We find that intelligence increases and neurotic personality traits better if we run "withhold communication from (valences)." What a fantastic reversal.

We have just found out somebody, and we have found them out a long way from base. Their idea was to get somebody to sit down and talk for two years, see? *Tsk*. No. Now, you see what background this is, why this is upsetting.

Actually, to some degree, we have always given credence and the benefit of the doubt. We—I have never said to myself, "All past researchers in the field of the mind have been absolutely stupid." I couldn't have said such a thing. It would have been a completely insane statement because it couldn't possibly have been true.

As a matter of fact, look at the dedication of *Science of Survival*, things like this. But as years go on and I find out more and more things like this, I begin to wonder why I haven't said so. Because it's actually impeded our work tremendously.

The whole concept that the pattern of the child is the perfect pattern on which adult behavior is formed, you see, and it's the natural, normal development of the child which gives us our pattern for barbaric behavior. And that's the basic standard of human behavior is the barbaric pattern of behavior as a child. Therefore we have to have jails. It follows, doesn't it? See how well that follows?

We say, well, we have to improve people beyond children because, you see, they would all be like children, and children are very lawless. And if you really did do anything for people, if you let people look into the mind, why, of course they'd all become as lawless as children and we'd have to put them all in jail.

And you still say this is no control operation? I think it's a knowing control operation. I don't think I could be around—if I were as stupid as a—somebody down here at GW in the psychology department—I don't think I could be around their rat mazes more than two or three weeks without finding there was some curve in it. See, it would have been something. Any one of you, walking back and forth and inspecting this sort of thing, would sooner or later have come to realize that something like this was going on.

Now, the idea of confession is very, very old. It's as old as witch doctors. Don't let any church claim it as a monopoly because it's not. It's one of the oldest witch doctor tricks there is: confession. If you could just confess it to somebody, you'd be all right. Listen: that's an operation. The answer to it is, if you could just withhold information from somebody voluntarily, you would be all right. See, it's the exact opposite side of the vector.

Now, let's get factual, huh? Let's get off of my favorite hobbyhorses here and get some usable processing information since this week we're covering processes.

We found this to be the case: that those people from whom one felt he could hold nothing were the aberrative valences on the case. So we have a

5 AUGUST 1957

new definition for aberrative valence: a person from whom the preclear could have withheld nothing. Most aberrative valence on the case. Got that?

And as you run it, you'll see—you'll say "Think of something now that you could withhold from Aunt Grace."

And the pc will say, "Well, unreality, unreality, unreality. Unreality, unreality, unreality. Gee, it seems like I could just—I could withhold a dollar in my billfold or—or *mmmmmm*, an old broken tooth or a pile of dirt or a book or *something* from Aunt Grace, but I don't seem to be able to withhold anything from Aunt Grace at all."

You got your quarry. Tallyho.

Now, here's a test of this. You ask a criminal, "What could you withhold from jail?" He'll do the same thing.

"Unreality, unreality, nothing. Nothing. Jail?"

And just the mention of the thing, he will see sort of the facsimiles and so forth and pictures of himself and so on go sweeping toward some spot he considers the jail. He is unable to withhold anything from jail.

So what are we looking at here, kiddies? We're looking at the basic anatomy of the trap and the basic process by which one would run a trap.

And boy, if you don't think that's valuable, you ain't been in no traps lately.

In other words, you could be sitting in the middle of the trap and just dream it up for a while and say, "How did I get in here? I don't know." The only way anybody could keep you in a trap would—give you the idea that you had to surrender to the trap. Ha! That won't work. All you'd have to do is run this kind of a Straightwire process. Not Straightwire, but just thinkingness process. You could run a Straightwire process on this, too.

"Let's see. What could I withhold from this trap?" And finally get one with complete certainty. Just one, no matter how small and crummy and insignificant. You'll be amazed how long it takes to get them when you really strike an aberrative valence or a trap that's really—you really think is a trap.

"What could I withhold from?" You think of another one.

"What could I withhold from this trap?" Another one.

"What could I withhold from this trap?" By that time you'd start to yo-yo in and out of the trap. Don't give it up because it takes quite a few more to free you. Got it?

If you get outside of the trap and find yourself too avidly playing the game of, "Boy, that was a tight squeak" (that's quite a game, you know), why, just find something else that you could withhold from the trap and that would be that. Got it?

Now, what do you do about the other side of it? Takes care of itself. I don't know how a thetan can keep from communicating with everything unless he feels he should withhold everything from everything.

Now, what are you trying to do? Are you trying to erase a lot of things? No. No, no. Get off of that. It is the regaining of the ability to withhold. So on some gradient scale, you lead the fellow up. The process is flat when he has regained his ability to withhold something from Papa. Something from Mama. Something from school. Something from—I don't know, maybe he was a drill press operator—something from a drill press. You got the idea? He was a painter—something from a canvas. Got it?

He could, with certainty, selectively withhold things from canvas or aberrative valences, you've got it licked. You don't have to go the other way at all. Why? Because an individual has been in a games condition with the canvas or the typewriter or the drill press or the valence. And he's been in a games

FACTORS BEHIND THE HANDLING OF IQ

condition that absorbed all of his ideas and thinkingness and everything else. And they're all stuck and bunched up on the track. But he's trying to think, "How can I communicate? How can I communicate?"

Let's take a boxer. We had a boxer in our midst here and I asked him to think this question over. And he gave me a report on it today, and he says, "*Uuuuh*, that's quite a question! What could you withhold from another boxer?"

He said it's easy to withhold those things which a person would normally have withheld from him in training. "But the other things," he said, "I don't know." What would the other things be? A blow!

All right. So the individual's been in some kind of a high games condition requiring a lot of effort such as boxing, you would find the same rules applying. Overt act-motivator sequence is what you're studying now, folks. After all these years, man and boy, we've been looking at this overt act-motivator sequence and ways of wrapping it up, and we saw them—suddenly look at it. Because the individual who cannot withhold, cannot communicate, since communication is composed of selective withholding.

Now, it's not a break-communication process because it is running out things. Now, there are many other fascinating factors involved in this particular process, but none of them are—should be bypassed. I should tip my hat to each one of the side effects here. And so I will.

You've got this kind of an activity, then. You have individuals in a game condition, with their highest common denominator of a games condition. And that action is communicate, and they are trying to withhold communication from their opponents. Wherever they have considered an opponent to exist, they have withheld communication from the opponent.

Now, having decided to withhold communication from the opponent, they now decide to communicate with the opponent because they *have* to. And you get a denial of self, which is of course your basic aberrative pattern. Basis of all aberration is the denial of self. You say it is black and then tomorrow you are forced to say that it is white. This is quite aberrative.

All right. We take this circumstance, we look over the picture and we discover that the individual has been made to break his own postulate. "I am withholding it," he said, because he considered this person an opponent, and then he said, "Now I have to talk. My crimes are so great. My misery is so tremendous, the harm I have done is so sweepingly horrible." People love to set themselves up as God, you know, with the idea that they caused the whole flood. It's really wonderful. I mean, the conceit with which some people will take upon themselves authorship of consequences far beyond their power to create.

Yes, yes, I imagine some ex-thetan of a major general be sitting up in cloud ninety-nine after the next atomic war or something like that saying, "Well, it serves me right. I caused it all." Brother, he never had brains enough to cause all that. He never had brains enough.

Now, the ability to withhold a communication, then, is an ability. And when one starts withholding automatically or as a pattern, or when the withholding, more importantly, is broken down by the feeling that one must confess, divulge or communicate, one loses, then, out, and closes valences and takes on the other valence. So there are many criminals walking around who are nothing but ambulant jails.

When you can no longer withhold from a valence, you become it. And we have the basic mechanism of valence closure. Because what is the one thing that you don't withhold from something you have become? Yourself.

5 AUGUST 1957

So you have to go up a gradient scale of withholding in order to stay apart or out of a trap or out of a valence. Lead-pipe cinch. So all you would do is run a process of this type.

Now, how would you run this process? One, you would take an inventory of valences. And if I were doing it, I would take an inventory of valences and professions and habitats. A habitat is a place where a preclear has lived and couldn't pay the rent. In other words, I would find the old homestead, the old apartment house in Harlem, the hole in the hill in California. Childhood home, in other words. Got that? I'd take a list of these familiar places. Then I would take the professional list, and I'd certainly have this valence list. You got it?

Now, there are numbers of tricks by which one can isolate these without asking the direct question. And he can isolate these on the basis of comm lag, the fact that he didn't mention them at all. In five of these people, the two—in two of the cases out of five, the most aberrative people or valences on the case were never mentioned by the preclear but were dug up by the auditor on an oblique questioning angle. In other words, they were completely out of sight. They were never mentioned. The two, see? Two out of five, in other words. That's an awfully heavy percentage. It means you never would have gotten the aberrative person on the case.

And I would then take the most likely suspects, totally convinced that other suspects were probably much more likely and would turn up. And then I would run it in this wise. I would establish a session with thoroughness. And with questioning I would find out if there was a present time valence with which the person was very deeply involved which was a horrible problem to him, and I would just run that as a problem of comparable magnitude and get it out of the road. And then put it down very carefully in my notes to knock hell out of it with a process. Got it?

I'd move into session and I would sandwich valences in this fashion: I would take some valence that was easy to run and get him used to the idea of withholding communication.

My auditing question would be "Think of something you might withhold from (blank)." "*Think* of something"—not "Tell me something," not "Recall something." It'd be "Think of something you might withhold from (blank)." And he'll think. And when he has thunk, why, he tells you so and you say okay and give him an acknowledgment and carry on. You got that?

In other words, you aren't asking him to divulge a thing. But after a while, he's getting a broad smile upon his face and his tone is coming up and he is doing wonderful indeed, and you say, "Are you able to think . . ."

"Oh," he says, "I can think of lots of things."

Now, beware of an automaticity. He might strike a games condition automaticity that says, "Oh, I could withhold something from (blank). Yes—very, withhold this stage, this *thh, mmmm-mm, ho, vmm, mmmm, thhhm, mmmth*, oh, there's just too many things. I just couldn't say all the things I could withhold from (blank)." That's an automaticity. That has to be flattened. Get it finally to where he can withhold rather ordinary and routine things at his own discretion, one at a time. And that is the ability regained. The only thing you're interested in. And he finally decides that he could withhold things from (blank). Shift gears.

Go into Locational Processing. Orient your pc in the environment with Locational: "Notice that wall. Notice the ceiling. Notice the floor," to command his attention. No more. No less. And then turn around and pick the next valence you care to run.

FACTORS BEHIND THE HANDLING OF IQ

Now, this valence you should consider a little stiffer. And run it until he has regained his ability to withhold things from. Go into Locational again and then pick a little stiffer valence. Got it?

Until you get one that you just know he can't withhold anything from at all. You know by the way he bogs on it, how he never mentioned it, how he told you that it wasn't important. And run that one. And then I would pick up his professional tools. You know, spaceships and other working tools. And I would run those on a similar gradient scale until he could withhold anything from them.

And then I would pick items like the childhood home until he could withhold anything from the childhood home. And you would have this individual just coming out of various stuck spots of his life just pop, pop, pop, pop. Got that?

By that time you've regained enough ability to withhold that he could withhold himself from this universe and there he goes, and you got an OT.

Well anyhow, it's interesting theory. The question is, does it work? Well, it would only work on those preclears whose thinkingness could be controlled. There is no use running a preclear whose thinkingness cannot be controlled. You got that? Don't run him on a thinking process if his thinkingness can't be controlled.

So this tells you that if you were going to do this, the very least you would have to do is probably flatten CCH 0, 1, 2, 3 and 4 fairly well with the pc before you cut loose with this, and then use ample quantities of Locational Processing for the remainder of the intensive. And you would find, then, that you had your preclear pretty well straightened out. Lord knows what his IQ would be if you went for broke to this degree.

Once you have regained the ability to withhold from a valence with a preclear, you could also ask him this auditing question: "Something you could do or say to that person." But this would be more in the line of showing him that he now had the ability to speak at will; that he could communicate with the person. That apparently restores itself more or less just if left alone. But he would feel very free to talk to people. Communication level of pcs definitely comes up, as so reported in most of these cases.

Now, what special guard would you use on this? I'll just repeat this again. The person—that is to say, the body of the pc would have to be under the auditor's control. The attention of the pc would have to continue to be under the auditor's control. Hence, the use of Locational between valences.

But the attention, of course, would be brought under control with the first early CCHs. And then I would move forward into these various valences, and if I felt that he was very badly slipping or he was getting no reality on it at all, I would consider that I had given the preclear a great many loses and that the things were not particularly real to the preclear.

I would then coax him into a higher level of reality. I wouldn't let him keep muffing it, keep missing. I wouldn't let him miss once.

Now, there is another way of running this and diagnosing that, and that is with the use of an E-Meter, providing you can use one and providing you would only use it for diagnosis. Of course, an E-Meter could also tell you if the thing is flat, but an E-Meter will never speak up, even if it's got a beeper on it, and tell you that the ability has been regained. And that is what you are looking for. You're looking for a regaining ability.

This runs as fast as you are trying to get to the preclear to regain an ability to withhold. And it runs as slowly as you expect the process to sort of

5 AUGUST 1957

rub out this or that and do a job on it. The process won't do anything unless you have some goal as to where the process is going. And that is to restore to the preclear the ability to withhold. That is completely important. That is then to bring the preclear out of all traps.

Now, quite incidentally, this is evidently IQ. And it changes valences only to the degree that it totally snaps the preclear out of the valences. Why didn't we get large valence changes here? We didn't get large valence changes, evidently, for the reason that nobody ran a valence flat. We were experimenting. We were spending a lot of time on useless characters in the case. We were wasting time like mad. The amount of effective processing done during this research thing was about ten hours out of the twenty-five.

Now, if we had actually decided to find the aberrative valence and polish it off until we could inspect it with white gloves, we undoubtedly would have got a terrific valence shift because in the final analysis all an APA, if bad, is, is the preclear's idea of the personality of the valence in which he is interior -ized. The APA or personality profile is a picture of a valence the preclear has known, much more than a picture of the preclear's idea of an optimum. Do you understand that?

Audience: Mmmm.

So right here while the ACC has been going on, another milestone has been added. I want to thank the HGC auditors who took part in this test and all those who have had part in testing programs because it's finally culminated to where even we know something about it.

Thank you.

THE SCALE OF WITHHOLD

A lecture given on 6
August 1957

Thank you.

Well, how are you making out?

Audience: Fine. Okay.

This is the seventeenth lecture of the 18th ACC, August the sixth, 1957.

Well, your questions tonight absolutely inundate me. I don't know whether I can answer them or not. For this very, very, very good reason, that they aren't here!

Female voice: Right.

And I understand that your difficulties in one of the units today with the definition of "nothing" . . . Every time anybody would try to define *nothing*, he got himself into a fine state of restimulated loss, of course, you see? So nobody could agree on "nothing." Well, I think that's probably what's the matter with thetans, they can't agree on nothing; they've always got to have something.

Well, there's a high degree of probability that tonight's lecture could concern itself with various processes. So, I think I'd better tell you something about the processes you're doing.

And last night I talked to you about what rose IQ. You understand that that was the news. IQ was the news. Because I could point out to you, over here on your—CCH 9, Tone 40 "Keep It From Going Away," is withhold. Now, we already knew that that had a considerable workability. The road to solids, tolerance of solids, lies through withhold. Only we'd never had a Straightwire version on this before or anything that clipped it directly and immediately. But we for sure have it here on Tone 40 "Keep It From Going Away." And just to be in sequence here if you don't mind, I'll talk to you a little bit about solids and these processes that concern them.

Well, we'll take hold of CCH 9 here, "Keep It From Going Away," and we'll discover that there we are dealing with the automaticity which goes as follows—fascinating automaticity, *the* most fascinating automaticity there is. In fact, you couldn't do without it (you think). Everything that comes along is used by a thetan to keep things from going away. He gets a cannonball in the stomach, he says, "Ah, look—at that moment of impact, it kept the body from going forward, ha-ha! So I'll make a lovely picture of the impact (hence the necessity for pictures) and have it keep the body from going away from here on out!" That it gives us a cannonball in the stomach all the time is somebody else's lookout.

6 AUGUST 1957

Sounds pretty wild, doesn't it? And yet that's why people hold on to impact engrams: fear of loss; fear they will lose a body. They do other things. They fill the atmosphere around the body with machinery and that sort of thing, so other thetans will be afraid to come into it and take it over and take it away. But keeping things from going away is a basic mechanism which guards against loss.

Well, of course, as I told you about the mind, it runs on a gradient scale from thought, through efforts, to solids. Actually, the mind has been graphed already on the Tone Scale. That is the gradient scale of approach between something that is nothing and total solids at the other end. It isn't that a person himself becomes a total solid but his approach to solids is on a gradient scale through less solids and misemotions and plain emotions and little energies like aesthetics, and then just thought, and we have this band at work. Well, when the individual gets hold of something like a cannonball in the stomach, he says, "Oh, boy!" He says, "That certainly . . . We got there in a hurry. That I can directly handle, obviously, because it handled me so well!" Well, he keeps things from going away. He guards against loss with impacts.

Now, he does other things with impacts. Quite fascinating things. He uses them as control mechanisms. I would not put it beyond a thetan to take a cannonball engram on the right to move his body to the left, a cannonball engram on the left to move his body to the right. Handy, isn't it, you know? Requires no effort. He just puts a slight thought into the line and he says, "Move to the right." You know? And the cannonball goes into restimulation and he moves over to the right. You could see how this would be a *good* system.

Well, he's using these "keep its from goings away" as control, then, isn't he? In other words, he lets the body be shoved around by things and he keeps those things there and thus he can control the body rather easily. Right? He thinks! Deteriorates at the same time. Well, could he control anything else with the same mechanism? Yes, an individual very easily takes a cannonball engram, hangs it on somebody else's head to make him bow.

That it's a cannonball in the stomach put on somebody's head does not keep it from working. You just get somebody to think his head is in his stomach and something of this sort. So very often you start to audit a preclear and you find out that you're auditing a stomach out of his right arm, a head off of his left foot. Well, this is the interchange of facsimiles, and thetans use these facsimiles on others. They throw it at other people, throw pictures at other people.

Way back on the track there's a thing called the engram police. Just as there have been police in every other line of human activity, so there have been police in thetan activities. And it's quite amusing to get this thing into some kind of a condition where it can be policed. So there's "thirty days in a space opera trap," you see, "for using a cannonball facsimile on female thetans," and other ordinances of one kind or another.

But in the main, facsimiles have use. And then they have the lovely attraction of also being themselves mass.

Now, a fellow who keeps money for its own sake is the sort of a fellow who would keep facsimiles for their own sake. Got the idea? There are characters up on—oh, I don't know, they regularly get elected to be secretary of the treasury. But money is itself, it is a thing. It's not a communication particle. It exists totally for itself. And so a thetan gets into this frame of mind every now and then and says, "Well, engrams for their own sake!" You know?

THE SCALE OF WITHHOLD

Has no idea of anything else but just keeping one. You start to look, as an auditor, for the significance of why this fellow has this thing stuck in front of his face and you may find that he's merely keeping it for its own sake. Be prepared to have that happen. That's the only violation of this "keep it from going away." All other engrams are used to that level, "keep it from going away." All right. They either keep *you* where you are or the body where it is or something. They're control mechanisms.

Then sometimes a fellow will get a series of engrams all hooked together, beautifully aligned, you know: a shoulder with an arquebus shot in it, a stomach with a crossbow through it, a leg with a spear in it and a few slinging stones just back of the left eye. This is a nice combination, and moves the body quite rapidly. You start to shift the engram a little bit and the body really jumps and you move this at somebody else and he really jumps, too. You take this particular string of facsimiles and somebody sees that much agony and perception and so forth, and the somatics begin to somatic and somebody moves. All right. That's fine. Or he stands still and doesn't move anymore.

What's the gist of this? When that finally peels off totally to a thought level, you are looking at somebody who has a service facsimile. (That's all a service facsimile is, is a series of facsimiles which you can call *a* facsimile, which can be applied to the control of others very nicely.) But after an individual's been on the track for a few billion years using one of these nice combos of one kind or another, why, sooner or later he flops. You're coming along in a robot and doing very well, thank you—no somatics, no effect on self at all, robot totally run by extraneous and exterior machinery and couldn't feel pain if it had to, couldn't be stopped possibly because it was wound up two or three years ago and hasn't run down yet. And you're wheeling along in this robot and you just feel wonderful about the whole thing and this other person slings this service facsimile at the robot and it rattles off of it quite easily. He gets a lose.

Well, the intention was for it to control something. So it controls the nearest thing to hand, which is himself. Now *he's* got it. But he'll still use it for control because that's the basic postulate behind it. You got that?

Now, if an individual is going to have any real—anything to do with facsimiles at all, he's going to rattle somewhere between solids and thought. There's that extreme band, don't you see? And by gradient scales and concatenation and by lots of postulates about association—you know, one thing is another thing which gets into identification—finally this scale itself can become relatively solid. He can think a thought and turn on the solid at the other end of the scale. Get the idea? The president of General Motors can think a thought that all the wives of stockholders should get roses, and the roses appear. You see, nothing to it. Of course, he doesn't think that kind of thought. He actually thinks the thought that all stockholders should stay away from the next board meeting. That's "keeping them from going away from home," is the way he would use this.

Well, we look this over and we see that the movement and the motionlessnesses of people and so on can easily be handled by facsimile patterns.

In this decadent time, facsimiles as themselves aren't used anymore. It's been a long time since anybody walked up to you on the street and said, "Look," and showed you a facsimile. I mean, they just don't do it. The engram police were very, very effective way back when. And fellows think it'd spoil the game if they mocked up perfect Illinois Western bonds, redeemable at

face value at any bank, US Saving Certificates of one kind or another, just mocked them up and piled them. They think it'd spoil the game, the silly fellows! They don't realize that game is a no-game condition. Well, anyway . . .

As we move along the line and get down to these times, why, we're not seeing a facsimile being used as such. We're seeing the results only at the top end of the band. Thetans are less willing to move around solids as themselves, less willing to move around facsimiles, but they will use the thought end of the spectrum. And they use the thought end of the spectrum and then they get these things going into action and they say, "What was that?" Which is very silly. I mean, they once upon a time knew very well what "that" was. But now they've lost track. People trying obsessively to locate things and so forth are simply trying to find out what facsimile is on the other end of that thought chain. What is this that wiggles when I think, "*Wug*"? See? He thinks, "*Wug*," and all of a sudden something wiggles. What is that? It's a big mystery.

Well, that's just because facsimiles have gone out of style. They're made these days in Hollywood. And there's a big monopoly on them. And they're shown on every television screen in the country, and there's just tremendous numbers of facsimiles being purveyed and they all have copyright notices on them. And you couldn't copyright one of your facsimiles if you tried. You could go down here, mock up a beautiful facsimile down here at the US copyright office and they'd give you "no sale." They wouldn't stamp any circle with a "c" in it on it, that's for sure. They're going to say, "That's all made in Hollywood, son; you better quit," or "carried in *Life* magazine." Facsimiles-preparation of.

90

Well, there's a terrific breadth of scale between a printed picture of a car and the car, isn't there? There's quite a breadth of scale between a picture of a car and a car. Well, there's just as much breadth of scale between the picture of this car and a thought about the car. Only it's the other way: less and less solids. You could easily see the more and more solids when it was applied to the physical universe, but the less and less solids we don't see very often. Yet these get in the road of our auditing all the time. An individual has a certain auditing command, he starts to perform the auditing command and all of a sudden something *wigs* when he went *wog*, and he wonders why he is crying! Well, he's crying because he pushed the button which on the scale down the line resulted in tears; a lachrymose somatic of, sometimes, some bucketish magnitude. And he's very often very surprised. He doesn't quite know what turned on these tears. Well, don't be—as an auditor, don't be in a big puzzle about this because it's simply a scale which had tears on it. That scale was stuck in grief, was intended to trigger at grief, don't you see? Well, others are intended to trigger at solids. For instance, thoughts about pretty girls or good-looking young men very often end in solids. Just go down to any maternity ward and you'll see where those thoughts go.

Now, if we look over the basic phenomena of all this, we discover a great oddity. And that is that throwing things away or dispensing with them is much inferior to holding on to them. Now, this is a great phenomenon we have here. Just call it a phenomenon. You can rationalize it any way you please. But it required an enormous amount of work on my part to get this thrashed out. I damn near killed more preclears trying to find this out.

Which side of the reach and withdraw mechanism is the one which can be audited? Which side is true? Which side holds good? Well, we find out that we—the *reach* one is good, high-toned, not-games-condition activity. That's communication, isn't it? Well now, unless you have an opponent situation,

THE SCALE OF WITHHOLD

you'd certainly better run reach. Got the idea? Reach. But in view of the fact that everybody has some games condition on almost everything, we can run some withdraw, can't we? And we find out that withdraw is the side that can be run rather endlessly. And by withdraw, we mean "withdraw something from," because this builds up and increases havingness and this is the entrance to most cases.

Of course, we're talking about *Homo sapiens* even at his worsser states. We're talking about anything from psychotic, neurotic to normal, or up to acceptable. And as we look over this scale of people, we find out that this holds good, this scale, up to maybe—this idea that withdraw or hold to yourself, you know, withdraw it from or hold to yourself the object, holds good anywhere up to a couple of hundred hours of processing. I mean, it's all the way from the bottom, clear on up there. An individual has to get almost entirely over the idea of acquisition, have, possession, mass, need-of and so on before he's in any kind of a state where he can accept very much "Pitch it away from you, give it the yo-heave."

Well, a man will communicate outward to the degree that he can hold inward, and the monitoring thing is the hold inward. (Lump that if you like it. And if you don't like it, it's still true.)

Now, I'll tell you the first clue that came up on this line is every time a psycho would come into the Foundation, we'd find out that you couldn't separate anything from them. I used to try to process them on getting them to throw away a single scrap of paper. Anything, see? We've done a lot of experiments in this line. But a psycho would come in and sit down, why—try to get her to let go of a purse. (Particular one I remember.) She could be audited all right as long as she could hold on to her purse; and her purse couldn't be set on the floor or on the bed or anyplace else, it had to be clutched to her bosom. Right here. I notice two or three of you laying down your purses right at the minute. Anyway... Had to be clutched right square to the bosom. But although one or two of you are doing that, I assure you that if I ask you to see your purse, you would undoubtedly turn it over. You see, one of them just—Audrey's just given up her purse there.

Well now, a psycho never would have done that regardless of who the other person was—just never would have separated from the purse. You would have just had a knockdown-drag-out clawfest; it just would have been a tug-of-war to end all tug-of-wars, with an enormous amount of power being put into it and a terrific amount of caterwaul. Maybe all the auditor was trying to do was not hold—she wasn't supposed to hold it to her chest, just put it in her lap, just to get the purse put in the person's lap, see. It was just more than she could do. That's an extreme case of "hold," see, "pull in." You might say, "withdraw it from others." Extreme case. And you'll find out as a person heads on down the scale, it gets down that bad. But what complicates it is it has inversions. And right above this "clutch it to the chest this tight" would be an inversion of "throw it away—throw it away madly; get rid of it."

Well, all right. Which one solved it, the "throw it away" or the "clutch"? Now, that was a technical research problem for years. And I beat that one around, as I say, made a lot of preclears unhappy with that one. Just throw things away; just have somebody throwing things away and doing nothing but throwing them away. And give them a test, find out what happened to them, find out how long it took them to get better or to faint. The funny part of it is, they can do something ad infinitum, which they can't do the other ad infinitum. They cannot throw away ad infinitum, not even vaguely. They run

out of havingness. You realize now, we're talking right on the center line of havingness and of anything explaining it. But they can clutch it to their chest forever.

"Well," you say, "that's impossible." I mean—you mean this fellow's going to walk around with all the debris and bric-a-brac and battleships he's sunk and airplanes he's—and all the facsimiles of all the coins he ever had when he was a little kid? (Every once in a while somebody gets broke, you know, and they think of all the money they wasted on candy when they were a kid or something.)

Now, here's a wild one—here's a wild one: we are really only concerned with a person's holdingness to himself. Aren't we? That gives us an engram bank, puts the bank in restimulation, upsets things endlessly, messes up things terribly. Everything is being pulled in to the individual. Right? All right. After a while, if everything is being pulled in to the individual, we get some kind of a silly condition where a person is himself a lump. And every once in a while you're asked to solve one of these lumps. That's a psycho—he's a lump. You're asked to exteriorize somebody. He's dead in his head—he's a lump.

What causes the lump? Well, you could say the fact that things can be thrown away causes him to hold them in. There are only two things to run there. One is "throw it out," and the other is "pull it in." There's just two. Which one do you run? Or which one can be run nearly forever? The one a thetan is running, of course, nearly forever, and that's "hold it in." Now, "hold it in" solves both "hold it in" and "throw it away." An individual's communication is raised by holding things in.

92

Well, this is a fantastic thing, isn't it? If you think this over—here's a nothingness that couldn't duplicate any mass anyhow, busy holding mass into himself. He comes to harm because of it, his abilities go to pieces, his penalties and that sort of thing are—all accumulate on him, everything he's done wrong he's carrying around in a little picture to remind himself how guilty he is so he'll shed three drops on the altar of Gog or whatever religion he happens to be in. But this is a great peculiarity. It should be looked upon as a peculiarity since it is simply the result of a number of considerations, probably peculiar only to this universe.

Now, this individual will have, maybe, a psychiatric psychosis. There is one—there is one. I'm speaking seriously now. Psychiatry is a whole track phenomenon. You'll run into psychiatrists in all sorts of past periods in a preclear's life, if you care to go into an E-Meter. He says he's never been near an asylum—he sure looks like he has. Well, who knows how long he was in an asylum a few thousand years ago?

Whole track phenomena, space opera and so forth, placed a heavy reliance on psychiatry. No more and no less than psychiatry, which is a brutal miscontrol of an individual under the guise that people are insane. (That's a definition of.) And you'll find this rather repeatedly employed—various things of this character.

Well, they kept people under control by shipping them someplace else. They'd ship them elsewhere. And they would get them to move as a particle. In other words, they'd treat a thetan as a particle and shoot the thetan someplace else. Now, for a thetan to have to go someplace else is the ne plus ultra. This is seven times as bad as him having to ship all of his possessions someplace else. Get that?

Supposing somebody told you tonight that you had to ship everything you own to the Germans because they weren't getting enough out of losing the war. Supposing somebody told you that.

And you said, "Well, I have to ship everything I own?"

And, "Yeah. Including your wife or your boyfriend. They all have to be shipped. That's the way it is. That's the way it is. We've got to be noble victors."

Well, that—a fellow would feel pretty bad if he'd had something like that happen to him and it was enforced. Well, how much more so would he feel if he himself had to be shipped? And all of his possessions stayed here? In other words, he is shipped away with no slightest chance of ever possessing again or having any of his environment again. Well, you realize that would be a rather upsetting thing.

Yet this was the trick on the whole track that was pulled by what we can call facetiously—they were—psychiatrists. They would take a thetan—there're all kinds of gags on the track. You'll run into these things every once in a while. There's a great big floating stone, for instance, on a nearby planet and they expect soldiers on leave and space opera people and so forth to volunteer. It's called the Emanator, this thing, and they're expected to volunteer.

And they walk in and the second they walked in they see this great big stone floating in space. (By the way, we had this on Earth, which was a dramatization of the Emanator: it's the Mohammedan lodestone that was at Mecca. That's a dramatization of the Emanator.) It's suspended in space, and it was radioactive as they came. And it knocked a fellow into a pretty grogged condition and he'd be dragged off into a side room by the boys in the temple. And he'd be shot off to some other planet at some mocked-up story of what tremendous good deeds he had to do there. But nevertheless, this was a dis-possession of a body and everything he owned, wasn't it? Well, it'd throw him so far down scale that he'd never even remember this.

Well, how do you throw somebody up scale, then, so he *will* remember something? Well, don't have him throw things away. Don't run his havingness down, in other words. Have him—we thought for a long time —simply increase his havingness. Well, we know more about it now. We have to increase his ability to *hold*. And when his ability to hold is emphatically good and he himself *can* do it, he will abandon all these cannonballs in the stomach. Got that? In other words, he abandons all this lower-scale automaticity of having things held for him.

For instance, the citizenry very often depends on the courts to hold things for them—they do until they put it up to a court! Somebody's suing them for their shirt and they say, "Well, that's all illegal and illogical, and I wasn't there, didn't even know the girl's name, never took a drop of liquor in my life!" Go down to court and defend the suit and that's what is awarded: not only your shirt, but your suit too! And they immediately go terrifically down scale. In other words, you can consider this a third dynamic automaticity of holding on.

The court is supposed to secure to you your possessions. And dependence on the court, not on yourself, to have the possessions secure can then be upsetting to you. Do you follow me? Because an individual can no longer do it himself.

I suppose one of the definitions of a civilization would be an organization whereby nobody ever did anything himself. It'd be a definition for it. Another one would be, that organization most calculated to keep people from ever owning anything. Collective ownership is the final refinement on something like this. Then we all hold for everybody. You're a member of a twelve-man cell, so you expect eleven men will hold on to the goods of the state—not even yours, you see. You don't bother. And then one day, much to your consternation, you look around and find out the nation isn't succeeding very well. And of

course if you were looking very closely you would discover that the other eleven members of the cell weren't holding on either. And neither was any other cell in the country holding on to anything. And of course you would just have chaos. Do you follow me here?

Now, "holding on to," when it becomes automatic, goes out and beyond one's power of choice. Automaticity can start by power of choice but after that it has to violate it all the way to be automatic. In other words, one doesn't stop an automaticity. An automaticity, if it ever stops, it wears out or something of the sort. All right. Now, if we have everything holding on to things for us such as gravity, body holding on to you, all kinds of things holding on for us—belt holding up the pants and that sort of thing—we get eventually to a frame of mind where we feel we're being totally cared for. But at the same time we don't dare reject anything because it might be some of our hold-on-to mechanisms, and a thetan doesn't reject.

Now, it's actually only necessary to put all of this back into the abilities of a thetan. For a thetan to reacquire the ability to hold on to things is not necessarily the same as a thetan having to destroy all automaticities. The automaticities quite incidentally fold up when the thetan starts to reacquire the powers and abilities contained in an automaticity. But the end goal of this should be better understood by Scientologists. We do not take over automaticities to destroy automaticities. Do you understand? We take over automaticities only to rehabilitate the ability of a thetan. That's something a few people have missed along the line. I'll say it again: we just take them over because they, in many instances, are robbing a thetan of his ability to perform.

94

Now, these "hold on to it" automaticities can utterly destroy a thetan as far as his willingness to go on and do and be. Any accident he has, he presses it close to his bosom thereafter. Any time he gets into trouble, he presses it close to his bosom. Any time any man in a crowd came along and gave him a shove in the chest, he pressed that in from there on to his bosom. In other words, the inflow principle of the universe is being used to hold on to things rather than a thetan's ability to hold on to them.

Now, power is contained in the ability to maintain a position in space. You know the base of the motor that I used to talk about that's still talked about in 8-80? If you can't maintain a position in space, you'll never have any power. Well, if everything is holding things in to you, they will eventually start moving you around. And the second this happens, you no further have power. That's all there is to that. I mean, *you* start moving around.

Now, the psychiatric principle which I just mentioned—you just thought I was just lying about psychiatry, didn't you? Fooled you. Because I'm not—it's "move him around," is what they operated on, on the whole track. They knew that was a total loss. If they could just get somebody to move himself, and lay no further claim to being able to move things, they knew he would become a thing in his own eyes. And the second that this happened, then he could be controlled utterly. One had a slave then. Got that? All right.

If we understand this, we will see why it is necessary to rehabilitate the ability of a thetan to hold something else than himself. In other words, his ability to withhold, his ability to hold, his ability to keep something from going away is part and parcel of his ability to maintain his own position, situation or location.

Now, I'll give you an example of this, shall I? Now, take this front wall and without your moving at all, pull the front wall to you. Did you get any feeling of weakness? Hm? Hm? You get any sensation at all?

Audience: Mm-hm.

What kind of a sensation was it?

Audience: Felt like the wall started moving. Shaky.

Well now, do you realize that it's your ability to hold your position which would make you capable of pulling the front wall over? Do you see there's a coordination between those two facts? It's a weirdie. Somebody way back when, who invented the lever in order to torture physics students thereafter, said he could move the world if he could get a long enough lever. I think that was very, very cute. Because there was no possible place to rest the lever. One of these wonderful theoretical abstractions with which professors drive students into distractions and a completely silly postulate.

As a matter of fact, the size of the lever and its weight and mass, in order to have any tensile strength, also would have overthrown this. But here we have a situation which is much more demonstrable, and that is to say, it is a thetan's ability to hold his location which delivers to him power. Thus we have confronting. Now, some people start confronting and immediately fly out of their heads and they're last seen going past Arkansas. Eventually they get so that they can sit there and confront and hold their position. Do you see this as a necessary point in confronting? You have to be able to hold a position in the face of something.

Well, all right. Now let's go up a little higher than this—or down lower, since it goes either way—and realize that to keep something from going away is a sort of confrontingness. But keeping things from going away is an ability which gradually cultivates the ability of the thetan to remain where he is. Now, there's a process that goes along with this. You can actually say to somebody: "Get the idea," and I'll say it to you now: Get the idea of moving the front wall to where *you* are.

Get the idea of moving the ceiling to where you are.

Get the idea of moving the floor to where you are.

Get the idea of moving the back of the room to where you are.

You noticing something as you do that? Hm?

Well now, this keep-it-from-going-awayness is only part of the phenomena involved, but it all by itself will promote the other phenomena. To understand this process is to be able to run it. To be able to run it is to understand it. I wouldn't try to run this process on anybody unless I had some idea of what I was doing.

"Keep it from going away"—by the way, this was evolved empirically. I evolved this empirically at first and it didn't gel—I didn't know why these three things were one, two, three. I had no idea. I merely took all available elements and found out that the three together worked and used it in that fashion and later on came across the explanation. And I don't believe I've ever told anybody the explanation until this minute—it's not been in a PAB or anything else. If you can keep the front wall from going away—just that—the ability to hold still in general is regained. One is then able to confront things, isn't he? And so of course he can recognize solids. He dares recognize a solid is the final step of this. You got that?

First he's got this ability to keep things from going away, which also gives him the ability of, you know—well, that's power. Then he finally discovers that he himself can be stationary or other things could be motionless, and then he finally—that gives him the idea of confronting. And as soon as he's willing to confront, why, then he can make things more solid, and you've got it made.

6 AUGUST 1957

And that's why these three processes, CCH 9, 10 and 11, are where they are and are run in this fashion. The amount of actual thetan power generated by a good flattening of these processes cannot properly be estimated. Because we figured out one time about the only way you could kick the world off its orbit was not with a lever invented by some Greek, but would be by a thetan thinking the smallest thought possible. You'd have to think a small enough thought to throw the world off of its orbit; it'd have to be probably that tiny an impulse to overcome that much mass. This was just theorizing, but there was a high probability that this was the case.

If you could keep the world from going away, you could eventually hold it still. If you could hold it still, then you'd probably be able to confront the idea of that much solid mass having that much gravitic pull and you'd probably be able to confront it all at one fell swoop.

Now, how much of the world are you confronting right this moment? You're not confronting very much of it. You're confronting a little bit of it. See, at the most probably you're confronting a few square blocks. Got that? Just a few square blocks.

Well, the horizon goes out in both directions from those few square blocks and we get to considering the mass of it and normally, unless we really tackle this problem head-on and get it flat and change our ideas concerning it, it's rather overpowering. The idea of that much space and that much mass and that much weight as composed in a small, rather insignificant sphere only eight thousand miles in diameter, but it's apparently to us quite a lot of mass. Well, it ceases to be so doggone much mass the moment that we can get the idea of keeping it from going away.

But what's keeping it from going away for us? *We're* being kept from going away by *it*. You talk about an automaticity, that's a royal one. Not only are we not keeping Earth from going away, but Earth is keeping us from going away. Now, that's what I mean by an inversion of a royal order. That's quite an inversion, you think it over. The only person that could keep you on Earth, in the final analysis, would be you. But what concatenation of thought have you think that finally got it down to a point of where you've got a total inversion? That's pretty wild, isn't it? Total inversion. And that total inversion of "keep it from going away" is gravity. Gravity is not mass V squared by the pi root of *yak*.

Now, the solids that you're willing to confront and the solidity which you're willing to confront has an awful lot to do with your ability to hold still or hold things still. And your ability to hold things still or hold still has an awful lot to do with your ability to keep things from going away. And we have the entering wedge. Without that entering wedge the rest of this would be mere vaporings. There would be no ladder to climb. There would be no bottom rung. We would be rewarded with the beautiful scene of a ladder reaching up to the top of the hanging gardens of Babylon, all first hundred rungs missing.

Well now, the first thing on this rung is a secret. An individual can make and keep a secret, he's really done something. That is an ability. Of course it's an ability, too, to worm secrets out of people. But here is a basic ability: the keeping of a secret. Being able to withhold things from other things selectively, various odds and ends of items, graduates at length up into more solid things like keeping a mock-up from going away. And that goes into more solid things like keeping MEST objects from going away. So we have a whole span here of keeping things from going away, all of which begin simply with a withheld thought, which is what a secret is. And it scales on upstairs to a withheld object. Got it?

THE SCALE OF WITHHOLD

Now, if one ran the whole gamut of this from the withheld thought to the object, and won all the way and regained his ability all the way, and was willing to keep certain things—many things from going away, he of course could then start in on the basis of "hold things still." But, he'd never hold himself still for the excellent reason that he isn't there to be held still. A thetan isn't hold-stillable. He is think-hereable. He can suppose he is in a place, and this depends on his ability to hold other things still.

So "hold it still" is the next rung up. But now, "keep it from going away" solves both outflow and inflow. It's quite remarkable. That's the side that solves both outflow and inflow. "Hold still" solves motion and no-motion. Hah! That's quite remarkable, isn't it? We've got both of these things and we solve them there with just one of them. We got motion and no-motion. So you really don't solve motion with motion, you solve motion with hold-stillness. And the ability to confront and confound solids solves, alike, something and nothing. To be able to confront a solid then makes a person capable of confronting nothing. So we've got nothing and something contained in solids.

Now, here we have six items and they're a gradient scale, and the first of these items are a pair called "reach and withdraw" or "throw away and hold to you." Got that? That's two. And that bracket is solved by running *only* "keep it from going away." And the next one up is "motion and no-motion, action and stillness," that pair. And those are solved by running "stillness."

You'll just get everywhere you want to go if you just have a person (a thetan, I was going to say) going around—I'm going to teach you to audit thetans probably next year, but not now—you just have him go around and hold tables still and that sort of thing. Now, it's quite remarkable as a case cracker. Don't think that you have to run always only a gradient scale.

We've asked—a psycho who was spinning like one of these white mice that's been around a psychology department—and we've asked him to just look around the room and find something that was still. And all of a sudden he's found something finally that he considered still and he himself stopped spinning.

He says, "*Uh-huh-uh-huh-ahhhhh.*"

You say, "What's the matter?"

"Oh, it's just been going on for years."

"What's been going on for years?"

"All this sea of motion." He's liable to tell you all sorts of weird things.

We audited somebody one time over in the London clinic. For twenty-five hours nothing much had been happening and the last two hours to go (this "hold it still" was in a very experimental stage, this was a couple of years ago) and the auditor came out and said, "What do I do now?" And I said, "I don't know. Why don't you have him find something in the room that is still." (Been working on this.) She went back in and he found four or five things that were still, with great relief, and said, "Do you know, the drop of blood that was taken at the national medical center that they have under the lamp so they can see what I'm doing and saying doesn't bother me now; I'm not there."

Well, that's the way cases go. Anyway, they actually had taken a blood specimen and told him something like this. We checked up on it. It sounded too mad for us, but it sounded like it might be reasonable. And we found out it was reasonable. Now, there's that one taken all about.

The preclear is troubled by obsessive motion: the environment seems to be in motion, in motion, in motion. Now, you have a choice: you have motion, you can run motion or no-motion. Now, it's *a* fact that you actually can get

someplace by running the motion, which is quite interesting. You can actually get somewhere running the motion. But the fastest way to get someplace and the most stable someplace to get is to run the "still." He says, "Oh, the room is just going round and round and round and round." You could say, "Well, make it go round and round and round. Make it go round a little faster." You'd get someplace with this, you understand. But you'll get someplace faster by saying, "Find one point in the room that is not going around and around." And it might take him a half an hour to do it, but all of a sudden he'd say, "*Uh-ha-ha*. Oh, that cup—that cup is right in the middle of the maelstrom; it isn't moving at all; it's dead still." You could say, "That's good. That's fine. Now find something else." And he would gradually have the whole room settle down. You run the still side of it, see—that's the smart auditing.

All right. And we get up to this last bracket and we have somebody who is terribly fascinated with vaporous nothingnesses. He has been studying in the field of oh, economics or some other nothingness, and he's been studying around in, oh, something. He's been reading books on electronics. You know? How the little particles wiggle-waggle as they go through the wuggles. Or he's been down panting over hot brains in the AEC, trying to find out all about why he shouldn't stop exploding atomic bombs or something. And when we've gotten to this level, we no longer have a choice. To solve nothingnesses, we run solids. He'll graduate rather rapidly up to being able to confront nothing if we run solids. But we don't run nothings, any more than we can get a definition on it by agreement.

98

So we've got the first four of these pairs, "throw it away" or "hold it to your chest," "reach" or "withdraw." We can run either side of those, but had better run "hold it to your chest." You know, it's—we're in favor of that one: the case runs faster and better. And a case can actually deteriorate by running the other side, but can never deteriorate by holding things to his chest, which is probably why he does it obsessively.

And the next pair of "motion and no-motion," we can run "motion" and get away with it. You understand we can run "throw it away" much more easily and with less consequence than we can run "motion." See, the other side of the pair is deteriorating here. We can still run "motion" or "no-motion," but we'd better run—and here the majority is well up—"still," see, the no-motion.

And there on this next pair you haven't got any choice. There's no choice left. To run nothing or something, you run solids. The most solid something that you can run and that will get him up to a state where he can look at nothings. Got it? Actually what you do is pick him out of those places where he's totally convinced of solids and you walk him back to the world of thought on the little gradient scale I was talking to you about before that goes from nothing, through emotions, through effort, through facsimiles, into solids. And you get him back up to where he can handle it on the effort—up above the effort band, up above into thought. Now do you understand that little setup? It's very, very cute. And you audit on that side of the picture and you won't miss very badly. You'll win.

Now, there aren't cases that violate these conditions. I can assure you of that. But there are cases which appear to. There are cases on which "only motion could be run because they have no concept of stillness." *Aaaah!* You mean you're going to run motion from a motion point, the thetan? The thetan is so much in motion he can only confront motion, and he is motion, so you're

THE SCALE OF WITHHOLD

going to run more motion. Oh, no you're not! You're going to find something that's still if it takes you all day. And if in one whole day's auditing you just found one item that he could hold still, that puts him on the cause end of it—much lower down, "was still"—you'd have won more than motion run on him all day long. Got it?

Now, when we get down to the bottom of the thing, we don't ask him what he could communicate, we could ask him what he could withhold. But we still could ask him what he could communicate and get someplace. Do you understand? We could still run "dispense with" on the Trio side and get someplace, if he could run it. See, you got a little more latitude there, but it is much more favorable—the auguries and auspices are—if you run "withhold." "Clutch it to your bosom."

I actually have run tests on objects in the room of the idea of getting rid of it. "Get the idea of pushing on it." See? And the idea of holding it in. And have found that it's tremendously more effective for the person to hold it in. This actual test could be made by you at any time.

Now, you could go around all around the room and have him do nothing, no matter what he wanted to do with the object, but hold it to him. "Keep it from going away" is the phrase. And he would wind up in very good shape. But you still could have him get the idea of throwing it away.

Now, do you understand CCH 9, CCH 10, CCH 11 a little better?

Audience: Yeah.

One final remark. These things can be run by Formal Auditing and are not necessarily Tone 40. If you've got a very figure-figure case and he wants to discuss a lot of things about it and the ARC would break down rather easily with it, but he still can—you can control his thoughts to the degree of running this because it's a thinkingness process, you understand, why, you better run it Formal. It'll run more easily Formal.

Now, these are bearcats. That particular three are bearcats. And you could jump from the first four CCH processes to this group of three, directly, and win like mad. That's a terrific battery. It could also be done subjectively, but it's much more effective objectively. Got it?

Audience: Yeah.

Okay. You're welcome.

Thank you.

CCH

A lecture given on 7
August 1957

Thank you, thank you. How are you this evening?

Audience: Fine.

Well, this evening we have come along here to the eighteenth lecture, and there are only a few of you now who aren't getting it from time to time, accidentally. And I want the rest of you to get up to a point of where you can do it accidentally now and then, because the truth of the matter is it comes in handy occasionally. In an auditing session it's handy, you know, to occasionally in an offhanded sort of way, just as though you intended it, to throw an intention out, something like that, I mean. It does work a little bit better; you don't need many of them, you know. And every once in a while sit up briskly, you know, and put your feet on the floor, your hands in your laps and look squarely at the preclear; it wakes him up when you do this. And when he makes an origin, why, scratch your head; at least that shows some sympathy for the situation. And when you get—when you get to the end of the session, why, if you happen to think of it, tell him so. That's really about all you need to know about auditing, you know.

When you compare 1950 auditing with the auditing that we are doing today, it is not even in the same universe.

Male voice: But it worked.

That's what's amazing about it, it worked. I suppose many of you really don't know—I've just insulted all of you and invalidated you. Excuse me. Apologies and so forth. I understand that I have insulted you. Thank you!

Female voice: Whoo-hoo! We didn't feel invalidated. We thought we'd been acknowledged.

Oh, dear. I wonder if you realize entirely how various mechanisms of auditing today are themselves therapeutic. That is to say, they get things on the road and do things with a case.

A duplicative question all by itself will get the case progressed. Acknowledgments all by themselves will progress a case. And we take these other things and detract—delete, rather, from the session the element of surprise. You know, starting him into session, comm bridging him from process to process and taking him out of session smoothly and so on. The discovery that they can sit there that long without being amazed, surprised or upset by a sudden boo-boo by the auditor is in itself very, very therapeutic.

Furthermore your altitude actually depends on the excellence with which you can do what you are doing. You want to know what altitude is, you ought

7 AUGUST 1957

to see some of the awe that I get every now and then. Somebody said they saw a professional auditor working on somebody. And they write in and say, "Ahh," you know, "gee-whiz, I didn't know that anybody could do anything like that," you know? And it was amazing at the congress when professional auditors got up on the stage, well trained, you know, and went through this. We're very used to this and we didn't get, really, any audience reaction unless we looked for it. But the audience sat there and went—they didn't know what to make of this at all, this was above any imagined perfection that they had entertained at all.

Well, if you don't think this sort of thing registers on a preclear—it registers tremendously that somebody can sit there and turn out a good job of auditing on them and so on. And that all by itself says, "Well, there's somebody in the world that can help me and knows what he's doing." All a preclear needs to find that out—somebody is willing to help him, and he does much better by it.

Well now, this evening we have arrived at the 18th lecture of the 18th ACC, August 7, 19-5-7. And the title of tonight's lecture is CCH. (It's a good title for any lecture.)

Once upon a time we had something called ARC: affinity, reality and communication. ARC is with us today and we have the understood level of it: control, communication, havingness or control, havingness and communication, if you want to get the comparable parts. Affinity—control; he just steered me down the street; he must like me. Havingness—reality; solids. Ability to own or possess solids. It's reality on its lower levels. And then we have, of course, communication is communication, and it is nothing but communication. But communication is a very precise thing.

102

Now, the aspect of communication alone is the one thing which has remained unchanged here for seven years. Communication in *Dianetics 1955!* was better delineated. And we understood a lot more about it and we began to use it as itself and understood its great importance.

Now we have come up against another great importance and that is reality. And first we had—that was very good on reality—was this thing called havingness. And at that time we thought havingness was one thing and reality was something else. But the truth of the matter is they were the same item. The ability to have a reality is merely the ability to possess, in most cases. Now, what is the ability to possess—and you'll laugh when you look this over because it's entirely too simple—and that is simply the ability to withhold. And that's what havingness is. It's the ability to withhold. Of course you run it with only that in mind and all of your other considerations on havingness will have a tendency to stick.

You shouldn't explain this to a preclear. He will stumble into it sooner or later. He said, "Well now, let's see, I can have that." At first he says, "I can have that only if I could withhold it from everything under the sun, keep it close to my chest, pull it in to me and never let it go forth from now till the end of the universe. That would be a proper havingness. That's good reality; that's a good reality, that's right, it'll never disappear—good reality. Always mine, no other thetan could touch it, no other person could ever have anything to do with it, nobody could look at it, and I've—we've got it made, see, and that's why we could—it's real."

What's real then? Well, we look at a person and we start to run Havingness on him and he will find first only those things very close to him and very intimate are possessible by him. He'll just say—he says, "It's—if it's within a quarter of an inch of me I could have it." What does he mean? He

means, "If I could have it within a quarter of an inch of me and keep it there forever, then it would be real." It is not real unless it has this much persistence.

Now, persistence is the one thing that is comparable to a thetan who can do nothing but survive. It is a quality that enduring objects hold in common with thetans. Now, when thetans wish to associate bodies very, very closely with themselves then they make bodies endure. Havingness shouldn't have to endure at all, to be. An object, a solid object could be conceived to exist for an hour, for a day, and it would still be a solid object, but a thetan doesn't feel this is the case. He doesn't feel that he would have any communication, duplication ability on a solid object unless he at least had endurance in it. Got that?

So we want suits that will last, watches that will run forever. The only violation of this is the American automobile industry. American automobile industry violates this and they do not know to what degree actually they damage themselves with this. We see new cars all over the place all the time with new styles and new improvements, but the funny part of it is, they are understood to be, each time a model comes out, a more enduring car than the last models. And the truth of the matter is they are becoming much less enduring.

Somebody was talking to me the other day about this convertible I drive around and casting snide remarks on the subject. I ought to get rid of the thing, you know, it's really declassé.

And I did a comm lag on it myself. It took me a couple of days to think up the answer and I just happened to think of it this afternoon. The answer was, I'll get rid of that convertible when I find new cars out-dragging it. When we start up from stoplights and I no longer am passing this year's Oldsmobile, this year's Cadillac, this year's thisa—and we won't even call it Fords and Chev-rolets. And when I cease to out-drag those things rather easily, I'll turn it in.

Well now, there isn't any real consideration of endurance, it's a consideration of changing styles. And people go on the bent of changing styles all the time and that changing style is in itself supposed to be an improvement.

General Electric has some lightning that they group together into the symbols "GE" on the television screen and say, "Our most important product is progress." I'm glad of that, I'm very glad of that. That's all they've got to sell, they say. Well that's fine, but there's undoubtedly a great deal that could come out of the scientific world to the possible benefit of man. But I want to show you just exactly where it goes.

They used to say, "Well, peacetimes are made so much better, you know, because of the war developments. You say that wars are all for nothing. Well, as a matter of fact, look at all the scientific encouragement which took place during the war. Look at these tremendous developments which are now of use in peacetime." As a matter of fact I can't find anything that was ever invented in a war, in complete reversal to this. War, however, would use and develop some of these ideas on some sort of a necessity level, about which we are going to speak in about two seconds max. Most misunderstood thing in the whole of this science is necessity level.

But here we have—here we have this consideration that progress has led to what? Let me point out to you that progress is always slanted at a higher endurance. Eat more Wheaties, run more blocks. You get the idea? "We're progressing toward an electric light bulb" they would have you understand, "which will burn longer, for less." Of course the modern electric light bulb, you screw it in, you take it out and throw it in the wastepaper basket, you get another one, you screw it in, you take it out and you can—they last three or four pages before they go. But that's an exaggeration; I had one last six pages.

But there's no tungsten in them because this is all being taken up for critical war material, I understand, or something like that. Their war has now not only given us the total progress that we have, but now it's taking away from us all the progress that we have and it's going to go on this cycle very easily and smoothly up to the point of *boom!* And that of course is the progress that GE is aiming its lightning bolts at, I suppose. They're busy building atomic thisas and atomic thatas and they're having a great time with it.

But this thing called progress understands that we're going to get a greater endurance. Now, you as a preclear also have a little bit of an understood thing here. You understand that if you get enough processing your body will go on longer. Well, that is to say you probably understood it once. Just having taken a glance at your minds I find you don't understand this. Now, some of you say, "Well, if I get enough processing I won't have one at all, and I will be able to endure without one." Now, that's all very well, but the point is that havingness is cut down to the degree that one has to insist upon this Q-and-A with his own survival, with every havingness, see?

We've got a piece of MEST that lasts forever. Piece of MEST that lasts forever—therefore this has some comparable duplicative value for a thetan. He said, "Look, I have something in common with that piece of MEST—it lasts forever." The Egyptian making a mummy tried to make the mummy last forever. Somebody said in a story one time, I think *The Mummy's Hand*, the name of the story is, or *The Mummy's Foot*, said the dream of Egypt was eternity. Well that's for sure, they tried to make everything last forever. And there's . . . But these masses which they erected, on a forever basis, aren't doing very many of those Egyptians any good. They're off someplace else, probably, long since.

Now, let's take a look at this duplicative factor in communication. An individual finds something in common, in other words, an agreement, which brings us back to reality. He finds something in common with the things he can communicate with. He conceives that there must be something in common between the two points of a communication line and this isn't true at all and isn't a necessary adjunct. When you start running duplication at a thetan, ask yourself, "Why does he improve?" You're running out duplication. You're showing him he doesn't have to avoid it, that he can tolerate it, and as soon as toleration of duplication becomes possible, then he loses the idea that both ends of the communication line, of which he is one, must have an agreement. Then you can get something in the order of postulate communication, which you're doing with Tone 40 on an Object. Postulate communication.

But the greater agreement a thetan believes necessary between the two ends of the communication line, the lower down the scale he goes until he even gets down to—well, I don't know—AEC engineer. Yeah, I imagine these AEC engineers go home and explode. I imagine they get their thoughts on a sort of a radioactive scale and do their mathematics and so on at the rate of consumption of so many millicuries. Get the idea, they're communicating on some sort of a communication line and they think to stay on the line that they have to duplicate something that is on the other end of the line for a communication to take place. Do you understand this?

And you get the idea that the way to talk to a woman (and this is true) is to—and we had this for years, we knew all about this—we would have to talk to her about womanly things. In other words, we'd have to put some womanishness into the communication in order to talk to a woman. Or to talk to a man you'd have to put some mannishness into the communication line to talk to the man. You get the idea? Well, that's just Q&Aing with the

universe. No wonder you get stuck in it. It isn't true at all that a woman has to talk to a man mannishly. There's many a girl has failed to get her man—the Northwest Mounted Police and women have the same motto. And that's very true—they've gone completely on the rocks because they insisted on talking to the fellow about guns and camping and duck shooting and pipe smoking and that sort of thing. As a matter of fact, she didn't know enough about the subject to talk about it and he kind of thought she was silly. And he went off and married some girl that was always talking about the delicious cream pies that she could get down at the—down at the local restaurant. That's about all she ever talked about—and it just misfired. And the number of girlish men who marry women are very few. Now you know, that's for true. Women are always marrying somebody with hair all over his chest.

It's the workability of the situation—the work—general workability of the situation as far as a thetan is concerned is overstressed. You get the idea? Well, they start going downhill on this and they think, "Well, let's see. That wall, for me to look at that wall, the wall would at least have to have some expectancy of endurance in order to match my potential of survival." You get the idea? And then they find out the wall doesn't endure so they feel they must be wrong about their survival and they themselves invent death for themselves. Get this?

In other words, they set up an agreement line. They agree with this thing over here to get a duplication so we get a proper communication with it and then they find out that their original postulate on the thing was for the birds—it's denied, the thought on the agreement snaps back on them and they have to perish. You see that? And there's where perishing comes from. It comes from tearing down things which were to endure forever.

You could probably cause a great many deaths in a city, just to take one of its principal landmarks and one day in a sort of a careless frame of mind go down and take some bulldozers and knock the thing flat. Lot of people measured the fact of their communication, their own endurance and so forth by it. They've already done a flop on it see? A flip-flop on the line. Somebody knocks the monument down, they kick the bucket. Get the idea?

In other words, they originally went into agreement, by choice, with that and assigned survival to that wall so they could communicate with it easily. Well, that's fine, they assigned survival to it and then one day somebody knocked down the wall and this was the first death the thetan suffered. Only he didn't die at all, but to make a liar out of himself he turns on a forgetter mechanism so that he won't remember. Well, that's as good as death as far as he's concerned.

Now, it isn't necessary actually to duplicate anything on a communication line, or have any agreement at all on the line. There's no necessity of doing this. No need for it at all. Communication can occur, and there's where Tone 40 Auditing comes in. You assume no duplication on the line. You assume that this—you don't have to be crazy to process the lunatic. You got the idea?

You don't assume any necessity for a duplication and yet you can communicate, can't you? Well, I'm just showing you that other considerations about communication are possible than the ones *Homo sapiens* had. Communication is essentially the act of transmitting an idea, or withholding one. Receiving one, or refusing to. And you have your interchanges, all interchanges possible. Got that? I mean, it's just as simple as that.

All right now, if we lard this thing up with a tremendous number of extra evaluations, lots of conditions: "I can't talk to you when you look at me

like that, George." I don't know why, he—see? That's just an oddity. "I can't read a book when the temperature is over 95 degrees." Here's the—here's just an oddity. What does that have to do with reading a book? You say, "Well, I can't talk to that man until he has given his consent." I don't know why not. You see? You say, "Well, you'd violate attention." Yes, *Homo sapiens* has these considerations. Why abide by them? There's no reason to abide by them at all. You're lying within too many restrictive barriers for communication to take place.

So when we look at havingness, we are looking at the bottom rung of a series of considerations concerning communication. And we get to the bottom of CCH, we find that control is anytime I touch it, it touches me. Anytime I start it, it starts me. Anytime I stop it, it stops me. Anytime I change it, it changes me. Instantaneous reaction. And that is reactivity. That's the basis of the reactive mind. Reaction. Total reaction. In other words, we try to control it, it controls me. We have a society of mutual instantaneous control every time a control is effected. Every time it seeks to control me I seek to control it. Now, on the communication line, with which and what do we control it? Exactly what it is controls it. Well, with what and which does it control us? Exactly what we are controls us. You get the idea?

So we get a communication, an agreement, you might say, without space. We get reactivity. We start to process preclear, we're in the valence of the preclear at once. We change the preclear's mind about cats, we change our own mind about cats. We don't change his mind about cats, afterwards we can't change our minds about cats. See how silly this thing is? There isn't any rational inspection, no choice involved with it and so forth. It is anything that happens, why, that is what happens to me. You see? Or that is what happens to it. Reaction. You put up a red flag in the bank and somebody else puts up a red flag in the bank. This is a stupid sort of reactivity.

Now, you don't even have association there. You have two conditions, one where you get rather good equality. That is to say, you put up a red flag, you only get a red flag. And then you get an identification beyond that point which is when you put up a blue flag, that is as good as a red flag which is as good as a green flag which is as good as flagpoles and which are of course all the same as blondes. Now, when it skips over to blondes and it's "all the same as," then we say the fellow is disassociating. No, he's totally identifying. All right, we get reactivity, then, at this bottom rung of CCH.

Now, the road out of this circumstance where every—one has to agree with everything which he faces, in everything it is, on every agreement it has—we get into an interesting condition then, where reality is a total, total, total, total solid which endures forever and will never disperse or disappear. And control which is counter-control as fast as it is control. We control it, it controls us. It controls us, we control it. It's sort of dancing together in a very tight schottische.

These three factors merge together and give us thinkingness as she ain't done. Or as she is done automatically. It's automatic thinking. What's the best thing to do in the situation? Well, the answers to all problems are the problems themselves. When you think that a solution is the answer to a problem you have already started on the road downward. You keep kicking in cures then. Therefore nothing is ever as-ised and we get this agreement across the line interrupted, changed, altered and we get alter-isness occurring on either end of a comm line. How do we do that? Something presents itself bright blue. We say, "Ah-ha! It should not be bright blue, it should be purple."

And we get something or other and shoot it along the line which makes the thing purple. Then we're very surprised when somebody runs us on the backtrack and we find a blue object sitting there. Why'd we find a blue object sitting there? Well, the only way the blue object would disappear at all was to notice that there was a blue object there. So a nonrecognition is an unfinished communication cycle.

So the whole of the dwindling spiral depends upon unfinished comm cycles. You follow this? But to get a comm cycle that won't finish it is necessary to mock up this idea that we have to duplicate everything across a line, see? We're on this terminal and we have to duplicate things on that terminal. In other words, we have a concern then with every terminal we confront in any way. And in that way an unfinished cycle of communication does occur. And I don't know how many people are in this universe and in the state they are in simply because nothing was said yes to on the early part of this line. But look, the consideration of duplication must occur. Now, if one makes the consideration of duplication and then says he cannot duplicate, he sticks the consideration of duplication, doesn't he? So all he has to find out how to do is knowingly duplicate and these cycles start to run out like mad. And a duplicative auditing question—making an individual confront a duplicative auditing question all by itself starts to strip apart this mechanism. And he'll finish tremendous numbers of cycles of action that the auditor never inspects.

His acknowledgment, furthermore, sweeps—the acknowledgment on the line sweeps away and finishes a tremendous number of suspended and incomplete communications. And you're doing something with auditing without inspection. Why? Why can you do this without inspection? Simply because you're taking the elements of how one got into the trap and undoing those elements. Those elements have to do with obsessive agreement on either end of the line, which we call duplication; with finishing off communication cycles which were never before finished and with not solving problems, but by just recognizing the existence of problems. And you just do these things in auditing and you could practically wind up a case with just those things. Do you understand?

So that auditing tools today aren't just a method of addressing a preclear so that he will think we're experts. It's actually—starts to rub the case out the moment that the auditor starts to handle it. He uses a duplicative question. Well, the preclear starts to go nuts on this question after a little while. I don't know if you've watched somebody when you just sit down there and you calmly say, "Notice that wall. Thank you. Notice that wall. Thank you. Notice that wall. Thank you. Notice that wall. Thank you." And he'd say, "*Batter bap brp.*" Well, the reason you don't get straight protests on it is it is beneath his recognition. He does not recognize a duplicative question until a lot of time passes in auditing, and by that time he's in good enough shape to tolerate it.

But you're actually cutting his bank to pieces just by saying, "Do fishes swim?" or "Notice that wall." And every time you make a boo-boo on an auditing command and don't duplicate, you actually hang up that cycle of communication. Every time an acknowledgment does not go through, you have left one more thing that has not been finished.

So it is tremendously amusing to watch somebody learning to be an auditor go right down the groove on the right question, without recognizing that the right handling of the question is more important than the question. You should follow that. I mean, just good auditing procedure, the early TRs strung together, are themselves the session.

All right now, you come along and you put some significance into it, you know, you make it interesting one way or the other and you say, "Well now, get the idea that all the lamps in the room are at the other end of the room. Fine. Now get the idea that all the lamps in the room are at the other end of the room. Fine. Now get the idea that all the lamps in the room are at the other end of the room. Fine." And you say, "Boy, I've really got a button here, this preclear's unwinding." I don't care whether you got a button or not, doesn't make any difference whether you got a button. You're just willing to sit there and audit him. Why, I don't care what question you ask, or what command you give, if you're handling these elements properly, this case is starting to come apart.

Now, it's true that there must be some recognition of the elements, that they are occurring. And sometimes a preclear is so armor-plated that he doesn't notice any part of it, including the auditor. Well, so it's kind of necessary then to get through to him rather positively, definitely and succinctly. It's all over his head, 't isn't real, there's nothing there and *so* on. All right, you tie in with something like the Reality Scale and you give him a reality on a comm line, you give him a reality then on terminals at the other end of the comm line and he finds the auditor. Then he gets up to a point where agreement will take place and he starts to get out of the woods.

108

Now, this has to do with how close together and how positive must the manipulation of the preclear be and so we get into manual auditing. We get in right close, vis-a-vis. Now you start saying, "Give me your hand," making somebody sit that close to you and repeat the action over and over, is—also makes him confront, doesn't it, rather positively; and wild things may happen just because of this. Doesn't matter much what you were doing, you would still get results if you'd pat him on the shoulder and put your hand back in your lap and pat him on the shoulder and put your hand back in your lap. You got it?

What I'm trying to show you is that auditing is itself a resolver of cases. Now, the three elements of auditing that auditing must embrace are communication, havingness and control. And because these three things are being used deliberately, they tend to pull out of the unknown band into the known band. In other words, they come to view.

Communication—communication takes place—the Reality Scale gives us the havingness level of the communication, and control gives us the positiveness of the affinity on the line. We must be fond of the guy—we just knocked his head off.

Now, when you look this over, you will see then that an argument about auditing commands must end with "Is it doable?" Not much, "Is it therapeutic?" but "Can it be executed?" And as we have pushed people up scale with CCH we found rather definitely that there were certain auditing commands that couldn't be executed above a certain case level, which was kind of remarkable.

And we found that old time 8-C becomes utterly silly, after a while, on this basis: We say, "Look at that wall" and then insist the fellow turn his head. What's he doing turning his head? For what? What's the matter, can't this thetan see a wall? And he actually could obey the auditing command and be invalidated by the auditor and thus auditing would start to lose ground.

So the auditing command must agree with the reality of the situation, which is that the preclear (being), is himself without mass and that he is handling mass. And if we indicate that he is to—well, let's get a sample command here. You say, "Now, touch your body on the forehead." Well, you'd say

offhand, "Boy, that's an executable command, isn't it? 'Touch your body on the forehead,' that's a very simple command." Yes, it's executable up to the time of near exterior or after exterior, then it's not executable. Why? He may be—have a thousand bodies around, he's got old mocked-up bodies, he's got bodies in the next county, he's got bodies on the brain and you say, "Touch yourself on the forehead" and *tzuhhh*. "Touch your body." He'd be perfectly licensed to say, "Which body?" or "I haven't got one, thank you." Do you see that? So the command then has a limitation.

Now, you could say, "Touch that body." Now, there might be some limitation on this, but it works. We could say, "Touch that body on that forehead." Now we get this thing about "look at the wall." Now, to be absolutely sure, we'd have to say, "Through that body's eyes" or "Through those eyes" or some such thing, indicating them, "look at that wall."

Now, the second we pronounce a truth of this magnitude, why, we're raising hob with the process as well as the auditing procedure. And a combination of these two become absolutely deadly. The two together are irresistible. He might get away with it, you see, if he just had auditing procedure and nothing else, but now we add in an auditing command and then we direct the command very directly toward a truthful state of affairs. We tell him to do what he is doing! When he looks at that wall, he of course looks at the wall through the body's eyes. But we tell him to look at that wall through the body's eyes and after a while he realizes he's obeying the command. Well boy, is that control. Look at the control factor involved in this thing.

Now, it's quite amusing, the control factors involved with "Sit in that chair." This has a certain level of unworkability, but a thetan can still mock himself up sitting in that chair, you get the idea. So you don't go out through the roof on it. Now you say, "Touch that chair" and if you expect him to touch it with his hand—he's already sitting in it, isn't he, when you tell him to touch it. Well all right, he doesn't even have to twitch to obey the auditing command. You assume that he's enlivening the body and you assume that through the body he touches the chair, and he's done the command whether he even wiggles. He can't get out from under. Have you got it? He just can't get out from under, that's that. He has to do the command willy-nilly.

And there are several auditing commands of this character. Now, those are very reactive commands. They are directed directly at reactivity. They command the thing which is in existence. Total reactivity, you got the idea? This thetan, dead in his head, is sitting in a chair and we tell him to sit in a chair. Well, he's all mocked up sitting in a chair and then we say thank you as though he has complied—which he hasn't done anything else but—and he can't get outside of the control. You see this? He can't get outside the control.

Now, there are several other commands that work in the same way. These commands are, oddly enough, all recognized by preclears as wins and they work on a baby a few days old. Now, Scientology parents are always trying to lead the kid and make him better and get him up scale and get him squared away, and they neglect the fact that the fellow is operating within the considerations of being a baby or a little boy or something like that. And they never give him a win. And after a while the kid gets absolutely wog, he says, "Why can't I please my parents?" Said, "In the state that I am in I do not please my parents at all."

So I've done this several times now, that I've taken a child, put the child in a chair and said, "Be a little girl. Thank you. Be a little girl. Thank you. Be a little girl. Thank you." After a while, kid says, "*Hh-hh, hh-hh, ha, ha,*

7 AUGUST 1957

ha, hh, I got it made." Little baby, he's lying in a crib, you say, "Lie in the crib. Thank you. Lie in the crib. Thank you." Well now, that's not a very exact auditing command. Let's explore the command and we find out that it is not a very good command, it simply has a workability. Because in the first place a thetan isn't lying in the crib and a thetan isn't being a little girl.

Now, if you refine one of these commands down—and I'm just giving you the clue on how you do this rather than the whole parade of commands—which exactly fitted the facts, you would then have a total reactivity control command which would be 100 percent win and the preclear would regard it as 100 percent win. Now, if you said to this little girl—these commands get clumsy sometimes, and involved, but you should explore them and look them over for their workabilities. You could say to this little girl, "Now have that body be a little girl. Thank you. Have that body be a little girl. Thank you. Have that body be a little girl." And you'd find out it'd probably work faster. See, that's exactly what's going on, you acknowledge it, you say that's fine, they have the sensation of winning and therefore don't have to hang up forever on it.

Got a report the other day, some little kid had been audited and Mother said that before she could study to be an auditor she'd have to grow—up and she promptly grew three inches. That was taking her mother very literally.

But your responses on the part of the preclear at the lower end of the spectrum are reactive responses and it's the reactive responses that have him pinned down; these are unknown. So you give him wins on the reactive responses and you've got it made. So you give him wins on the level—lowest level. Your fellow is actually sitting there and he's doing something and you told him to do it and then you thanked him for doing it. From just an existing state, hung up, you are now acknowledging the state, you're giving him a win with the state, you are telling him that it's all right for that state to exist, you're putting him into communication because that state is the communication and his considerations on duplication tell him that therefore that is communication. The only communication to that state is a statement of that state. You get the idea? And you have very well a perfect auditing command.

We had a flop on one the other day. I sent to an auditor in a very far place—rather tragic flop because I told the auditor to do—who had never heard of Tone 40 processes or anything like that—I told the auditor to run a command, and which was one of these total reactive commands, you know, just tell the preclear to do what the preclear is doing and thank the preclear. And the auditor wrote me back some gobbledygook of some kind or another, a very involved supersignificance, and had completely misinterpreted the process. Didn't even think the process could possibly be doable because the preclear wasn't doing anything.

Now, get obnosis. Obnosis is that an individual sitting in the chair is doing something. Now, don't get so obsessively on change that you never command existing state. You've got the idea? So you say, "Through the body's eyes, look at that wall." What's he doing? He says yes. All of a sudden he says, "You know, there's something obstructing my vision, you know?" After a while it turns out that they're his eyeballs, something like this.

Now, why would that take place? The individual—now get this—the individual is obeying a series of commands which culminate in this state. And it is a series of commands which wind up with this state. The state he is in is in obedience to the commands. All we have to do is utter the commands and we as-is the original commands. Next thing you know, the fellow doesn't have

to look through his eyeballs. Why is he looking through his eyeballs? Well, it's all very well for you to say, "Well, that's just the way people are built." No it's not the way people are built, that's the way thetans are ordered around. Whether circumstances or gods, demons, devils or sergeant majors, somebody has ordered him to look through eyeballs.

Now, let's go back to repetitive—repeater technique, old repeater technique. Are you aware of the fact that the auditor can take a key phrase on the case, the preclear's always saying this word—this series of words like, "Oh well, all women are alike," you know, "Oh well, all women are alike." And you say, "Well now, how are you getting along?"

"Well, I'm getting along all right except for my wife, you know. Well, all women are alike."

He couldn't even really get it in there squarely, you see, but he got it in there anyhow. And you say, "Well, what is your opinion of women?"

"Well, oh well, all women are alike." Well, this can go on forever unless there's some knowing direction at the phrase. So the auditor can sit there and say, "Oh well, all women are alike. Oh well, all women are alike. Oh well, all women are alike." And the engram starts to run. This is pretty wild, isn't it?

Now, you could sit there and repeat the Axioms at a preclear, with an okay and a good acknowledgment at the end of each axiom, (this hasn't been done, by the way, and it should be done experimentally) and practically blow his case to smithereens because he's obeying every one of them. Just old repeater technique, you get the idea.

So you say, "Through that body's eyes look at that wall," the only thing that gets him out of the problem is the problem, and the problem is an obedience to an order, which is "Through that body's eyes, look at that wall. Look at the MEST universe only through that body's eyes. You can only see while looking through eyes." Now, that's the order he is obeying. Now, there's no sense in hanging glasses on his nose, there's no sense to tell him to look some other way, there's no sense inventing a system by which he can look another way. Let's just say, "Through that body's eyes, look at the wall." And he says, "Well, *er, oooh.*"

Once in a while an individual goes completely hectic when you do this sort of thing to him. He's nicely seated in the chair and we say, "Now, have that body sit in the chair. Thank you."

All of a sudden he says, "*Errr.* Why, I'm doing it!"

And you say, "Good. Fine. Have that body sit in the chair."

"But I'm doing it!"

"Well, have that body sit in the chair. Thank you."

What's this franticness? What's this franticness? All that's running off is the duress which makes him obey the command. Other considerations add up to duress and when that duress starts to come about we get the situation known as a blow. Now, he'll blow *through*. Now, we—somebody has told him in some complicated fashion that unless he does so-and-so, and so-and-so — methods, magic, mysticism, punishment, consequences, if he does not look through a body's eyes he will not see any universe. Now he becomes very anxious to obey this command, "Look through a body's eyes." And for a while, because he's off on the subject of duplication—he's learned that duplication is dangerous and he mustn't do that anymore—he's only frantic because he doesn't think maybe he's looking through the body's eyes. There's something wrong with his performance of the order and that's the only reason he's going crazy on it. The other things can fly off, he can handle them fairly well, but

he starts to distrust himself. Well, it isn't himself that is there to be distrusted. What's there to be distrusted is the fact that he thought he was obeying the command and here's somebody giving him the command as though he wasn't obeying the command. And he right away tries to insist to you, but he *is* sitting in the chair.

And you take some swivilian [civilian] Homo sap someplace or another and you say to him—he's sitting down in the restaurant—you can produce some of the more interesting effects, tap him on the shoulder as you go by his table and bend over and say, "Sit there and eat your dinner. Good." Practically blows him out of the water! But if you were to sit down across the table from him and repeat the command several times, his tendency to get up and run, to leave, to stop eating and so forth would all fade away and he would probably laugh about it. The funny part of it is, it wouldn't be a laugh because he found out you were all right, it would be a laugh of relief. He had discovered that he could obey the command.

And you understand that only—the only persistence of commands contain in them "try." So the real original command said, "Obey the command" and then sat on his head so he couldn't. Get the idea? It said, "Now lift your head out of the water. *Slam!* Good. Lift your head out of the water. Lift your head out of the water. Lift your head out of the water. Lift your head out of the water. Lift your head out of the water." And this guy is floating around with his head in the water.

112

You come along to him and you say, "Lift your head out of the water." He will—then he'd get frantic. And then he—after a while he would lift his head out of the water. Don't you see? But he knows this is not an obeyable command.

This is the way people get crossed up very, very madly. But what is his condition? His head is in the water and his command to himself finally was, "Well, damn it, I'll keep my head in the water. I will show them." So what you have to do is come along and say, "Keep your head in the water. Thank you. Keep your head in the water. Thank you. Keep your head in the water. Thank you. Keep your head in the water. Thank you."

And all of a sudden he says, "Well, that's what I'm doing! But I'm supposed to be doing something else." Now, the something else he's supposed to be doing can usually be neglected, because that wasn't what loused him up. It was some force, duress, or cross order and if you release either side of any of these things they have a tendency to spring. You got it? He was prevented from doing the command, actually.

Now, an individual who is looking through the body's eyes and can't see well, cannot obey the command and is up against one of these shuttles. Got it? All right, supposing the thing did hang up so that the command to lift his head out of the water while his head was being held underwater, and the command "Hold your head underwater" got so entangled with each other that it was just a total confusion and he went into a total confusion on it. You could probably speed the thing up by giving him both commands. You got that?

You'd push his head under the water and you'd say, "All right, keep your face underwater. Keep your face underwater. Thank you. Keep your face underwater. Thank you. Keep your face underwater." And then you grab him by the hair and you'd pull his head out of the water and you say, "Now, keep your head out of the water. Thank you. Keep your head out of the water. Thank you. Good. Keep your head out of the water. Thank you." And you're just working both sides of the same command—series. You got that?

Then the thing would for sure just brush off and disappear. You got both sides of it. Now, quite often it disappears on one side only.

Now, I'll give you some kind of an idea of this when applied very directly to a straight mechanical principle—it's nothing but a mechanical principle. And that is this, "Don't give me your hand." Or "Don't give me that hand," the more exact command. He isn't giving you his hand and you tell him not to.

Now, you're doing something else here, you're getting much more significant, because you're going into withholdings, which is right on the button of havingness. See, you can sit there and say to a preclear, "Don't give me your hand. Thank you." And expect every now and then that you get an explosion on the part of the preclear, an anxiety that he must throw his hands upon you. He must reach you. You got it? You'll get an explosion the other way too. You say, "Give me your hand. Thank you." And he's got the idea that he mustn't give you his hand. You've seen that happen. Well, let's look at the reverse and we would see what would happen on the reverse.

Now, somebody has run bad 8-C on him. They have prevented him from giving a hand, or reaching with anything, while they were telling him to reach. Got the idea? They say, "Now Johnny, don't reach for that light cord. Johnny, don't reach for that light cord." Put his hands up on the light cord. Don't you see? Now they say, "Now Johnny, reach for that light cord," and hold his hands in. Now you've got two postulates which are—or two commands which are so intertwined that neither one can be obeyed without countering the other one. If you split up just one side of it you will have done quite a bit. But if you split up both sides of the commands you've wrecked the whole incident.

Now, in view of the fact that we know that "withhold" has greater validity, in terms of havingness, than "reach," we find out that a very workable process rests in this process, "Don't give me your hand. Thank you." It's a withhold process, isn't it? "Don't give me that hand" would be the process, "Thank you." "Don't give me that hand. Thank you. Don't give me that hand. Thank you." You're liable to get it. But don't you take it, because that would be a violation of the auditing command.

Now, you say that's a violation of communication. No it isn't a violation of communication. It isn't a violation of communication for this reason: communication is occurring, isn't it? Well, I can assure you if somebody is obsessed with keeping his hands to himself, on the subject of hands the only command he will obey is "Keep your hands to yourself." Do you see this?

Now, postulates of one kind or another, to the tune of billions and billions and billions and billions of postulates, different kinds, shapes, sizes and descriptions, have been uttered at people and then crossed up. This is the way the physical universe works. They say, "Lift your head out of the water," and push the guy's head in the water. Now they say, "Push your head in the water," and lift his head out of the water. They pick him up and put him in the Sahara Desert and say, "Drink." They throw him in the Atlantic Ocean and say, "Never get wet."

Now, it's got to be crossed up orders or there won't be any confusion. So an individual after a while becomes very allergic to orders of any kind, and any time you issue any kind of an order he's all upset. Now, we take the basic background laws of existence, which got him into this in the first place, and use those for our utterances and of course we're pulling out from under him the rug of all these other confusions. We're saying, "Well now, just try and find a confusion now, son."

7 AUGUST 1957

Now, we could run communication and break communication at a CCH reactive level. Doesn't run well on upper levels, it doesn't run long or persistently, but it nevertheless runs. Quite remarkable. If you tell somebody to withhold things you'd certainly better build up his havingness. You're going to run out his havingness, his automatic withholdings. You understand that? His automatic havingnesses are going to be shot. You could make him quite ill by overstressing this without running some Havingness. So "Keep that Object from Going Away" and so forth are definitely necessary at least as Havingness, or Trio or something of the sort. Now, we run two things then, one against the other, and we're all set.

Now, does it apply in other ways? Now, yes there are some other ways here which are quite amusing. One of them is self-determinism and other-determinism. An individual cannot make up his mind really whether he should run totally on self-determinism or other-determinism. After all, privates in armies do fine up to the moment they get killed by running totally on other-determinism. But that's fine, privates in armies only do all right when they quit the army and follow their own instincts. Now, those two things are crossed, aren't they? Is it better to run my own life or have it run for me? Now, this is just one of those unresolved questions.

114

Here's another one: is it better to have or not have? Of course, if you have something, then you will lose it and that will cause pain. You'll find many preclears telling you something like that. It's better not to own anything at all. But he's got to have in order to live but he can't have because he can't live. But the best way to live is not to have anything because then nobody will tackle you and kill you. You see the basic confusions.

Now, let's look for those basic confusions in the three bottom levels at CCH. The basic confusion of control is to be controlled or to control. So if you ran a permissive control like Trio, you would do very well to follow it up with Locational, which is total attention control. See, you've let him be permissive, let him choose. All right, now you start controlling him with his attention and you'll find out that he'll spark up on it; there you've run both sides of control, see?

All right now, is it better to have or throw away? Well, that's the Trio. Is it better to not communicate or communicate, and you could run both sides of that on such a thing as "Give me that hand" and the other one would be "Don't give me that hand" and you'd have run both sides of the communication. Thus you would have unraveled a tremendous number of confusions and it's only these confusions which keep the thetan stuck in any kind of a track. He can think his way through anything as long as it's logical. It becomes logical to us when we know both sides of all the puzzles. And they are contained in CCH.

Thank you.

Thank you.

CONFRONTING

A lecture given on 8
August 1957

Okay. And this is the nineteenth lecture of the 18th ACC, August 8, 19-5-7, and the title of tonight's lecture is "Confronting."

As you could suspect, anything that would trail as far through a training course as confronting (Training 0) would have some consequences in the field of processing. And there are certain processes in that field which are quite fascinating and interesting and which we will take up, unless I forget it. Now, there is a phenomenon in which you might be very interested, having to do with enough and not enough. This adds up to one phenomenon, meaning insatiable. The thetan, you might say, is insatiable, as far as "enough" is concerned.

Just what *is* enough? Well, that limit has never been agreed upon. For instance, the government has long since exceeded "enough" with Internal Revenue. The fact of the matter is, though, that if you object to taxes, it is probably because there are not enough taxes.

After all, tax collecting in the past in Egypt provided a fascinating game. As a matter of fact, the Egyptians used to fight with the tax collectors, the tax collectors fought with the Egyptians, and they finally expelled them. And they had a Dead Sea guide with them and he knew all the tricks of crossing the Dead Sea, and when the tides came out and the tides came in. And he crossed it just before the tides came in, and the whole Egyptian army got swallowed up in it. And in the Dead Sea wilderness, why, they used to keep their water under rocks. And he'd hit one of these rock piles and by golly, there was water there just like there always was. And there's terrific games evolved out of tax collection.

You can just see now that these things do have no saturation point at all. Game like that goes on and on and on and keeps going for two thousand years, only they don't call it tax collection anymore.

Now, that gives you an example. And I was fascinated to study and did study with some sobriety and with no sneers and no skipping of paragraphs and very scholarly attitude—I got some glasses and punched the lenses out and—so that I'd look scholarly while I was doing the study. And I examined several hundred governments to discover what made a government persevere. What did people consider a good government to be? Fascinating question, isn't it?

I imagine that somebody like Swizenstein or whoever is president at the moment might very well profit from such a study, but it just never occurred

to them to study what would be a government. They just take a sort of *fait accompli* and they say, "Well, we're riding the saddle now, we don't have to do anything about it."

Truth of the matter is, there are certain requisites to a good government. People only seem to buy, by these facts—they only seem to buy governments of tremendous duress. And governments which are very sweet and very polite and very constructive are all lost. But governments which call in the leading citizens, incarcerate them in the donjon and tear off their toe-nails with pincers seem to be very well liked on the track. They persevere, they go on for years and years. Not because the police in those governments do a good job; probably be only because they're interesting.

This is a fascinating look. When you look at the idea of good government, then to study what people have made persevere and have never revolted against and couldn't have been more pleased with, we find it's a government like that con—misconducted by Justinian, whose wife—who used to get four or five shekels an hour. Not really upright work. Forgotten her name—I think it was Theodosius or something like that. It was Theodumpsius or something. This character used to call in the foremost members of government that had happened to make her a little bit in ire and throw them in the nearest dungeon and torture them to death and sell their wives off to the Arabs for slaves and it just was one horrible mess.

116

The leading general of this particular nut—I mean emperor—actually was one of the great generals of all time, but every time he'd win a great victory, why, the—why, Justinian would issue some kind of a cross-mandate depriving the victory of any significance at all.

The Roman Empire was all knit back together again three, four times, and each time this Justinian would issue another mandate and crumple it all up again. A fascinating fellow—and at the end of this general's career, Belisarius, why, he was rewarded by having his eyes put out. This great emperor—one of the great "Christian" emperors—this great emperor is the one who is responsible for the desolation now present on the south coast of the Mediterranean, which is to say, the north coast of Africa. He is directly responsible for that. And yet we still use his law code.

Now, this doesn't seem very significant to you, but he made an awful splash. He just ruled for years and years and years and he finally—hand fell off or something like that, from signing silly decrees. And people for countries all around, they just subscribed to this a hundred percent.

The more people he'd illegally tax, burn and torture, why, the happier they seemed to be about the whole thing. There was no smell of revolt! But in—the same people, just a few years before Justinian, and just a few years afterwards, took a perfectly good emperor who had equitable laws, equitable taxes, did things the right way, had his courts just, nobody. . . In Justinian's time if you had a couple of quick bucks, you could do one of two things: you could get a law changed, or. . . And the emperors just before that and just after that time were fairly good emperors. And they'd last something on the order of ten, twelve months, be the regime, see? Just, boom! Revolts all over the place. Well, what is this? What is this? Well, that's certainly *enough* government. Get the idea? Enough government!

Well now, when people get habituated to enough government, they think, or almost enough government (it never could be *enough* government), somebody tries to lighten it up and the populace blows into revolt. Now, what we're looking at here is a close, short-term look. These good governments actually

couldn't hedge themselves about with enough protection at any given time to let the populace blow. And what you had there was a sudden explosion on the part of the populace, and it merely *seemed* to be against a government running good 8-C. You got that?

Male voice: Yeah.

All right.

Because these good governments were weak in that they did not safeguard adequately against blows, the whole country would go to pieces, so the apparency to the populace was that it required all this duress in order to make a government at all. The populace had an idea of how much government there ought to be, and if you didn't give them that much government, they exploded!

But they would have exploded to a higher level if somebody could have caught them. But nobody ever caught them as they came up on the up-bounce. They'd just get some new tyrant who would push them down harder. You got the idea?

Well, the only reason I'm talking about governments is I just want you to see a preclear. If I were talking about John Jones you might not get the picture as clearly.

Here's somebody's wife. And he's been good to her for quite a while and she explodes. Here's somebody's wife. He's mean to her, mean as the devil! And as long as he continues to be mean, she doesn't explode. The one day he decides to be kinder, she explodes.

Here's some husband. This sounds weird, but this is what makes life so incomprehensible. Here's some girl's husband and every time he comes home he hardly gets his foot in the door, she jerks his pay envelope out of his hand, counts it very rapidly, tells him his supper is on the table—cold mutton.

And here we get a—here we get a tremendous amount of duress, duress, duress, duress, duress. And then one day she's feeling poorly and doesn't furnish this much duress and he explodes and there's—he goes haywire and so on.

What's this prove? This obviously proves that unless one applies a tremendous duress and very bad 8-C, people explode. You see this? Unless one applies very bad 8-C and terrific duress all the time, people explode, whether they're governments or individuals. Man's learned this lesson thoroughly. Well, you're looking at his first chance to unlearn it.

A preclear explodes under a mediumly mild 8-C which has regularity rather than a tremendous number of surprises and so on, and this fellow blows up. He's never been given orders he could follow before. What's this? And immediately into restimulation goes all of his efforts to be orderly. His efforts to be orderly were manifest at those times when disorder was in his vicinity. You start to handle him well and the disorder, to his view, goes into automatic. And up he blows. This is a blowup, what you look as a blowup on the part of a preclear, student and so forth. Individual is getting a proper duress. It's very positive. The stress is considerable, but it still is a proper duress, don't you see?

Now, this restimulates his efforts to keep a chaotic duress, which he first used to—long time ago, lives and lives and lives ago—he used to have an orderly duress against such chaos. You actually start running out the tremendous duress which he has had to apply to keep chaos from exploding.

When that runs out, you get an explosion of the chaos he's been holding down. Do you see that? Do you see that clearly? You run out, really, by command, the duress which he has applied to chaotic times of his lives. As a consequence, you get an explosion. But what it looks like is that the fellow

can't possibly tolerate good order and discipline. It looks like he thrives on nothing but chaos. And that isn't true at all. He doesn't thrive on chaos. He doesn't want it and he doesn't want to have anything to do with it.

But a short period of application of very good 8-C that is very positive and that won't let him get away with a thing because—actually runs out all of these periods when he, in a very orderly fashion and with great strength and force of character, has kept chaos from exploding under him. And the chaos, which he still has pictures of, goes *whooom!*

Now, whether you do that on a government level—so on. But this individual will apparently sit around in a sort of a mucky apathy and be abused for years without anything happening. Why? The abuse he's getting is sort of running out former chaotic periods in his life. It's in restimulation. It's convincing him he can't handle them. And he actually goes into, "There is nothing you can do about the government. There is nothing you can do about the wife. There is nothing you can do about the husband." You get the idea? He's in a "nothing you can do about it."

Well, are these regimes or individuals and so on productive or successful in any way? No, they're not! They form the garbage pits on the time track of civilization.

An individual who is subjected to a chaotic duress year after year is not getting anyplace, he's not being productive, he isn't getting anything done. But get this! And this seems to be the criteria by which all this is judged: he didn't revolt! He didn't revolt! He didn't kick back! He was quiet! He was very quiet. And we get the same motto the psychiatrist uses on a patient. The only criteria is, "Is he quiet?" Now, you think I'm being sarcastic. That happens to be a technical fact. That's their only goal, is to make the patient quiet.

So individuals who are mishandled very often are successfully quieted down. Nothing is done for them, their life may be a complete ruin, but they aren't protesting. Then you as an auditor come along and you give them positive direction.

The degree and accuracy of the direction you give them establishes the speed and finality of the blow. And if you want a slow blow, you're going to have a *long* session, a *long* series of sessions. It's going to take a *long* time. And you want a fast blow, you're very didactic, very positive and totally not confused. And you get Tone 40 auditing. Nothing confused about the auditor in a Tone 40 session. The preclear pulls out blow after blow, see? He pulls out tricks. First they're just origins of one kind or another. And then they're tricks and then they're somatics and then they're stomachaches, and these things are just floating to the top just one right after the other, *bing, bing, bing, bing, bing!* None of them interrupt the positive control. Therefore you just continue to run out all the times when he has tried to control things and has had them blow up in his face. After a while he gets the idea he can control things. This is the engramic, you might say, content of a civilization, or otherwise, that it is chaos opposed to good control.

If the chaos can be continued in restimulation by a government or a person, why, the individual—who couldn't handle it anyhow—remains quiet. But the moment you no longer restimulate this chaos, the individual kind of wogs out of it and looks around and he'll say, "Well, it's quiet enough now, maybe I'll start to handle something." And of course he misgauges the effort on the line completely and he goes tearing around in circles.

It's very interesting to watch a child move up into his teens. His parents have been giving him the good 8-C, you know, of, "Go to bed." "No, don't go to

bed." "Now get up." "No, don't go to bed." "Go to bed." "Now, have something to eat." "Did you wash your face?" "Well, why don't you have a glass of milk?" "No, you—there isn't any milk." You know? He's really getting good 8-C, familial style. And he gets up into the teens and all of a sudden his parents aren't applying very much duress at him and he revolts. Well, what's this revolt? This revolt is really not a feeling, sentient, knowing revolt at all. It is a restimulation of his own efforts to take care of the chaos which happened to him years ago. So actually, bad control breeds periods of chaos which will someday explode. And an auditor can explode these with great rapidity. So much for a basic theory of what goes on in this.

Now, the actual appearances that come out of this are quite fascinating. One of the appearances is that an individual likes lots of drama, or needs lots of drama. One of the things you'd read out of this, you'd say, "Well, if a thetan would stand up to that much chaos, he must like it." That's not true. He doesn't like it, but it is at least something to do. It doesn't play too much part in it. But we get a whole side panel of rationale about which I'm going to talk to you. And that is his misconceptions—I could hardly call them conceptions—of what is worth confronting. His ideas of what should be confronted.

This fellow had a nice art collection, he lived a fairly orderly existence, he was an interesting conversationalist. He lived in this Maryland village and he never had a caller. Nobody ever came to see him. Nobody ever came near him and so on. He lived a life of great idleness. And one day he died. And everybody went to his funeral. Now, what kind of a silly thing is this? Well obviously, a funeral is worth confronting, isn't it? But a live being isn't, is he?

You just add this up to what we used to have to say about acceptance level. Now we get confronting level. Got that? This fellow hardly had anybody ever talk to him in the office. He went along, he did a good job and so forth. Nobody ever talked to him in the office, particularly. One day he got sick. And everybody at the office came to see him clear down at the hospital. Now, if he'd gotten sick from leprosy, they all would have come in the first five minutes. People who think they need a great deal of attention should learn these little rules. Maybe they subconsciously—pardon me, reconsciously practice them.

Now, an individual has a concept of what is worth confronting. And all of the chaos which he has been handled has got him so joggle-pated that he doesn't understand that things don't have to be horrible, terrible, miserable or dramatic in order to be confronted. And he falls straight away from confronting the universe around him and he confronts only the horribleness and nastinesses and so on.

Now, for instance, there were many books written about the Civil War. Many books. Matter of fact, it was the only war American authors had to write about from about 1865 clear on through till 1917. And they wore it to pieces. That Spanish-American War, that didn't seem to bite too much. You found even after the Spanish-American they were still writing about the Civil War. Very interesting war, I am sure. But lately the reviews of books tell us that a book called *Andersonville*, by a McKinley Cantor, is supposed to be and is advertised as the greatest Civil War book ever written. Well, I took a look at it. Sat there with a bottle of milk of magnesia and a couple of packages of Tums and studied what America considers, at this moment, great literature to be. It's on the pocket book stands at this moment. *Andersonville*. It isn't about the Civil War at all—only incidentally. It's about a prison camp erected in Georgia by the Southerners, in which they incarcerated damn Yankees.

And every nasty, foul condition of humanity is delineated, painfully and unartfully, at exceeding length. Man doesn't even know enough to put quotation marks around the statements made by his characters. They're all jumbled up in the book, too. You can't tell whether somebody's talking or McKinley Cantor is talking, or it's just four or five more Union privates dying in their own excretia. This is really—really, the book runs on at that tone level. This is a "great book!" Well, this is fantastic! Obviously, however, readers (particularly literary critics) consider—they're just a level of the less intelligent reader; that's a literary critic—they think this is worth confronting. There's hardly any part of it that isn't below the belt. I'd hate to tell you where you'd exteriorize those fellows from. But a book like this gets circulation, gets popularity and so forth because people consider that it must be worth confronting. Right? Crazy business, but—it's hard to believe that it would happen, but this is what is happening to American literature these days. It's gone off; it's way below 2.0 at this time and it's going south with great rapidity. They're trying for greater and greater effect.

If you've watched TV lately, some of the 1.5ing and—a high-toned TV actor acts at 1.5. That's a high-toned one. Total misemotional production. Hundred percent. Well, that's evidently worth confronting. Do you see what they're trying to do? Now, if you could just figure out what a lot of people considered to be worth confronting and then gave it to them, just total calculation on the thing, I don't know what you would come up with. You'd probably come up with much greater popularity than anything else. That is one of the reasons people look on popularity with some askance. They don't believe in popularity.

120

Popularity would be merely somebody having met the sum total of what people consider worth confronting. And that consideration, when it can drop as low as this book by Cantor, or when it can go as bad off as some of the TV programs that you see, with all their misemotion and so forth, and when these things really attain a tremendous rating and so on, you'll get an idea after a while that people are getting into a pretty anxious state. They must be in a pretty fantastic state of mind to—this is all they'd look at? This is pretty weird. Pretty wild. Worth confronting.

Now, a circus erred in the opposite direction. At one time circuses had five rings. Not just three rings, they had five rings, with the same performance going on in each ring, with different troupes, and with at the same time two or three shows going on in the tracks. In other words, they would put up this tremendous confusion of things to watch, and they thought that people would consider that worth confronting. The American circus went out and became much less popular solely because people don't consider that worth confronting anymore. They don't go there and pay their money. See, circuses play short runs and they play real close to the railroad tracks and only in big cities.

Hollywood got the idea and, I imagine, laid a tremendous multibillion-dollar egg with their Vistavision and wide screen and all the rest of this. They were getting actors up there bigger and bigger and bigger on those bigger and bigger screens and so on. You finally sit down and—you began to feel like an ant crawling on one of the actor's knees.

Now, here we have the other side of the manifestation. We have the anxiety to be confronted. See, we get two sides to this. What is worth confronting versus the anxiety to be confronted. We get these two things in conflict with each other, and those two things in their adjustment make the drama of life.

CONFRONTING

Now, where we find a preclear out of present time, we are prone to think, in our charitable way, that he is stuck on the time track and that some other force greater than his own is sticking him on the time track. But we long since learned that there was something going on here which the preclear apparently liked.

Well, he—where do you find him stuck? You find him stuck in drama. Now, how does he ever get into this drama? Well, he gets the idea that that is something worth confronting—the drama. You know, some Indians had him tied to the stake and they were circling around him one way or the other and they chopped his scalp off and didn't even send it home to mother. This is worth confronting: picture of all of this going on.

Well, he got lured into this on the idea that if he just had more to confront, he would be more famous, he would be more this, he would be more that. There would be more prizes offered, he could demonstrate his courage and gallantry and that sort of thing, and the glory would be greater and he'd face up into these things. And they go off on a gradient scale to things nobody could possibly confront and which he never did confront. And that is when he goes anaten.

First he starts facing these things which are—he considers worth confronting. And if he considers enormous drama to be the only thing that's worth confronting, then he easily slops over into enormous chaos. When he goes over into enormous chaos he gets caught up in the fact that nobody could possibly confront the thing. But he's already stuck on an earlier postulate there was nothing worth confronting. And so he gets no havingness in the physical universe. Now, this is one of the tricks by which people run down other people's havingness. They tell him, "Nothing around here is worth looking at. Nothing around here is worth looking at, at all. Nothing. There isn't anything interesting happens in this town. This town is a dull town." I think America invented the small town just to convince people there was nothing worth confronting.

And these small communities and these small minds would work one way or the other of making nothing out of the things that a kid was willing to confront. And so they bred, as the child grew older, a contempt for anything in his vicinity. And the kid started looking around for something worth confronting. Well, nobody tipped him off as to what was worth confronting. See, there was never enough and so forth. And you pick him up one day, no sonic, no visio, mind all caved in. Now, what did he do? He walked up looking for something worth confronting and went over the edge and went into this chaos that I was talking about in the first part of the lecture. Now, he tried to control it, he tried to keep that from happening. He found that the most positive control that he could render would not fight back the postulate that he had to have something worth confronting. He was trying to fight against his own postulate and he didn't make it.

All right, what do we get, then? We get a chaotic condition where every time we try to make the individual confront something, he merely goes back to something that is considered to be worth confronting. Highly dramatic, chaotic, colorful in some fashion—he just merely slides back that far. That's the all further he goes. Well, if you can get him back there, that's fine, but he doesn't stick there. He goes right on up and he has to have more. The second he wants *more* he goes back into all of this chaos of ridges and shooting stars and space opera and everything else. You see, that was worth confronting. And he gets mixed up into electronic ridges and implants and stuck in again.

So if you just ran "Confront it" on somebody, you know, "Well, confront your bank. All right, that's fine. Just confront your bank," you might get somewhere. You know, just told him to do that and nothing more, you might get someplace simply by running out the fact that he *was* confronting the thing. But let's be a little sharper than this and let's look at anatomy—its anatomy very closely and we will discover some horrendous processes.

All right, we've got a process that's a little bit involved, but it runs this way—just a sample process. You say, "Mock up something that isn't worth confronting. Make it a little more solid. Thank you." You know what the guy gets? He gets the streets in his immediate vicinity. He gets all the havingness of the only things that he could ever get any havingness from. You got it? Here's all these things. Where is he going to get some havingness, walking back and forth and around? Havingness, barriers, so forth? And yet his total idea is that none of this is worth confronting. If none of it's worth confronting, he never sees it.

And you get your standard *Homo sapiens* vacant eye as he walks down the street. It's quite interesting. It was a very lovely cool day this afternoon. There were some people walking down the street, some people driving, and there was one lady who was—had a little boy in a little cart. And these people were oh, going along totally vacant-eyed, driving vacant-eyed, walking that way, they weren't seeing anything around them.

122

All of a sudden this woman who had the little boy on the cart, very smartly and properly, with a great feeling for weights and balances, pulled the tongue of the little cart up and catapulted the little boy out on his behind onto the pavement, with a crash. Instantly traffic jammed. The kid wasn't even hurt. He was crying a little bit. He wasn't even hurt. But all the cars that had been in motion stopped. All their passengers were pop-eyed onto this terrifying scene. Everybody who was walking stopped. And where there had been no crowd at all, there was instantly and immediately not only a crowd of people but automobiles too. And that's pretty hard to do.

That was worth confronting. But the streets and trees and the nice cool day was not worth seeing. You got this? The ingredient of blood-curdling drama was added. But when the little boy wasn't hurt and he shut up, looks of disappointment were on all faces, and the crowd dispersed quietly to the vacancy of other blocks.

That's what you get on almost anybody if you run that process. "Mock up something that's not worth confronting. Make it a little more solid. Thank you." Fantastic process.

All right, how about another process on this line? "Mock up something that *nobody* could confront." And we discover at once one of the more favorite games of psychos. Something *nobody* could confront. Not a very productive process, oddly enough. But it produces an awful lot of effects. "Something that's not worth confronting" produces ten times the result "something nobody could confront" produces. Isn't that a great oddity? Now, let's get a process that's quite therapeutic that would take in all things. I'm just telling you the odd conditions.

By the way, when you get "something nothing could confront" you get black minds with ridges and shooting stars and bits and pieces of space opera flying through them and so forth that nobody could make head nor tail out of. Labyrinthine circumstances of one kind or another. If you just said, "Invent something to confront. Mock it up and make it a little more solid," you would probably get the best process that can be worked out of this morass.

And the individual would gradually change his mind concerning things there were to be confronted.

Now, we're talking about the woof and the warp, the alpha and omega of confronting when we're talking right there in that process. *Worth* confronting. Is there such a thing as "can't confront at all"? I'm afraid there isn't. I'm afraid there isn't. I'm afraid there are only things which are difficult to confront. Now, I'll give you another manifestation here which turns up on another process. And that other process runs like this: "Mock up something you've *got* to confront." And what do we get? We get the standard, run-of-the-mill, *Homo sapiens* nonsense. Five-alarm fires, funerals, that sort of thing. But we also get: work. Now, only in a few nations anymore, here on Earth, is work considered to be nonharmful. In the bulk of nations and amongst the bulk of populaces, work is considered to be about the last thing that anybody should ever be expected to confront.

Here's the main thing, then. An individual who has maybe been running this—he's been running a Caterpillar tractor and it's had to confront great banks of dirt; the duress with which he throws himself into that job is a "got to confront." And one day he didn't feel well. He was getting along all right on the job and he didn't feel well and something of the sort, and he still had to confront it. And another day, why, it was bad weather and he certainly didn't want to do that job and he had to confront it. And another day he'd met a good-looking girl the night before and he certainly didn't want to come to work that morning and he had to confront it just the same. So this "Mock up something you've got to confront" returns in mock-up most of the tools of a trade of an individual in this society at this time. That's rather unusual, by the way.

123

The Anglo-American view is to put a tremendous amount of kick in the pants on this thing called work. The way you work out work as something that is impossible for anybody to confront is this way: every time a child tries to perform any work, you discourage him. See, you say, "Oh, get out of my way. It's too much trouble to show you. You're in my road." And by the time he's six or seven, he's thoroughly educated that he will not be permitted to work, you see?

Then they keep him in that state with a bunch of laws of one kind or another, so that this amount of child labor and so forth won't get in the road of the trade unions and Dave Becks and Hoffas and other people. And they work him on up and by the time they realize—the police have a vested interest in crime, and they have to move him up there to the good, high-quality status, "juvenile delinquent," you see, in his teens. So they get into a lot of trouble and nobody will permit him to work then either. By the way, if anybody is going to work in the US anymore, as a child, he actually has to get permission from his teacher and his grades have to be at a certain level and there's all kinds of complications concerning this thing. That's why you don't get your newspapers on time.

Anyway, all the ways kids had of getting jobs and getting money and getting out from underneath the tremendous dependence of family were all swept away in some super-saccharine idiosyncrasy on the subject of "children mustn't work."

All right, now we get this fellow all the way up the line, see? Get him up there at eighteen, nineteen, twenty, something on the order—I don't know when they let him out—if he goes through college, get him when he's forty or fifty or whenever they get out through college. And we insist he get married.

See? And then we show him that he's *got* to work. Then we have happy factories and happy plants and we never have labor troubles or anything and life goes on, sweetness and light. And we never have economic repercussions.

I'd say it's just around the corner where somebody would have to stand with a bullwhip if they continue these particular tactics on work. To make somebody front up to a lathe or something like that, or a Caterpillar tractor, would just be a bullwhip job. This is how you make a future slavery for a nation. But here you've got one of these superduress "got to confronts," don't you see? So work is a "got to confront" in this country. No wonder people get tired. Because every time you have put them into a "got to confront," then you run them into all the emergencies.

All right, what's an emergency? An emergency is something which requires a necessity level. What is a necessity level? It is a heightened willingness. A sudden, heightened willingness untaps a tremendous ability, of course. House burning down, so the fellow is perfectly able to carry the furniture out in the front yard, don't you see? He's got something to confront there, he's very willing to confront it, his moment has arrived, his willingness goes *zoom!*

He untaps or uncovers all of this ability (which he covers back up again rapidly at the end of the emergency) and you get these tremendous feats. But look what this does. Look what this does when work becomes a "got to confront." It takes all of these old moments of hyperaction which he can have in terms of pictures still, and it takes all these things and it works them out very nicely and he can go along for quite a while on this supersupply of old facsimiles and things. And then one day he gets to the other end of it.

You never saw anybody more tired than a soldier who has been through twenty-four hours of battle. He might have been right on the ball all the way through the twenty-four hours and never aware of the fact that he was tired, but all during that time he was running way above any ability he had to continue. All of a sudden the battle ends, he goes thud! Thud. That's that. And boy, is he tired.

Now, this cycle of superenergy in application winding up with super-tiredness then gets applied to the workaday world of turning a lathe or driving a truck or keeping a set of books. And the individual—first he's got to get that work done. See, he just goes *grrrrr! grrrrr! grrump!* That's a day's work, you see? Just pressure, pressure, pressure, pressure, pressure, pressure, *flop*. Finally he goes into a total exhaustion. He has nothing left of all of his former emergencies but the exhaustion end. He works at a total emergency from one end to the other. Why? Because he has no orientation on what's worthwhile confronting, or he never confronts anything unless he has to, because there isn't anything that's worth confronting anyhow. And all of this logic of one kind or another adds up to the fact that the man goes onto an emergency level. And his lifetime is one *long* activity at an emergency height.

I'm well aware of this, by the way, at congresses. It's quite amazing at congresses what we—here we have a tremendous number of lectures and a tremendous number—a lot of activity. There's a lot of pre-congress planning and so on. And all the people come to the congress and you pour on the coal, you got the idea? Very fine, pour on the coal. Four days go by and all of a sudden there's no more coal needs to be poured on. If I didn't watch myself, I would still keep going at high C.

Day after the congress, my feet are tired, maybe, something like that, but I'm all willing to get in there and pitch and lick the other half of the world and so forth and keep on going. And the day after that, I'm perfectly

willing to go on and go out *rrrhhh rrrhhh rrrhhh* and the next *rrhhh rrrhhh rrrhhh*. And I've found out if I don't get by the first three days after a congress taking myself by the scruff of the neck and throwing myself in a bunk, that all of a sudden I come up against a dead end. I get dead tired about a week after a congress. Well, that's a silly thing to have happen.

In other words, I know enough about physical anatomy to know that unless I just slow it down perforce, and then build it back up again at its ordinary peak, that I will be having a "got to confront" go right on going. Because I'm not kidding you. About the third or fourth day of a congress, walking out again in front of the audience is a "got to confront." There's a terrific amount of communication involved in something like this. It knocks havingness to ribbons. There's a bunch of energy thieves always in the crowd. They just take your ridges and just tear them to bits. You look like Swiss cheese.

Now, here is a reaction, emergency level. It tells us a great deal about performance. It tells us where this hectic anxiety to get the work done, to get it done all at once, get it done right now, *grrrrr*—both where it comes from and where it'll wind up. It'll wind up with flop! Got to do it all at once, got to do it right now, pressure, pressure, pressure, pressure—collapse. Now, if that's a cycle of action, I don't want one.

Human body has certain limitations—stands up and caves in at certain stress levels, completely independent of a thetan. That's one of the things that you very often overlook, is the fact that a body is built on a number of now-I'm-supposed-to's. And every now and then you think you've got all these now-I'm-supposed-to's erased and you take it out on the middle of the Sahara Desert and a "now I'm supposed to have a drink of water" keys in and you haven't got it licked at all. *If you* had mocked them up they would be different, that I'm sure, but you probably had nothing to do with it.

Now, here we have confrontingness added into a tremendous auditing practicality. This is very practical stuff I've been talking to you about. Go over this again—just by running a process to predict exactly what will turn on in the preclear is quite interesting, just as a phenomenon. You can run "Mock up something you've got to confront." You'll get the guy's tools of the trade. Run it a little bit further in a man, you'll get women. Run it a little bit further in women, you get a man. It's a "got to confront."

All right. Now we go over this again, "Something not worth confronting," and we'll get the present time environment. Present time isn't worth confronting. By agreement with Father and Mother and so forth, present time is not worth confronting. Obviously at no time that he was in present time did he find anybody confronting present time, so obviously it's not worth confronting. That follows, doesn't it? Racial agreement, and everybody should abide by those (if he wants to go crazy).

Anyway . . . Now, you take this "Invent something to confront, mock it up and make it a little more solid," and you have a workable process. And you take "Something that. . ."—just the third predictable one—"Something that cannot be confronted," or "nobody could confront," and so forth and you normally get the more black messes that some people call minds. But the workable process on the thing is, no more, no less, "Invent something to confront. Mock it up. Make it a little more solid." This is quite, quite reliable. Has the liability of all mock-up processes, of course, in that the mock-ups behave in certain ways and so forth, and you have to pay attention to that.

Also, you have to run, sometimes, before a person can mock things up and make them a little more solid, you have to run keeping them from going

away, you have to run holding mock-ups still and then make them a little more solid. It behaves exactly the same subjectively as it does objectively. This we take into consideration that you've done something about. And you solve this confrontingness material in the pc.

Now, you could ask yourself what the solution of confrontingness in the pc would mean in terms of exteriorization. Things that are impossible to confront; things that have to be confronted; things that are not worth confronting— each one of them plays its role in exteriorization. Somebody's dead in his head. Well, he's—he knows nothing else, maybe, but he knows that one cannot possibly confront a skull or a body, but one has got to confront one. See, now there's an odd frame of mind and that's what hangs people up in it.

A lot of cases can run this—pretty low-scale cases can run this sort of thing. But I would say offhand it would take a lot of preparation with the early steps of CCH before one started soaring into those rarefied realms of confrontingness. You're liable to tie into a pre-c, you know, and with great enthusiasm you're auditing and you just know you're going to get him there and so forth, and you—"Mock up something else that you've got to confront." Fine, you know, really getting there, and he—you know, he does and go ahead, and you audit about four or five hours on this and he turns around and he says, "What's 'confrontingness' mean?"

It's happened more than once to me. Terrific process and so on; way over the pc's head. Now, there is one process that is called a training process—or it was and it really shouldn't be—Locational Processing, which works out a tremendous amount of confrontingness and controls attention at the same time. And it gives you—actually, your best confrontingness Objective Process is simply old-time Locational. That was the best one up to a certain period. "Notice that wall. Notice the ceiling. Notice the floor. Notice your chair. Notice the table." That sort of thing. No more than that, run with great accuracy and great precision by an auditor, actually at once controlled the attention of the preclear; and the preclear's attention was controlled all the time by facsimiles and odds and ends in the mind and it took over the control of these things and ran them out and let them explode and go to pieces and so forth.

Actually, a steady control like that runs out the preclear's attempts to control, as I told you earlier in this lecture. But we just say, "Notice the wall. Notice the ceiling. Notice the floor," with good acknowledgments and so on, particularly if run at a Tone 40 level with great precision and exactness. Not hem and haw and aw and er and "I don't know what that thing is called, but notice it anyhow I guess. Maybe. Huh?" That sort of thing won't do much. But precision control on Locational Processing gives us a tremendous objective confrontingness process, and Locational is just as good outside as inside.

There are very few of you have ever run Locational outside with malice aforethought. Just said, "Well, we got Locational a little bit flat up close, let's take him outside and just run nothing but Locational outside." We put other significances on top of it. We ran locational type processes with other significances, but not just Locational all by itself.

Now, in view of the fact that Locational Processing, "Notice that wall. Notice that floor. Notice that chair," happens to make the thetan make the body confront the wall, the process in the training drill is not the top Locational Process. You'd have to have some sort of a command qualification that would go somewhat like this: "Through the body's eyes, notice that wall." Now you're asking *him* to confront on a via, which you are declaring. And you're actually asking a thetan to confront the wall.

Early Locational, by the way, (it might interest you) and early 8-C were both designed as exterior processes, and were not designed for a body at all. Hence this randomness of commands. Never been reinspected from the earliest days.

We expected the *thetan* to notice the wall, move over to it and touch it. Those commands, the earliest time that they were used, were supposed to be on an exteriorized case. Then they were adapted to get the preclear under the auditor's control and so help me, the commands haven't been refined from that day to this. And so we found some bugs in the commands not very long ago. That's just because we never inspected them on a body basis, although that was the main use they were getting, which is quite amusing.

We could run Locational so that we're asking a thetan to confront the walls while moving a body around, we would have the attention of the thetan himself under control and he himself would not dog off very badly. So this is a tremendously valuable confronting process. And I would say as of this moment that we had two very valuable confronting processes. Locational, which works better and better the higher a case goes. That's quite weird— works better and better. But it has its limitation because if you just say, "Notice that wall," and then you expect him to turn his head over there, it might have nothing to do with his noticing the wall and you yourself have put something else into the command that would limit it. But "Through that body's eyes, notice that wall," we are actually running a process which would exteriorize somebody after not too much time. And that would be the objective confrontingness process. That's a process, you understand, not a drill.

And the other process, the subjective one, is something on the order of, "Invent something to confront. Mock it up. Make it a little more solid." That's the best all-around subjective confrontingness process. Now, you've been getting, as you—speak of confrontingness and I notice people sneezing, that's quite interesting. You've been getting a lot of "you confront it" here in this ACC, haven't you? Confront it!

Well, all right. It was intended, in the main, to desensitize the necessity to confront and I think very few of you now feel frantically on the subject of "You must confront it!" You're not gritting your teeth and spitting out the enamel and holding yourself in there and so on. If you still are, it is still a case of some more "Go ahead and confront it!" see? If you can't stand it, confront it, you know? That sort of thing. Now, that is the—training's answer to getting through confronting because it runs out the necessity to confront and brings a fellow down at last into the cognition that he simply can confront it. He hasn't *got to*, he just can. Big difference! And the processing equivalents of confronting, I've given you tonight. And I hope they'll be of some use to you.

Thank you very much.

INSTRUCTING A COURSE

A lecture given on 9
August 1957

How are you doing?

Audience voice: Fine.

Female voice: How are you doing?

Ah, yeah!

Here we are at the last lecture, the twentieth lecture of the 18th ACC, Aug. 9, 19-5-7.

And tonight I have to cover two or three loose-ended points. As you realize, an ACC of this character is organized and run primarily, of course, to raise the training and ability level of the persons in it and secondarily, to learn a lot more about doing it.

Now, one of the reasons we learn a lot more in an ACC is the people on it—in it aren't usually groping for fundamentals and asking foolish questions and so forth and they have some sort of an idea, usually, that a pc's brain is in his head and that's not what we're processing. But we get a tremendous insight into training. And you might say that the training skills of Scientology have advanced entirely through the ACCs where important progress was made, and only occasionally in the Academy. That doesn't mean that Academy training isn't good; it means that Academy training takes off from ACCs. This is usually the case.

Here we have, then, a circumstance of development which is going forward continuously on the subject of training and I was willing to confront the possibility that we would have a tremendous change in training. You see? This was not the case. The training skills which were—and drills which were worked out have held good throughout this ACC. We have seen consistent and marked progress. And it means, then, that the Academy or HCA/HPA organizational training would remain rather constant, as far as its general form is concerned, but considerably improved as to the exact action required of the student.

And I'd like to cover here just a couple of things of considerable importance to us. And one is training. Just some fragments of the things we have learned in this ACC—and then cover PE Courses. I'd like to cover these two things. Now, here we have, in training, a stability. We know where we're going with these processes. We have a set of processes which apply to cases that ordinarily would not comply with auditing commands. In other words, nonverbal processing has been achieved and it was—has been achieved after all these years, actually, by the handling of the body and the attention. Now, you

say it's nonverbal in spite of the fact that you are using words. The truth of the matter is, the words don't play nearly as large a part in it as otherwise.

Now, in 1950 if a preclear said, "No, I won't execute the command," we were licked—which limited us only to those people who would execute a spoken auditing command. Wow! There's a high ceiling, isn't it? I mean that we were way up! Now, gradually we've gone south in the type of person we could process and our first steps in this direction actually came about—besides other things, besides trying to get processes the lower-scale cases could do—with the advent of body mimicry. And we had people mimicking what people were doing with the body and this had some efficacy. This, however, wasn't particularly new as far as we were concerned. This had been done by Homer Lane many, many years ago, who was a squirrel, a psychiatric squirrel in England. And he didn't hold with old-line psychotherapy and he, a layman, simply went up to an institution and started working on people the way he thought he might be able to help them. Well now, that was a step in the direction of physical control and then we move up from there to physical contact. And the first time we got into physical contact, we began to be able to handle these lower-scale cases rather easily. Well, from there on it has been an avalanche.

Now, just when did we start doing this with any ferocity? Many of us here and there had done it. But we didn't start to train people to do it until the middle of 1956. And there we were really training people to do it on the basis that it was absolutely necessary for an auditor to know how to do this. It was part of auditing skill. It had arrived! There was no question about it anymore. Now we have moved along and finally developed what we call Tone 40 processes, which didn't depend on anything the preclear said at all. We moved that far out.

Well, the development of actual techniques to fit this processing drill of course is not ended by a long ways. There are many drills, undoubtedly, that could be done on a Tone 40 basis. And I'd be rather—I'd feel rather upset with you if you didn't here and there suddenly think a long blue spark as you're confronting this preclear and say, "Wow! Now, why didn't I think of that before?" And all of a sudden plunge in there and get him to do something he could do and get some very remarkable result, as a result.

Now, if we did that, we have a background of what to do. It would be control of body, then control of attention and finally control of thinkingness. And we could advance across these three levels in that order and win every time. We get a control of body, then we can get a control of attention; we get a control of attention, we get a control of thinkingness. If we could get a very good control of thinkingness then the preclear can get a control of thinkingness. And all that's wrong with him is, he can't control his thinkingness. In the final analysis, that's what's wrong with the mind: a fellow can't control his own thinkingness.

All right. Very well. We know then at what we are aiming. Therefore, training of an auditor must wipe out diffidence in these three levels: (1) control of other people's bodies, (2) control of other people's attention, and (3) control of other people's thinkingnesses—obvious. Now, how do we encourage an auditor in his willingness to perform these three types of addresses to a case? The training drills, as we do them, were modified early in the course to include an actual process on the last day of the Comm Course. And that was found quite beneficial. That made the Comm Course integrate all the things they'd been doing in the week, and do them all at the same time with "Sit in the chair," and then we even comm bridge it over into "Touch that chair," and

it was an actual process, not a coached process. So this wound up the Comm Course and made it a very excellent unit.

I think one of these days we will round out Upper Indoc similarly. Upper Indoc probably will be narrowed down to a point of where the last day of that week the auditor will actually do, probably, some version of 8-C uncoached. You got the idea? I mean, it's just actual preclear. Now, that would—that seems to be indicated.

Now, the actual training of people in how to do processes is something else—something else. This actually falls halfway between getting somebody processed and teaching him to *do* the process. It's halfway in between. We've moved out of the sphere of pure training for case gain when we move up into the CCH course. When we get up there, why, actually, what do we need?

Now we—although we have this thing called a repetitive question in the Communication Course, the repetitive question actually does not guarantee an ability to duplicate by the auditor—doesn't guarantee it at all. In the first place, origin is getting in his road. In the second place, coaching instructions interrupt the duplication, and the tedium of absolute duplication is relieved by the drills themselves.

So you could say (1) there is no duplication to amount to anything in a Comm Course, and (2) duplication is absolutely necessary in a CCH course. "Give me that hand. Thank you." Oh, man, the duplication this requires! The ability to sit there and take it. Therefore, it's necessary to add some duplicative process in the later stages of training. And the earliest version of Opening Procedure by Duplication—Book and Bottle—the earliest version is undoubtedly the best version. It was right when it was released, and that contains color, weight and temperature.

Now, we say, "Pick up that book." We don't really tell the fellow to pick it up with his body and every now and then you have a tremendous confidence on the part of the preclear that he himself could pick up the book, which is quite interesting. We do tell him to look at it. And that would probably be the only limitation of command: it would be "Through that body's eyes, look at it," would be a much more accurate command at that point. But this Op Pro by Dup as we used to do it way back when, does accomplish this duplication and breaks down the unwillingness to duplicate on the part of the student because it's almost as therapeutic to run it as to receive it.

Now, there—there we have solved something that there is no need to solve in the Communication Course. There's no need to solve this in the Communication Course. In the first place he's already handling a formidable battery of new skills if you're just taking somebody brand-new on this. And to add the arduous of duplication would almost murder him in his tracks. So that can be very well—now, that doesn't mean that you'd permit him not to duplicate an auditing command, but it's very, very easy, really, to duplicate a simplicity such as "Do fish swim?" and so on. But people quite often, in spite of all this, wind up at the end of a Comm Course sitting there in the chair just counting the seconds until the end of the session, see? Quite an ordinary frame of mind at the end of a Comm Course.

Well now, this is broken down at CCH level. It is best—be best broken down by, evidently, Op Pro by Dup or something of that character. And there's hardly anybody here who hasn't run or been run on Op Pro by Dup. Therefore, for this particular unit we are omitting it and substituting a very beefy process designed to do things with confrontingness. Much beefier than was being run in the CCH A course. That was a pat-a-cake.

9 AUGUST 1957

Now, here we have—here we have then, what will apparently be for a long time to come the training pattern of Scientology—and it has been very well confirmed. And the number of changes that have taken place by reason of the 18th ACC are few. I have pointed out what most of the changes and differences would be.

Now, I could add these various things. Evidently shouting in the Comm Course gets the student entirely off and away and out of control because he's already trying to run a total effect on the other one. He's already trying to run a total effect on the other fellow. And when you encourage him to shout, he really never does learn the elements of the Effect Scale. And the Effect Scale definitely must be taught to somebody in the Comm Course. And *then* he is going to be permitted to exercise the Effect Scale where it is effective—and shouting isn't part of it. He'll get much further whispering. You can knock somebody's silly head off with a whisper.

When I was at dinner tonight I noticed some of you people getting *real* slippy. A person came over and he gives me a note back and so forth and he gives me a nice Tone 40, very low-voiced "Okay," you see? And it almost knocks my head off! You people are getting there, that's for sure.

Well, this is a skill. You don't have too much time to teach somebody in a Comm Course anyway, and if you, in a Comm Course, get this whole idea of putting a vocal communication across, the Effect Scale, on the quiet side, they'll learn far more. All right. That's evidently according to findings here.

132

Now, in the Upper Indoc Course, let them shout their heads off. It doesn't matter. Shouting is less important than you might think. But ability to get a win by reaching something with a voice is not to be despised, by a long way. But if you had a very, very limited time, the drill which was run second could be run just in its basic three elements of space, voice into the space and intention into the ashtray. Those three, all by themselves will do a job in a rather fast hurry if you haven't got any time to flatten a person's vocal upsets.

Now, a lot of people threw ridges out in front of their faces, just the exact shape of their shoutingnesses. They threw a bunch of ridges out in front, and when they did the second drill they disintegrated the ridges which they had built with shouting. Quite amusing. But if any shouting is going to be done, it would be after he has learned that to *achieve* an effect he had better not try for a *total* effect. And it's a good thing to get an auditor over that in a hurry and early.

The trouble we have had in Dianetics and Scientology in seven years has mainly stemmed from people who had to have a total effect on the other fellow. Total effect. Best possible processing that could be done would throw the person into an entire convulsion, leave him retching on the floor for hours, and end of session would be picking up his legs in one corner of the room, his arms in another and gluing his head back on like a Dresden doll. And these boys never did make any cases gain. They just wanted a big effect. So to get an auditor over this very early is very, very good.

But in spite of all the little odds and ends that we've learned, we have learned something about coaching. Besides, we knew already that it took a good coach, that coaching was a high skill all in itself. There was a lot to know about coaching. But just here toward the end of the course, was finally able to articulate a coach's—not his responsibilities and not the other things, we already have gone over these things—but something he could do that would keep his auditor winning and keep him advancing rather consistently. And that is emphasis on single points in the drill.

INSTRUCTING A COURSE

Now, that rotational type of coaching is proving to be quite successful. But let me cover this and articulate it the way I see it right here at its conception, before it has any chance to get complicated. You'll notice all of these drills tend to get complicated. But we knew this. Earlier ACCs, we talked about simplicity-complexity, how people would ordinarily slip over into complexity rather than to move back into simplicity. All right. So these drills quite ordinarily become complex.

You will find that any Instructor, lacking a lot of self-discipline, will take a Comm Course and make it terribly complex. It'll just get more and more complex. And if you were just to start up some sort of a school and you were to teach the upper grades and you had somebody teaching the Comm Course and he didn't know much *how*, but you just thought, "Well, he'll get away with it somehow," you would find out that he starts teaching them more and more and more and more. And finally, on the first day, they get the rudiments, the Axioms, Book One, *Dianetics 55!*, AP&A, and then they memorize, toward the end of that evening, all the Dianetic Axioms in case they might miss something. And that would be a good first day in a Comm Course according to a lot of Instructors. They learn better. They learn better quite rapidly.

Actually, what a person can grasp when he first fronts into this is not what you have been able to grasp in this unit at all. It's quite microscopic. His attention is terribly confused. You have to give him little tiny data that are acceptable to him. And he goes out of the first couple of days clutching to his bosom some of the oddest data. If you just stop some of these people and ask them, "What did you learn?"—because I get reports from these people all the time and it's just perfectly wild what an HCA or an HPA report will consist of. "What I have learned!" and in all sobriety the person will tell you, "Well, I've learned that the Instructor's a professional auditor," or something like this. I mean, he's gotten something big out of his first few days, you see?

Well, first place, everything is new to him. He's in a new locale, he's addressing a new subject, he's not quite sure what's expected of him and the stable data he can be given are very few. He has tremendous questions. Amongst his questions is, "Does Scientology have any real workability at all?" See, he doesn't have any experience in this line. So therefore he goes through these early drills with a considerable amount of fog. And to give him a successful run through a Comm Course, it is essential that he be given things he can grasp and that they be said often enough and done often enough so that he eventually finds out that these *are* the things he's supposed to grasp! You see, that is the thing he's trying to learn: "What am I supposed to grasp?" He's supposed to grasp the training drills. That's what he's basically supposed to grasp.

Now, he also grasps, on a Comm Course when you're just starting out with new people, he's also supposed to grasp an Auditor's Code. He certainly wouldn't be much good for that. If he wants to know more about communication, you give him *Dianetics 1955!* to read. But if you go any further than that, why, you're going to be in trouble. Now, we don't expect a person to have a finished attitude toward Scientology at the end of one week, but we certainly expect that he would be able to communicate much better than he had been communicating! That's the only thing we want out of that week.

All right. If that is the case, then what is the coach? Remember this fellow is also the coach, alternately. So we have to give him a rather simple series of things to do, which he himself will feel he *can* do. Well, all right, that's fine. If you were to tell him, "Now, you're supposed to keep that—in confronting (TR 0), you're supposed to keep that fellow's feet on the floor, his

9 AUGUST 1957

hands in his lap and he isn't to fall out of the chair, his head isn't to sink on his chest and he's to sit there in that position and that is what the coach is supposed to maintain.

Well now, you'll find out he can do this rather well. But you still have to needle him a little bit and get him in there—and he'll be very diffident. After all, you forget that possibly you too were diffident once about suddenly reaching over and touching somebody. You know, very diffident about touching somebody's chin or adjusting his head and so on. You got to make him do a little reaching toward the auditor in order to get confronting done. Well, that's fine, that's an awfully simple drill.

As we move on later in the course, however, the drill is never absent. And the next day we pick up communicating *to* somebody. And that's confronting and communicating *to*—and we have to do both of these things. Right? And on the third day we do confronting, communicating *to* and acknowledging. Right? Getting more complicated now, isn't it?

But let's look at it from the coach's viewpoint. He did find out that he could make somebody sit in a chair. All right. He found out he could make somebody sit in a chair and not fall out of it. Well, very good. Now, on communicating *to*, however, he will happily open up the whole world of elocution, diction! It wouldn't matter if the preclear had an accent that was a perfectly normal accent for the area, why, the coach would certainly criticize it. It has nothing to do with the drill, don't you see? That's because the coach doesn't know what he's supposed to be doing! That's why he does that.

So we could look at this this way—this is the way we train a coach. And this we have learned in the 18th—he *does* win with the first day's drill because he did get the fellow to sit in the chair and not fall out of it. Right?

On the second day's drill, he's handling something new, which is communicate *to*. Well then, we could do it this way: for three commands he pays attention to nothing but confronting; for the next three commands he pays attention to nothing but communicate *to*; for the next three commands he pays attention to nothing but confronting; the next three commands he pays no attention to anything but communicate *to*. Do you get the idea? And we just go on that way for the whole day! Got that? It doesn't have to be three, but that's to give you order of magnitude. It isn't important on this second day, but the number of commands gets important on the third and very important on the fourth and extremely important on the fifth, because there are so many parts now that a coach could hang up easily for half of a morning on one part, if he didn't have some specific number of commands to handle.

So what would this look like on the third day? Three commands, the coach would pay attention to communicate *to*; next three commands, he'd pay attention to acknowledge; next three commands, confront; next three commands, communicate *to*; next three commands, acknowledge. You got the idea?

Now you could shift this over and emphasize the fact that today we were doing acknowledgment by doing this: first three commands, confront; next three commands, communicate *to*; next *five* commands, acknowledge; next three commands, confront; next three commands, communicate *to*; next five commands, acknowledge. You got the idea? Just stressing that day's drill because it's so brand-new. Now, what would happen if we got clear on down the line to pc origin, with comm bridges and everything else? Well, that's starting to look real complicated. All right.

Now, what's the advantage of this type of coaching? We've found that coaching was bad only when the coach would not permit any wins to the

student. So therefore, we could phrase it this way—well guarding the quantity that I've just enunciated, you know—don't let it go on and on and on for an hour on one piece, because the preclear-coach angle is only trying to get this other fellow comfortable with this step. All right. So if this is the case, he should really come off of it every time he gets a good one. Give the auditor a win and go on to the next one. Give the auditor a win, go on to the next one. Change only at wins. And the auditor would eventually discover that he could do the whole drill, and he'd have a win on the whole drill, *only* because he had a win on each of its parts.

Now, look how many steps there are in such a thing—tremendous number of steps there are in pc origin: understand it, acknowledge it, maintain ARC, return to session. This would apply the same way. And some such system could be worked out on each one of the parts, only we could take this just separate of all the other drills and just do these four parts.

Now similarly, we could take a comm bridge (the day before) and break it down into three parts. And for a little while, drill on nothing but the comm bridge and then go back to *all* the parts, don't you see? Confront, communicate to, acknowledge, repetitive question and then comm bridge. You see? And then you could—but you could take comm bridge all apart into its steps and have him do these, one right after the other until he just got used to handling each one.

Now, it's actually running a sort of a contact. As he contacts them he gains familiarity, not experience. And out of his familiarity comes confidence. It isn't how many gimmicks a coach can think up, really. It is the good 8-C that the coach can run upon the auditor. And if he runs good 8-C and doesn't give contrary directions of one kind or another, why, he could do it very, very well.

Now, this isn't trying to limit various hints, discussions, that sort of thing; that isn't trying to limit those things. But if you gave him a framework in which to work, by which he progressed every one of these steps all morning long as he was doing the drill as a coach, and he just brought it up to a win, changed it; brought it—next one up to a win, changed it. See, now we'd have the individual doing all of these things—doing the whole thing on the third day, of confront, communicate to and acknowledge. And he'd just go on doing all three of these things, see? He'd confront and communicate to and acknowledge. But while he's doing all these three things the coach only pays attention to acknowledgment. Do you see that? He does all three things; coach only pays attention to acknowledgment and then shifts over, and only pays attention to communication to, while he's doing confront, communicate to and acknowledge, and then goes over and only pays attention to confront while the fellow is doing it.

Now, you see the amount of familiarity which we would get there? We would cut down the amount of confusion, considerably raise the number of stable data. Now this we have learned and I consider it very valuable. Because this has been our puzzle: how do we make a good coach? Well, we can tell a person what to do in a little round of roodles here: he goes round and round and—on this, concentrating on first one part and then another part. He really would be interested enough in doing this so he'd never get off onto some pet bent of his own and start riding a hobbyhorse down into the ground, such as that broad "A's" should only be used, something of this sort.

I've heard some silly things said in coaching—very silly things. "That was not—did not sound mannerly." "That was insufficiently formal; this is Formal Auditing and your tone of voice is not formal." Now, funny part of it is,

9 AUGUST 1957

I've heard a great many very smart things and very wise things said by coaches too. But I also know that coaching *here* is not coaching in a raw state. Now, this all becomes important, what I'm saying here, because for true, there'll be a lot of this sort of thing done. That's why I'm going to talk now, a little bit later here about the PE Course.

One other thing has been learned, and I already touched on that, and that is: evidently, the way to succeed on Tone 40 on an Object is give the guy some kind of a win that he could reach something with his voice. This knocks out his voice machinery. But don't pay any attention to the machinery of voice, see? Don't pay any attention to the fact it's voice machinery. Just give him a win on reaching something with his voice. Got that? That's the concentration point. And then go into this drill, which is simply: make the space in which the object exists; fill the space with the voice, and put the intention in the tray—make the tray stand up, sit down and so forth. But those three things have to be done in rotation. And you would coach them exactly the same way as I've just described.

You'd just go over it first and show him making space—what you mean by that. Clarify it all up. Find out what kind of space he's making: is it pink or purple? It sometimes is. And you just want space; you don't want anything in it. Then you want his voice filling the thing, and then you want him to get some familiarity with putting an intention in that.

Sometimes he can't get a thought into it, but he can get effort or he can get misemotion or he can get emotion. Sometimes he can't get the thought in there, but he could get effort. His idea of intention is effort in the ashtray, so you have to sometimes pay attention to that. And then having showed him each one of these, we would have him do these in rotation. And while he was doing these in rotation, we concentrate on just one at a time until he gets a good win. And while he's doing these in rotation, we concentrate on the next one until he gets a win. And still doing this rotation—he's doing three things but the coach is only paying attention to one. Then we have him put the intention in, don't you see? And he'll finally come up the line. He knows what's expected of him and so could win.

Now, it's quite important—quite important, that all of us have some kind of an idea of how to train people through these various steps. The most important of these are Comm Course and Upper Indoc. These are the most important.

Why? In the first place, there is a new grade of auditor that has been proposed. What the title will be or not, I don't know. But it is something on the bas——. We had for a while Hubbard Provisional Auditor. We didn't issue very many of these; I don't think we even printed a certificate. I don't know. But not many of these were issued. Mostly because people were chopped up concerning the course and we were changing policy. It is no longer the policy here to permit organizations to issue, teach or certify; only individuals. You've seen a ghost of this in the past. So an individual has the right to do several things. Amongst them would be to issue this certificate.

Now, whether this form is final or not, this title is final or not, I could not tell you, but it is something on the order of Hubbard Apprentice Scientologist. It's an apprentice Scientologist. You get the idea? And all this fellow would have as a background would be a Comm Course and an Upper Indoc Course and nothing else. And all we would teach him how to do would be to handle people. And we wouldn't teach him how to process at all, or give him the idea that he was studying psychotherapy or the mind or anything else. Do you understand that? He's merely learning how to handle people, that's all. Handle

people on the job, to handle people domestically and so forth. That's *all* you're teaching him how to do.

And the way we teach him to do it is just exactly as you've been studying Comm Course and Upper Indoc. No Auditor's Code? Don't have to worry about an Auditor's Code as far as he's concerned at that level because he wouldn't have a clue what it was all about, really. Instead of that, you tell him about misemotion. And you tell him that in the Comm Course with the drills! You say, "This is the way you talk to people. You don't shout and rant at them. You don't catch people when they're tired and worn out and bawl them out and kick them in the corner. This isn't the way to get any compliance." You'd have to back that up, out of your own initiative.

But here we discover something: that an individual who can handle the drills of the Comm Course and the Upper Indoc could teach people and handle people rather well, no matter what sort of a job he had. The only processing we would teach him would be those training drills which we saw back in the ACCs, the winter of '56-'57. Those little training drills. Teach him those drills. Give them the idea of repetition and so forth, the ideas of what he has to do to make somebody understand that. Do you understand that then?

Now, of course, this fellow—you'd say, "That is a code, that's called the Auditor's Code." Don't beat his head in with it. You'd say, "Well, here's the Code of a Scientologist—should have some vague working knowledge of this situation." You say, "Well, here's some axioms, if you want them."

But you don't try to teach him any of these things. Why? Good God, you're teaching him enough! See, you're just teaching him enough. The only theory that you'd teach him is, "People can be handled. How are people handled? They are handled by these drills. That's the way you handle people. Now, if you're a foreman on the job or an executive or somebody like that, you have to know how to confront these people and talk to them and answer up and so forth, and this is the way it's done."

137

Quite amusing. It's an amusing simplicity. It looks ghastly simple to you. It'd look quite upscale to somebody who'd never run into it. We sell it on the basis of, "This is how you train people; you have to know this, these drills, in order to teach people things, to get people to work, to get people to follow your orders. To associate on an even keel with the society at large, you need these drills." That's—we—he needs to be good in them.

Now, this would be quite interesting. If you can envision a foreman, a labor foreman knowing these drills, and just compare him with some run-of-the-mill person that you have tried to, just for a moment, show one of these things to (who knew nothing about Scientology), compare the blunderingness of that person with the possible ability to communicate and to handle people which would result from a rather thorough grounding (nontechnical, but awfully practical) in Comm Course and Upper Indoc. Now, that grounding then would be—would make quite a difference in this man's behavior, his ability to handle his—the human race at large, get a job done, get cooperation on the part of people and so forth. You know that is the case. So that's a pretty good grade.

Now, why do we give anything like that? That's because their certificate ought to be a little more than a basic auditor's certificate, and it shouldn't be as good as a professional certificate. But it ought to be a certificate. And it ought to be something that anyone certified to do so has a right to issue. You see that? He should have this—a right to issue that certificate.

All right. That certificate then would simply signify that this individual had had quite a little bit of training in Comm Course and Upper Indoc and

could handle people and probably teach them things with the learning; and was probably of good moral character and wouldn't do you too much damage in the community. And you—he says, "Well now, what if I want to process people, what you call processing people?"

And you say, "Well, go ahead." And give him an assist sheet. You know, the old assists of one kind or another. Just give him an assist sheet. He'd certainly be able to do those assists better than anybody else. He'd probably get some considerable—but play down the idea that he would know anything really about professional processing. Because that can get pretty wild and he would not be able to cope with it, not even vaguely.

All right. Now, how about—how about more people to teach this to? What would happen if we had some sort of an activity which really squared these PE Courses around and moved people through? Well, I'll tell you the PE pattern that is now going to go into Dublin.

As you know, the PE Course consists of one week of evenings, of a free course. This free course is simply attended—registered in properly—Monday night, and is attended for two hours a night (with a break between the hours), for the remainder of the week. And the only thing that is done in that course is the basic definitions of existence, as contained in *Scientology: Fundamentals of Thought*, in Definition by Agreement. And that's all that's done that whole week.

Step two—not an advanced course. They're not ready for an advanced course. But weekend group intensives with some small charge; very small charge, just a few dollars. And you bring them in and give them—anywhere that suits your fancy—six to ten hours of Group Auditing on Saturday and Sunday. That's all. And during the week, you pitch this. You'd keep telling them, "This is what you ought to do. Once a month we have one of these intensives" (if you don't want to do it every weekend), "and the next one coming up is such and so." But you'll find out that you will get more people in and they will stay with you better if you gave it every week that you gave a free course, you followed it with. But that's pretty exhausting.

Well, you'd get those people in for just a few dollars and those people now have a reality on existence, as shown by the averages that have been worked out by many tests. Those people have a greater reality on existence. Their IQs are a bit up, their personality is a bit improved. Oddity, but just Definition by Agreement does all that. Then we move them up to where they'd get some Group Processing. And this Group Processing, over a period of these few hours, however few—if you're going to run it every weekend, you ought to probably cut the number of hours you're going to give right on down. But there we would have these people with something to come to which they could afford and which they would not find antipathetic, and about which they would probably be curious.

Unfortunately, it really takes two auditors to run, on new people particularly, a group intensive. And if you're doing it, just two auditors doing it, your goon squad of course can be somebody who is very untried and who knows very little about it. But two auditors, it actually takes, to alternate over the period of hours if you're going something like six or eight hours. You don't want to stand there for six and eight hours on a Group Processing. In the first place an individual isn't fresh, he tends to run down. A little bit harder to handle than an individual session, any day of the week. And so you would just run alternates or one auditor would do a couple of hours and the other would do a couple of hours and you'd work it off between you, you see,

with an untrained, relatively untrained goon squad. It takes two people on the floor, one of whom must be an auditor.

And you do Tone 40 Group Processing. You tell these people what it's all about. You tell them you're not going to stop for hell or high water and that this is the way it's going to be; and if they don't execute the command, that fellow at the back of the room is the goon squad and he does see that they do it. You get an agreement with them on this subject, no matter how new or raw they are, and just run it. Don't go running a pat-a-cake. In other words, don't mess around. Because the boy who won't do your commands will mess up your group activity like mad. And if that guy's going to blow, you want him to blow early, not when he's enturbulated everybody in the group. That's for true! Because these boys are always present. They talk obsessively, they interrupt people, they spread entheta around, they raise hell. And it's a wonderful way to blow them. Wonderful way to get rid of them.

And they are gotten rid of in one of two ways: they're gotten rid of because they did the auditing command under the duress of your goon squad or because they couldn't take it and blew out the back door and you never heard of them again. And either way is okay. Somebody'll pick them up, maybe next couple of lives. Anyway, we're very hard-boiled on that subject because we've seen very fine groups disintegrated by people who would not perform the auditing commands, wouldn't buy any auditing, would prevent everybody in the group from getting auditing if they possibly could. Lot of entheta and so forth. So you don't want to play this on the light side when you're running a group intensive. Be "sweetness and light and everybody's right but you" just before the intensive and afterwards, if you insist on this social pattern; but during the intensive, run it!

All right. So, there's your next leg up. You got a week of free Definition by Agreement training. People turned up. Don't try to give them lectures. In *the* first place, you have to be in good enough shape to run Definition by Agreement, to lecture. And lecturing is no substitute because you don't like to run Definition by Agreement. Do you know that there are people around that won't run Definition by Agreement, and then will only lecture because they cannot confront individuals of the group? It's very remarkable. Have to be above that level. So you run this Definition by Agreement, nothing but, for that week. And you run either that week or at regular intervals which you publicize, your group intensives, for which you charge a little bit of money.

Now, out of those group intensives you'll get individual preclears. That's for true. And out of those group intensives you will also get candidates for a low level of training, if it's pitched at something they can understand; and that something they can understand is handling their fellow man. And that's the only thing you talk to them about.

"You want to handle people better? Why, I can show you how. And you'll have to take, however, a course. Probably of some three months in length. And that course winds up with a certificate that makes you an apprentice Scientologist. And here's this course, and it runs this way: you sign up and you go something on this order: for the first six weeks you get, Monday, Wednesday and Friday." People, by the way, will not consistently and continually go to five-night-a-week courses. Wears them out, their families object and everything else. But they will go to three-night-a-week courses. So you say, "For the first six weeks, it goes three nights a week: Monday, Wednesday and Friday. And for the remaining six weeks it goes Tuesdays and Thursdays. And if you can make it, Saturdays. That'd be three, but remember you

9 AUGUST 1957

can do it two." I just had that offered me this afternoon as a fine solution. I know it is a good solution.

So, what would they do in these courses? Well, maybe they would go through the Comm Course twice and the Upper Indoc twice in those twelve weeks. Well, but do you run this course consecutively and continuously? And you run it three months and then get another batch of people and you run it three months? You certainly better not. The least you should enroll it is every six weeks; that's the least you should enroll it. And if you have your steps planned out in some fashion or other, you probably could enroll it every couple of weeks. Because I don't say three months is the right number. And if you wanted to enroll every couple of weeks, then you'd be running a Comm Course every couple of weeks, don't you see? That would give you six evenings on which you would spend an hour on each side of each step, in two weeks. And you could enroll every two weeks. Then you'd run your Upper Indoc for whatever length of time was necessary to run them through an Upper Indoc, at two or three nights a week.

Now, why do we stagger this? Why do we put the Upper Indoc and the Comm Course on a stagger? And that's because the liability for anybody working with few hands is that he himself cannot—well, he can't teach two courses at the same time. You have to have the same man teaching both courses, don't you see? So you stagger them so you've got a person available. It isn't whether the people have this time available or not. It's whether or not you've got an Instructor. You see this? That's what's important. So you can just take just one Instructor and run a whole HAS Course over and over and over and over. Enroll it every couple of weeks if you want to. And run them out the other end with nothing but Comm Course and Upper Indoc under their belts, and with no understanding except that they were going to handle people better. That's the only thing that you're promising them, the only thing at all that you're promising them. You don't tell them anything else—not going to be able to make anybody well or spit further or anything—it's just going to—they're going to handle people, that's all.

140

Now, you know and I know that in three months you're certainly not going to level out a Comm Course and an Upper Indoc Course in evenings at that infrequent an attendance. But you're certainly going to improve the living daylights out of somebody—enough to make him surprised about it. Now, this doesn't say that you couldn't take the ones that didn't catch on quick and run them back through again before you issued them their certificate. If you thought they were going to be a disgrace to you in some fashion, train them until they wouldn't.

But what does this give us then? This gives us a very good opportunity to build up a number of people in our own community who are not pretending to be professional auditors but are only handling people and jobs better. They're doing a better job of living because of Scientology. They can call themselves a Scientologist, which would not then mean to them a psychotherapist or a psychologist or something of this sort. Do you see? Wouldn't have that connotation to it at all. It'd be somebody who was handling life better.

All right. If you have this strung out to that degree, let me assure you that you would have a great many individual intensives to do. You would have income—rather significant income.

Now, what is the real beauty, financially, behind one of these HAS Courses? That is, they can pay a very small amount at the beginning of every week. Monday night they appear with their small payment. This payment for the

whole course is stretched across all three months. Now, maybe you make them pay down a little bit of money just to make sure they'll appear and continue to appear, but you can certainly work within their financial reality. And you would be surprised, if it cost them five dollars a week or three dollars a week even, how many three dollars add up into a considerable sum of money. You got the idea? And you'd be surprised if you were only charging—this would be ridiculous—two dollars per group intensive, see? This is awful come-on. You're only charging two dollars for that and you still have built your group up to where you had thirty, forty people taking the thing. Why, you got a hundred and some dollars for a weekend's work, and who would despise that? I wouldn't. Matter of fact, I've been giving my auditing away too long here, I mean.. .

Now, looking at it in this wise, because we're dealing in small sums, always dealing in small sums, then nobody jumps. And there was an outfit once called Woolworth. And a Woolworth approach to this sort of a situation is not a bad approach at all. And I'll be brutal with you—you are entering in upon times when money isn't what it was. It isn't—there's all kinds of it in the society and none of it loose. Well, the way to get the money loose is to get it loose a dime at a time. Get the idea? Chip it out there a nickel or a dime at a time and you've got it made.

Anybody would take a course—I don't care, let's be ridiculous, let's say this course was going to cost them \$150. Let's peg it high or something. And that \$150 would look awfully big to somebody. But now let's break it down and that costs \$50 a month. Now let's break down the \$50 a month: well, it costs \$12 a week. Now you see how fast that would break down. Now let's take \$5 a week and add it back up and find out what it would become and we find out that it's a \$60 course. Now, if you're enrolling quite frequently, why, you're still taking in \$60 for every one of those people that goes—going to go out and handle people better.

In other words, we have to think of the financial side of this. We're not in this business to make money or we wouldn't be here, but we certainly had better not starve to death in the process, because people don't approve of your ribs showing through. That's an Asiatic fixation, that a man, to be holy, must be suffering from malnutrition.

All right. How do you get the people there in the first place? We still, to this minute, do not have a better gimmick than, "I will talk to anyone for you, about anything." That's still a winner.

The only trouble is, those people who have used it and then have answered the phone when it rang, and who have actually attended to this thing across the boards and have done it in a very businesslike way, get off on this silly kick: they get a mailing list of three or four hundred people and then that mailing list by word of mouth keeps expanding because of free courses and they don't do it anymore and it gets lost. Or they put ads in the paper and they get it all set and then they don't have anybody there to answer the phone—they're very unbusinesslike about the thing. Or—and this is the other thing they did which was real cute—they solved everybody's problem over the phone when the person called.

That you must never do! And where we've had flops, why, that's really been the flop point. Person would call up and say, "Well, I'm having an awful problem with my husband. He won't come home, he's down at the local bar and he's in those wide, swinging doors and nobody can get him out."

And you say, "Well, why don't you do so-and-so and so-and-so."

9 AUGUST 1957

And she goes down and gets him out of the wide, swinging doors and you never hear of either of them again.

You don't do that. You always have them come in for an interview. It doesn't matter if they're suffering for a broken leg, it doesn't matter what's happening. They come to see you for an interview and you book their name and address fully. If you can make them come to see you, not you go to see them, you eventually wind up with a very fine mailing list. Now, there are dozens of ways to get around, but that has been the one which has been most functional.

Now, word of mouth spreads to the degree that you are good. Let's not kid ourselves: our word of mouth is as good as we're good. I can go into the Academy any day and tell, within a three-week lag, whether or not the Academy course is good. This is a fantastic thing. It's not so true in processing, but it is true in training. You go in there and these people, if you've got a heavy enrollment, your course has been good. If you've got a lot of new people in the Comm Course, your course is good. If you haven't got anybody in the Comm Course, it's for the birds.

I don't know why this is. It's almost esoteric. I don't know how they find out about it all over the country or all over the world so quick. But you get a lousy Comm Course Instructor and you all of a sudden have nobody. You have a good one, all of a sudden you're full. Now, the only other thing that happens that monitors this, is when you have a good Registrar, you have students; when you have a bum one, you don't have any.

Ireland was busy complaining about the lack of business and an auditor was sent over from London to find out why the Irish office wasn't getting any business. He found the Irish office wasn't even answering people's letters. He answered all the letters he could find lying under the blotter, which wasn't all the letters that had arrived by a long way, and he has, from a zero bank balance, achieved a ninety-six pound bank balance in about two and a half weeks, *zoom!* Just by answering the letters. He didn't even improve the service! You understand? I mean, this is functional. You have to answer your mail! And when I say answer your mail, I mean *answer* it. I don't mean write a letter back.

When people ask you questions, answer them. It doesn't matter whether they are well stated or not; try to answer them.

Now, a lot of people here the last few nights have been giving me some questions about processes. Somebody wants to know the difference between anger and antagonism here—it's .5 degrees on the Tone Scale. And somebody said, "You'd said earlier that you had a process to run out between-lives area." That is exactly right, and you'll be running it next week. Having answered those questions . . . Answer their questions!

We did a very silly thing the other day. Bonnie went down to find somebody out of the Central Files for me. He brought back a letter which was the wrong person but it had a letter in it that was eighteen months old and the person hadn't added any letter for eighteen months. But eighteen months ago this person had written in and this person had said, "I'm working with children and I wonder if you have any more information on the subject." And whoever had answered the letter had answered it just a little bit off pitch. It was almost an answer to the person's questions. So I said, "Bonnie, answer her questions." And he did. And promptly we heard from the person; instantly and immediately the person ordered the book. We told her to order and she's in communication and everything's going along beautifully.

INSTRUCTING A COURSE

How many dead end like this? So an auditor has to do some administration. If he doesn't, he's dead. So given administration, which is to say, answering the mail, at least putting the money in your hat when it's thrown on the floor—these elementary things. Given that and given the fact that you're running a good PE, free course, and you're running some Group Processing and you're running a basic course to teach people how to handle people, you absolutely couldn't lose, not for a minute. Couldn't lose. And I don't want you to do any losing. I'm here to see that you win if you possibly can.

This is very far from the last lecture of the course, because I will give you that last lecture on the last day of the course. And we've got a whole week and one day to go in which you're going to make a tremendous lot of strides of improvements. You have done beautifully, but you're only up to a lower order of miracle, and I don't buy that.

I want you to put into practice particularly what I've been telling you tonight about coaching. And I want you to at least double the amount of advance which has been achieved on the people you are coaching for the remainder of this course. There are eight, seven, six—six whole days left. And you've got four days of processing next week—nights of processing—which shouldn't happen to anybody, not even you. But there's quite a long ways to go yet. This happens to be, however, the last technical lecture of the series.

So thank you very much.

THE FUTURE OF SCIENTOLOGY

A lecture given on 16
August 1957

How's it all going?

Audience: Good!

How's it all stopping?

Audience: Good.

Well, here we are with the last little short momentary period to go. It's a very good thing here to wind up this unit on a cheerful note. This is the first ACC for a very, very long time where we had total course completion. And that is pretty doggone good; it's never happened before that I recall. So thank you very much.

Now, there are tremendous numbers of things which I didn't tell you during the course and I'll have to write you a letter about them. They're not very important, really. They have to do with processing and processes of one kind or another.

That's the clocks, they—just shows you that the end of the world has arrived with the end of this ACC. Clock falls apart, just like that.

But you made it, you made it alive. That was news to me in some respects. And you did a very good job of pushing other people through this. I want to thank you for that. I think you actually have done very fine.

The only ACC which was to any degree comparable to the amount of success achieved and so forth, was—if I remember rightly there were three, really, before this which were quite different than earlier ACCs, and those were the 15, 16 and 17, and the people wound up in those units looking very, very bright; very bright indeed. But this one has well exceeded any of those three.

Well, you've really done a very fine job. I want to give you a little bit of data that might be of interest to you. From here on, the research is not south. To hell with that—we can crack cases. You should realize that CCH basic steps are applied all the way south, and just in case you ever get fooled, run them on everybody. Got that?

I mean, they take in all the way south; also they work quite well on upper-scale cases, and if you always take in people all the way south with CCH 1, 2, 3, 4, you will just never lay any eggs.

Now, there is today an official version of CCH 1, called CCH 1B which is "Don't give me that hand." This has been tested and has been found tremendously workable. It works as an alternate, but not as an alternating, process. Once you run "Give me that hand," and flatten it a bit, then you would run "Don't give me that hand."

16 AUGUST 1957

Now, actually, if you've got a case that is way down in the basement someplace, "Don't give me that hand" is the first one you run. And they really explode all over the room. It's one of the more interesting manifestations. Get somebody who is stark, staring goofy and you don't think you're communicating with him at all and you just sit down in a chair and start a Tone 40 "Don't give me that hand," and all of his covert bestiality starts rolling off at an enormous rate of speed. Quite amazing.

Now, this works extremely well on children. It has not been tested on comatose people, people who are unconscious, but nevertheless it possibly has some workability there.

Now, for a person who is lying in bed there is another one which proves efficacious and that is some command which tells them to "Put that body in that bed," you know? Or "Make that body lie in that bed." Some very factual command. "Thank you." "Make that body lie in that bed." "Thank you."

Now, the person is unconscious and evidently one of two things will happen if this happens; if the person is close to death anyway, they're liable to come to enough and get enough control to just kick off, *wham!* you see? Or come around and bring the body back to.

Now factually, to a Scientologist, we don't care which. I mean that. We don't care which. I'm not being funny. You talk about some overwhelming—the overwhelming of a person's self-determinism. Nothing compares to making them live when they would rather die.

146

Now, once in a while out of orneriness you can run a process on somebody who is absolutely convinced that the reason they should have auditing is to put the body in the chair, kick it off and leave you holding the bag. And you'll run into these once in a great while. I myself have run into three.

Well, there is a method of making them go on and survive which is almost a dirty trick, which is to mock themselves up dead. And they do that a few times and they run out the facsimiles on which they're counting to help them kick the bucket, and they go on living. You got that? Now, that is a process which makes somebody live. "Mock yourself up dead," or "Mock up a dead body." It doesn't matter which. It's not a very therapeutic process. It simply prevents this death from occurring. You've got that?

But somebody who is comatose, you process them, "Make that body lie in that bed," something like that. It will go either way, probably that direction which the person feels best. But their self-determinism has been overwhelmed to a marked degree by the various vicissitudes of fortune and all that process does is return their self-determinism to them. They say, "Well, there's no sense in keeping this thing running," and they kick off and find another one. That's actually the humane thing to do.

I'll tell you why that is. The total trick of brainwashing—this is another little item I've got to give you here—the total trick of brainwashing is to make somebody postulate that he's going to survive.

The total modus operandi of a surprise is simply to make somebody postulate that he's going to survive. You got that?

Now, for something that can't do anything else but survive to postulate that it's going to survive creates a very interesting state of beingness. It mocks up the potential of nonsurvival. In other words, instead of being relaxed about going on living, this fellow now mocks up the potential of nonsurvival and begins to dodge from living while determining to survive.

For instance, a whole regiment back in the War Between the States would occasionally turn into a complete rout. Everybody had decided to survive at

that moment. And oddly enough, to survive is not to confront; these are two different things. Surviving is not confronting. These people have decided to run and live another day, and they get shot down in their tracks and dead bodies are spattered all over the terrain.

An individual has *a* threat to his health and decides after that that he's going to have *good health!* He's on what? He's on one side of a dichotomy; he leaves all bad health then on automatic.

For an individual to postulate that he's going to survive is to make him leave all succumb on automatic. Therefore everything can happen to him after that. This is the trick of brainwashing, and I impart this to you in some confidence for this reason: the Russian does not know it. This is something he doesn't know that he is doing.

Any one of you could make Russian brainwashing so much more workable that it's grim to believe that there is no check on our information lines. I work it the other way around. I am hoping that someday a great deal of this material will be broadly circulated throughout Russia.

You remember the story about Detroit?

Male voice: Yeah.

The fourteen cops, and I think twelve of them resigned from the force; it was something on that order. In other words, they were supposed to listen to these tapes to get bad information and reel up a case and they said "Oh, so the state is attacking this sort of thing, is it?" And they resigned. Quite interesting, and I think you'd find the Russian doing the thing similarly. So it isn't totally bad that the information get to them; it'd only be bad if this information only, tailor-made only to brainwash people, got to them. Get the idea? Give them the whole story, not part of it.

Now, if we can get somebody to postulate that he's only going to be good, he leaves bad on automatic. Do you see that? It makes an unbalanced life since good and bad—and to a thetan, survive and succumb—are simply considerations. They're no more than that.

There is many a fellow who is suffering badly in life who has only one thing wrong with him: he is being good. And he does some of the most vicious, underhanded, dirty tricks to his fellow man, and he can't understand how they occur because he knows that *his* intentions are just to be good. But all of these automatic badnesses happen in the person's vicinity. Got that?

Now, one of the biggest religious tricks which is played on any populace is to make everybody be totally good; and they all die. Because then we classify disease as bad and they have no control over it. We classify death as bad and immediately they have no control over that. Now, this is throwing people out of control, isn't it? So an understanding of these factors really is necessary for a whole population to live a decent sort of life.

Well, the way you make people lead a good life is to put them in control of their lives, not to make them postulate they're going to survive or postulate they're going to be good, or postulate they're going to sin no more. This sort of thing is definitely detrimental, because it knocks out 50 percent of the control.

We say, "Now, promise me you will be good."

Fellow'11 say, "All right, I'll be good. I'm going to be good. Yes, I've seen the light. I've repented because the Kingdom is at hand, and all is well. I shall now after this be good."

Well, what is this thing "good"? It's just some consideration. After that it is only necessary to tell people what is good and they—this person will be it. Don't you see? So we could say, "Well now, being good is paying everything

you own into the exchequer." That's being good. Being good: "permitting yourself to be eaten at priestial feasts upon the rock above Mexico City." That's being good. Get the idea? All we have to do then is define the consideration of what is good.

There is an oddity; there is no thing that is bad in one society that isn't good in some other society. There is nothing immoral on the face of the Earth that isn't moral somewhere.

So we get this great philosophic enigma: What is bad? What is good? What is desirable conduct?

Well, Confucius laid down a bunch of desirable conducts of one kind or another, and he certainly made a government capable of controlling a people. Confucius is the patron saint of Chinese government since time immemorial, until this one. And this one is going to be very sorry, because they don't realize that there's a hidden philosophy running back of all Chinese civil service and so forth, that keeps them into a slavery. And they have come along and they've fed them something straight out of Karl Marx's delusions about the American Civil War.

You probably didn't know it, but the American Civil War was what influenced Karl Marx to turn antisocial. You didn't know that?

Audience: No.

Well, that's true. He was over here and he saw what he supposed to be industrial giants condemning labor to misery, starvation, death. He even claimed to have seen a twelve-year-old boy who died at his post in a factory thrown onto a scrap heap here in America. We never find any of these things in American history, but Karl Marx seems to have found them here. And this inspired him to go back and write *Das Kapital*. It was his experience here which caused him to write *Das Kapital*, which is what makes America Russia's number one target. Out of a network of lies about what's bad; good; something; we get civilizations. But if you wanted a civilization to advance or to achieve anything, it would have to have within it enlightened people; that would be vitally necessary.

The whole post of sage, philosopher, wise man, soothsayer and so forth, was long since relegated to the dustbin in the United States. A philosopher is somebody who sits alongside of a cracker barrel in a country store and makes wisecracks; I think that was the last well-known definition of what a philosopher is.

Nevertheless, although this country does not know it, it is totally starved for guidance throughout its ranks. And that guidance then isn't the kind of guidance where we say, "Everybody should get down and worship the great god Baal or the great god Moola." That isn't the sort of guidance it needs at all.

The guidance it needs is very easily stated, and that is guidance which permits the individual to reassume control of his own destiny: that's the sort of guidance this society at this time needs. If it gets that guidance it will live; it will be a good society. If it doesn't, we will have, not Earth going around the Sun, but a billiard ball.

Project Billiard Ball is going on at great pace right down here at the AEC.

Now, to rehabilitate any person, it is only necessary to rehabilitate his control of his environment. He isn't rehabilitated to the degree that that control is impeded. We were perfectly right once upon a time when we said, "Self-determinism is the solution." Yes, but self-determinism we didn't understand too well. Self-determinism must carry with it an element of control or it is a series of failures.

If an individual determines that something be so and then he has no way to make it so—in other words, the control factor is missing—then he is nothing but a failure and out of these failures are made broken lives.

THE FUTURE OF SCIENTOLOGY

Now, an individual, then, must be able to control his environment. But here is a great oddity: an individual must also be capable of being controlled. Just as we make the individual postulate survival and let succumb stay an automaticity, so when an individual is placed in a position where he himself controls things, a failure to rehabilitate his being controlled thereby leaves all other control beyond his own on automatic, and it makes that an automaticity and that too can sweep him up, sweep him into a fascism, sweep him into socialistic economic nonsense of some sort or another. In other words, he becomes very easy to control the moment that control of him is left on automatic. Therefore this is something that he must know something about, and this is something that he must be able to tolerate.

And between the two buttons, the one that is suffering is his inability to withstand or answer up to control of self. Hence the lower steps of CCH are terrifically workable. This is where the individual is starved and this is where he is victimized.

Now, that control is leveled at the person, leveled at his attention and leveled at his thinkingness, and unless these three things can be controlled, unless he himself discovers that they can be controlled without his dying, then he becomes the victim of every control that seeks to enslave him.

So to have a free society, you get this great oddity, that an individual in the society must not only be capable of controlling himself and his environment, but he himself must be capable of being controlled.

Now, there's practically no such thing as controlling yourself, there is practically no such thing as this, and we have most control centering on this. We have in the armed services in several countries right at this moment this great lie: "He who would learn to command must first learn to obey himself." Isn't that an oddity?

Now, they—if they said this sincerely, "He who would learn to command must first learn to obey," I would say that they were hoping that when he was first learning to obey he would forget how to command. And I wouldn't put these things first or second. "As he learns to command, so must he also learn to obey," and that becomes a true statement.

The only thing that's wrong with any person that you will ever meet in this society at this time is that he cannot withstand control exterior to himself and so becomes a complete dupe for anything that would control him and unless his tolerance for exterior control is built up, he will continue to be a dupe. And the society has lots of those; there is no shortage of supply today of potential slaves.

Now, all of this could begin very easily and very well way down in the kindergarten of our public school system. One of these days in very, very short order—I'm not just giving you a lecture on this, I'm telling you very factually that beyond the fact that we ought to make the society better, we ought to do this or we ought to do that, there is a central modus operandi contained in control itself which tells us what an individual would be capable of if he was in good, very good condition. He could command, determine, control, whatever you want to call it, and he could be commanded, determined, controlled. Don't you see? If everybody in the society was in that condition, you would have a tremendous society. You would find various things in the society which are considered evil today would fade away.

Now, you're on no mission to go out and tell people to be good, that's for true. But I think you're on one to go out and tell people to be a bit better. That's for true, because they could all be a lot better.

Now, the only trap that we ourselves could fall into with that is by continually conceiving everybody beyond our immediate notice to be very evil, to be incapable, because this puts us out of communication with the society, and we shouldn't conceive ourselves to be surrounded by this sprawling mass of relatively undisciplined, incapable people. We should conceive ourselves to be surrounded by a sprawling mass *of potential* people. And as long as we keep that in mind, we're on solid ground. But as soon as we say, "They're all bad, they're all bad, they're all bad," we also are saying to some degree, "There's nothing can be done about it." And we know that there is everything that can be done about it.

Now, individuals are caught in the machinery of a society of custom, precedent, tradition and they're ground to very fine bits. And one of our levels of attack is going to be against the educational system, since it isn't an *educational* system. We don't know what it is, but it's not an educational system. Maybe it's some other kind of system. To put a child in a classroom and to keep him there ad nauseam, endlessly, is a very, very terrible thing to do.

The only reason people do that to him and are willing to do that to him is because of this misconception that he is a wild thing who has to be civilized or controlled in some fashion and the best way to do it is to knock in his anchor points.

No, he has been subjected to too much duress already and his salvation would lie in the application of some such formula as this: for every hour in the classroom, an hour on the athletic field. One for one, at least. Two for one would probably be better than one for one. But if you're going to put a child in a classroom for an hour, you would have to put him at least one hour on an athletic field.

Now, this is a perfect solution to modern education. They do not have the buildings by fifty percent. They do not have the teachers by fifty percent. But they could get coaches. So you send the child to school in the morning and put him on the athletic field in the afternoon. Or put him on the athletic field in the morning and send him to school in the afternoon. Insist that he have one good meal a day and you would have the stock necessary to continue a race.

They don't have it now. It's an appalling thing to read the figures of physical disability amongst modern children. It's a very serious thing.

During World War II—at the beginning of World War II they were trying to get people squared away and into the armed services to pass physicals and so on, and they found an alarming percentage of the country was physically incapable by reason of bad diet and by reason of this and by reason of that.

And it seems to me that if the state has to go into socialism simply to get good training for its children, I think they have sacrificed the end goal of freedom and decency for a stopgap, just to get children fed well. That's one of the things that socialism promises, you know, is equal education and good food for everybody and all that sort of thing. And I think this country is capable right now of doing that.

I have in the works a book called *Creative Education* which will bring up all these factors. And I don't want you to be timid about shoving some of this material under the noses of principals and that sort of thing. This could carry us a very, very long way. This could be pretty exciting.

Actually, that education could become a science is fairly exciting news anyway. The great oddity is, is the Prelogics are the axioms of education. And all I'm going to do in this book besides advancing ideas and experience on child processing and how to put data across and the learning processes and

that sort of thing, little material we developed since, is just to take these Prelogics, call them the axioms of education and beat each one to death and say that a teacher who doesn't know this is a schnook. And then make sure this one lands in every public library around the world. See? That could be quite a campaign all by itself.

Now, that sort of thing is all grist to your mill. Certainly, to improve a country at large, some attention has to be paid to the immediate oncoming generation. Otherwise they would grow up and undo all the work you have done. So you have to pay some attention to them.

Now, there's another factor that goes along with this and that is juvenile delinquency. And I don't believe you know this, but the FBI is hysterical—they're just totally hysterical on this subject. They do not talk logically to you anymore about it. Hysteria.

The current issue of *Newsweek* magazine is a very good reference; they give diagrams in there of the juvenile gang murders and they give in there the figures of crime increase in the juvenile department. Now, there isn't much you can do about it, they say. In other words, they are men without a solution and men standing into confusion.

If you have a little idle time, I would ask you to overcome your unwillingness to confront courts of law and cops, since they aren't too easy to get along with, and go down to the juvenile court and have a talk with the probation officer, who's usually the *most* hysterical person present; have a talk with the probation officer. Tell him you're a minister, you're interested in children, and you would just like to have some children to do some Group Processing with. "New method of group therapy," you might say.

You possibly could find considerable financial support in your area if you had any set of figures at all that would substantiate your efficacy in the field of juvenile delinquency. After that you would move forward into the area of the judge, and you would find the judge would be making statements such as are made to me occasionally by judges. Oddly enough, we sometimes ourselves get stuck on the time track about our position in the society or our representation in the society at this time.

The battle is won at this time. It is won. It's won about the same way the Battle of Gettysburg was won on the second day, you see? There's an awful lot of shooting going on and nobody has mopped up any of the mess, but people involved know that the battle is over.

The seriousness with which a psychiatrist consulted on this assumes at your immediate mention of the word "Scientology" tells you volumes. The head of a hospital out West—and I had a report on the head of a hospital up here in the East, almost said exactly the same things; they said, "We'd be very happy to have you present in any capacity at all, if it weren't for the fact that we would endanger our standing with the AMA. And we have to watch out, because we know you're doing good work."

Now today, although violence could flare along this line and it isn't all done at all, there has been—a lot of which perhaps I have kept from you—a lot of randomness of one kind or another out in the public at large.

One thing, there was no sense in bringing it up particularly, and the second thing, one was simply giving a communication line to a bunch of confusion when he did so; and the third thing, to bring it up was to assume the role of defense, which I wasn't in mind to assume at all because the only role I have ever assumed and the only one I understand is attack. That I find is successful.

16 AUGUST 1957

Now, it's sometimes foolish not to have somebody holding the fort while you attack. I have discovered that too. But we're still here.

Well, today there are many interests afoot, many concerns in one way or another. People are entering the messianic level which is described in *Science of Survival** This is a bad piece of news which I give you. But as they enter it, for some reason or other we're thought better and better of. People think better and better of us. And if we get stuck on the time track in believing that there are people around who just think Scientology is terrible, remember this: as a society sinks on the Tone Scale, they are more and more apt to protect the underdog. It takes several years of vilification to make a hero. And this to some degree has happened.

This is almost a standard social cycle. We're just into the end of this cycle, and you'll all of a sudden—oh, it won't be many years before—maybe not even years. Tides like this have a tendency to turn rather fast when they turn.

You're not at this moment looked down on, but you will find yourself very thoroughly looked up to. This has already happened.

Looking down on a person has—pretty well over. But looking up to is a new experience for you and the only thing I would say if this starts to commence and if you did manage to dig yourself out of a PE Course or something like this and dig yourself out of what you were doing and exteriorize to the degree of going out and conducting a juvenile delinquency program—you know, by the way, all you have to do is get the names and addresses of people who support boy's clubs and that sort of thing, go around to see them. Tell them you have a new program. Ask them to write out the check. I mean, it can be done just as simply as that, you know. Because these people write out many large checks all the time just to see something happen, because they're interested in the society at large.

But the point is that when you get up to a point—since I think there are here people who will not retread again, I'll tell you this now in case I don't see you in the next year or so. And that is just this: is beware of anoxemia. It is a dreadful disease which makes a person do foolish things when the air gets too thin.

Pilots go up in airplanes, their masks slip off, they're too high and they all of sudden conceive themselves to be elsewhere and they do silly things with the rudder and stick.

It is very, very easy to support misfortune. That's rather simple. It's very, very easy to go out and slug away and work at it and hope and figure someday you might really get somewhere and amount to something. That's easy. Half starve to death and not have enough dough to do this and that with and owe a lot of money, that's easy, that's almost routine.

The other one is the hard one to bear. Altitude. What humility it takes to survive altitude. I can tell you that from personal experience way back when.

The last time I got a *whammo* out of being set up with altitude was so many years ago that I've forgotten all about it. And I had the experience of being a very well-known writer back in the middle thirties. And I found out at that time that it was very difficult to keep a check on myself so that I could continue to perform, and I had to get over it in a hurry. And I found out something: that it is much harder to survive good repute than bad. It's much harder to survive good fortune and plenty, than misfortune.

*See *Science of Survival*, Book One, Chapter 27, "Method Used by Subject to Handle Others."

THE FUTURE OF SCIENTOLOGY

First place, it gives you very little to confront. You begin to run out of things to confront. Everybody all over a whole area is calling you and looking up to you and the TV station wants to know if you'd come down and make an announcement on this national event of some kind or another just so they'd have your opinion. That's a sad day. That's a sad day.

So if you ever get the suspicion that you've just grown the proper whiskers and halo to be Christ, for God's sakes come and see me. It's easy to do when several thousand people start looking up to you. Now, I say that very prematurely. This is way before the time this will happen. That's why I'm saying—it'll sink in. One of these fine days . . .

Well, it was nothing—it was nothing in the—even in the early days of Buddhism for anybody that had any knowledge of the subject at all to be wined, dined and feted halfway across India. You get the idea? Well, I'm not making a comparable line, but I'm telling you and repeating this, the society is going into a messianic level. If you want to know more about that, read *Science of Survival* and what it says on the subject.

I have had five messiahs in communication with me in the past two months. And I haven't been looking for them. The weird part of it is, is they call me up and think they're reporting to headquarters. If this doesn't make a liar out of me, nothing will. But this is getting just a little bit wild. Now, this has been happening to me here and there and so forth. Very peculiar.

A fellow the other day in New York City, former bartender, had all of a sudden got the Word, and he was telling me about the next three hundred years and the various orders and so forth, and he defined what this was all about. It was total surrender to predestination. That was it. If you made a total surrender to predestination, you had it made.

In other words, the country is entering into fatalistic lines. Now, that's quite remarkable. It's quite remarkable, because I'd never heard fatalism in this country before, but that's fatalism. This fellow had just gotten the Word and he was on his way.

When you mock up anything as formidable as an A-bomb, and people can see no more future than they can see, even though they don't understand it, they begin to turn around and find some way which is the short road to heaven.

Now, you are the only qualified messiahs in the world today. It would be so confoundedly easy for you to turn in your shirt for a white robe that it isn't even funny. Now, I'm speaking to you a little bit ahead of the fact. This hasn't really come out to a tremendous big thing in the society yet. It is really not totally visible.

But you're going to find people turning more and more to churches. You're going to find people more and more—somebody suddenly stands up and says, "Hallelujah! I've got the Word." And everybody turns around and says, "What is it, for God's sakes?"

Only they will not be the intellectuals which turned to Dianetics and Scientology, they will be the emotional, worried, anxious people. It's a good thing we wrapped up far south, because to salvage one of those boys when he's three-quarters spun-in is a job I wouldn't wish on anybody.

So I'm speaking to you perhaps prematurely by some long, large period of time, but nevertheless, you see what I'm talking about?

Audience: Yes.

So keep your head; keep it sane. Because it's dead easy and I don't think there's any person here who wouldn't.

16 AUGUST 1957

But I'm telling you very, very bluntly that you are the only qualified messiahs. You're qualified. Why are you qualified? Do you realize that you are the only people that have any understanding or reality on the hereafter? Well, what more do you want? Do you realize that if you read down the list of all the messages brought by messiahs in former times, that you have the answers to each and every one of them? Well, what's that make you?

And yet you don't have those things because I've stood up and lectured to you and yakked at you and so forth, because I've told you consistently, "Find out!" And if you've got any information on this subject, you've got it for real, so you're not even taking it secondhand. See, you're perfectly qualified messiahs. And I'm not going to issue a certificate to that effect.

You probably want to know something about wafers. The Instructors have already graded all of the wafers and those have been set up, and set up very nicely and will be released tomorrow after your tests are available. There isn't one of those that is below tops that isn't rather easily repairable, and you will get a note on that tomorrow, anything that has to be done to up the grade of the certificate.

Now, those things will not come forward for my review until next week sometime, and when all of the material is there, why, we will have that squared around. And actually I don't expect otherwise than we will have eventually 100 percent gold-seal sweep here. It's not that now; it's not that now because there has got to be some things done by people before they can, as the Instructors have informed me, and I have no particulars on this at all. You will know all about this and it's not very bad news.

But I have some very good news here, and I'll just pass these out and you just pass them right back through to the person, would you, sitting back here? We have course completion. I notice that—did I put some tension on you when I told you that you wouldn't know about this till tomorrow noon?

Well, I'll tell you how to do this; I'll tell you how to get off of a maybe. Just consider that you've flunked and are going to get no certificate and that it's probably going to take you a couple of weeks to get this repaired somehow or another and you'll have the worst news that is in the pile. Got that?

All right, now these are your course completion letters and you will be interested in having these; these have a value in themselves because of the material going out in *Ability*.

Now, we have a very, very good party coming up here tonight and I am now going upstairs and arrange a Fac One machine so I can get all of your pictures, because I wanted to get the class pictures.

Now, one of the things that was fairly interesting in earlier ACCs is we always took people at the beginning, always took them in their class clothes and never had a prayer, you see, of getting nice, shiny pictures because they would be all restimulated and everything. But this time, why, we reversed it and decided to take the pictures at the party. So, I will get all of your pictures tonight, so I trust you will all be there.

Audience voices: Early. Early in the party, yes. Yeah. Early.

Early, you said it! You'll miss it if you're not there at eight, straight up.

Male voice: Okay.

Got it now?

Audience: Yeah.

It's been a terrific pleasure having you here and thank you very much.

Audience: Thank you! Thank you, Ron!

Thank you.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

L. Ron Hubbard's many works on the subjects of Dianetics and Scientology reflect a profound knowledge of man's nature—knowledge gained through lifelong experience with people from all walks of life and every part of society.

Ron's quest for knowledge on the nature of man began at a very early age, when he studied the Greek philosophers and other classics. He traveled across the United States and throughout the Pacific and Asia. By the time he was nineteen he had covered more than a quarter of a million miles. And during the course of leading expeditions, on three of which he carried the flag of the Explorers Club, he studied twenty-one different races and cultures around the world.

155

In the fall of 1930, Ron enrolled at George Washington University where he studied mathematics, engineering and attended one of the first classes in nuclear physics taught in the United States. This background allowed him to apply a scientific methodology to questions of man's spiritual potential. After realizing that neither the philosophy of the East nor the materialism of the West held the answers, Ron was determined to fill the gap.

He financed his early research through fiction writing and soon became one of the most highly demanded authors in this golden age of popular fiction. His prolific output as a writer during the 30s and 40s was interrupted only by his service in the US Navy during World War II.

Partially disabled at war's end, Ron applied his discoveries about the human mind to restore his own health and that of other injured servicemen.

In late 1947, Ron detailed these discoveries in a manuscript which enjoyed a wide circulation amongst friends and colleagues who copied it and passed it on to others. (This manuscript was published in 1951 as *Dianetics: The Original Thesis*, and later republished as *The Dynamics of Life*.) As his original thesis continued to circulate, Ron found himself besieged with inquiries from interested readers; and with the first publication of his work on Dianetics in the *Explorers Club Journal* in late 1949, the flood of letters was so great that it placed enormous demands on his time. It was in response to these requests for more information about his discoveries that he wrote a comprehensive text on the subject.

Published on May 9, 1950, *Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health* made his breakthrough technology broadly available for the first time. *Dianetics* shot to the top of the *New York Times* bestseller list and remained

ILLUSION OR TRUTH LECTURE TRANSCRIPTS

there week after week. By the end of four months, 750 Dianetics study groups had sprung up, prompting such headlines as: "Dianetics Takes US by Storm."

Responding to this groundswell of enthusiasm, Ron delivered lectures to packed halls across the country. Before the year's end, tens of thousands had not only read his book, but were readily applying it to better their lives. Meanwhile, he continued his research, and further breakthroughs followed. In 1951, he wrote and published six more books, including *Science of Survival*, the authoritative work on the subject of human behavior.

In the autumn of that year, and in spite of growing demands on his time, he intensified research into the true source of life energy. This research led him to identify the very nature of life itself, and formed the basis of the applied philosophy of Scientology—the study of the spirit in relationship to itself, universes and other life. This track of research, begun so many years earlier as a young man traveling the globe in search of answers to life itself, was to span the next three decades.

Through the 1950s, Ron continued to advance Scientology techniques with the development of hundreds of new processes, delving deeper into the true nature of man. And as more and more people discovered Ron's breakthroughs, Scientology churches around the world opened to provide services to them. Ron visited many of these churches, giving lectures and guidance to the church members to help them expand Scientology in their areas.

In 1959, Ron purchased a home in England, Saint Hill Manor, where he lectured to hundreds of Scientology students who came from as far away as the United States, Australia and South Africa. A new era for Scientology began with the opening of the Saint Hill Special Briefing Course in May of 1961 to train expert auditors. Between 1961 and 1966, Ron not only personally supervised these students, but also delivered more than 440 lectures and auditing demonstrations while continuing his research and overseeing the expanding affairs of Scientology internationally.

He released the Scientology Classification, Gradation and Awareness Chart at Saint Hill in 1965, laying out the standard step-by-step route for preclears and auditors. Additionally, because of Scientology's rapid expansion, Ron developed administrative policies for Scientology organizations which have proven to be universal in their application.

On the threshold of breakthroughs never before envisaged, Ron resigned from all directorships in Scientology organizations in 1966 to devote himself more fully to research.

The following years saw the discovery and codification of the technology which allows anyone to move through the levels of Operating Thetan, the highest states of spiritual awareness and ability.

Ron continued to seek out methods to help his fellows. As he encountered ever-worsening conditions in society, he developed procedures to address and resolve a wide range of man's problems. He even refined the techniques of Dianetics in 1978 to bring about faster and easier-to-attain results—New Era Dianetics.

No area of life was left untouched in this search for ways to improve the human condition. His work provided solutions to such social ills as declining educational standards, moral decay and drug use. He codified the administration of organizations, the principles of ethics, the subjects of art and logic and much more. And yet he never lost sight of the man on the street and his day-to-day problems of living in these complex and troubled times. Thus in Scientology one finds solutions to any difficulty one can encounter in life.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

This series of lectures represents but a small part of the more than forty million words of Ron's recorded lectures, books and writings on Dianetics and Scientology.

With his research fully completed and codified, L. Ron Hubbard departed his body on January 24, 1986. Ron's legacy lives on through his works which are applied daily by millions around the world to bring understanding and freedom.

Thanks to his efforts, there is today a pathway for anyone to travel to attain full spiritual freedom. The entrance is wide and the route is sure.

GLOSSARY

159

A = A = A: anything equals anything equals anything equals anything. This is the way the reactive mind thinks, irrationally identifying thoughts, people, objects, experiences, statements, etc., with one another where little or no similarity actually exists. Everything is everything else. Mr. X looks at a horse knows it's a house knows it's a schoolteacher. So when he sees a horse he is respectful. *See also reactive mind* in this glossary. *And his answer to never being surprised is to control everything and this is irrational and he can't have any fun if he's controlling everything because he'll never get a surprise, because he can't have any surprise and we get one of these good old A = A = A equations going. —Surprise —The Anatomy of Sleep (31 July 57)*

aberrated: affected by *aberration*, a departure from rational thought or behavior. Aberration means basically to err, to make mistakes, or more specifically to have fixed ideas which are not true. The word is also used in its scientific sense. It means departure from a straight line. If a line should go from A to B, then if it is *aberrated* it would go from A to some other point, to some other point, to some other point, to some other point, to some other point, and finally arrive at B. Taken in its scientific sense, it would also mean the lack of straightness or to see crookedly as, for example, a man sees a horse but thinks he sees an elephant. Aberrated conduct would be wrong conduct, or conduct not supported by reason. Aberration is opposed to sanity, which would be its opposite. From the Latin, *aberrare*, to wander from; Latin, *ab*, away, *errare*, to wander. *[Definition of computation] the aberrated evaluation and postulate that one must be consistently in a certain state in order to succeed.*

Ability: the magazine of the Founding Church of Scientology of Washington, DC, since 1955. *Ability* has also been used more recently by various other Central Organizations as the title of their magazine. *Any of you seen the most recent Ability? —Ability—Laughter (2 Aug. 57)*

Academy: the part of a Scientology organization in which auditor training courses are delivered. *We have not been able to teach one under three weeks full time at the Academy. —Ability—Laughter (2 Aug. 57)*

ILLUSION OR TRUTH LECTURE TRANSCRIPTS

ACC: abbreviation for Advanced Clinical Course, one of a number of theory and research courses delivered by L. Ron Hubbard during the years 1953 to 1961 which gave a deep insight into the phenomena of the mind and the rationale of research and investigation. *Anyway, this is lecture number eleven, 18th ACC, July 29, 1957. —The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes (29 July 57)*

acceptance level: the degree of a person's willingness to accept people or things freely, monitored and determined by his consideration of the state or condition that those people or things must be in for him to be able to do so. *You just add this up to what we used to have to say about acceptance level. — Confronting (8 Aug. 57)*

AEC: abbreviation for Atomic Energy Commission: a federal agency created in 1946 to regulate the development of the United States atomic energy program. Its functions were transferred to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission in 1975. *Or he's been down panting over hot brains in the AEC, trying to find out all about why he shouldn't stop exploding atomic bombs or something. — The Scale of Withhold (6 Aug. 57)*

Alden: John G. Alden Company of Boston, Massachusetts, manufacturer of sailing boats since the early 1900s. *But they got dependent on an iron hull and today you go down and try to build a sailing ship that sails and you get something built by Alden and you fall off of it and get drowned and the masts come out of it. — Thinnies (1 Aug. 57)*

160

ally: an individual who cooperates with, supports and helps another for a common object; a supporter, a friend. In Dianetics and Scientology it basically means someone who protects a person who is in a weak state and becomes a very strong influence over the person. The weaker person, such as a child, even partakes of the characteristics of the ally so that one may find that a person who has, for instance, a bad leg, has it because a protector or ally in his youth had a bad leg. The word is from French and Latin and means "to bind together." *Some people are working for the pride of accomplishment and the reward of just the "thank you" or "good fellow" of one person, who may very well be a dead person—a gone person, you know, a departed ally. —The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes (29 July 57)*

alpha and beta particles: two types of nuclear radiation. Used in the lecture as part of a humorous, made-up theory, with no particular significance. *"This shows us conclusively that the interrelationship between alpha and beta particles is the square root of bull." — The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes (29 July 57)*

alter-iness: an altered or changed reality of something. *Isness* means the way it is. When someone sees it differently he is doing an alter-is; in other words, is altering the way it is. *Therefore nothing is ever as-ised and we get this agreement across the line interrupted, changed, altered and we get alter-iness occurring on either end of a comm line. —CCH (7 Aug. 57)*

amphibinol: humorous made-up name for a type of sedative. *Now, hypnotics, taking hypnotics—Nytol, amphibinol, snooze-all, drowse-all, those things don't work. —Surprise —The Anatomy of Sleep (31 July 57)*

anaten: experiencing *analytical attenuation*: a diminution (lessening) or weakening of the analytical awareness of an individual for a brief or extensive period of time. If sufficiently great, it can result in unconsciousness. It stems from the restimulation of an engram which contains pain and unconsciousness. *When a thetan cannot control or handle any part of anything, he goes anaten.* —*Surprise—The Anatomy of Sleep (31 July 57)*

anchor point: one of the assigned or agreed-upon points of boundary, which are conceived to be motionless by the individual; anchor points demark the outermost boundaries of a space or its corners. *You might say restimulation is lost location —you lose the location of an anchor point or where it is.* —*Ability—Laughter (2 Aug. 57)*

APA: abbreviation for American Personality Analysis, a test which shows desirable and undesirable characteristics in a case when the results are graphed. *But let us take the remaining four on which this was run, and let us read, completely aside from the personality changes (which, by the way, were minimal —minimal APA changes; they're very, very small — they're all beneficial but very tiny) read these IQs.* —*Factors Behind the Handling of IQ (5 Aug. 57)*

AP&A: abbreviation for Advanced Procedure *and* Axioms, a book written by L. Ron Hubbard, first published in 1951. *And finally, on the first day, they get the rudiments, the Axioms, Book One, Dianetics 55!, AP&A, and then they memorize, toward the end of that evening, all the Dianetic Axioms in case they might miss something.* —*Instructing a Course (9 Aug. 57)*

161

ARC: a word made from the initial letters of affinity, reality and communication which together equate to understanding. These are the three things necessary to the understanding of something—one has to have some affinity for it, it has to be real to him to some degree and he needs some communication with it before he can understand it. For further information on ARC, read the book *Science of Survival* by L. Ron Hubbard. *If you've got a very figure-figure case and he wants to discuss a lot of things about it and the ARC would break down rather easily with it. . . -The Scale of Withhold (6 Aug. 57)*

ardures: a coined word meaning "difficulties." Formed from the word *arduous*, derived from Latin *ardu-us*, which means "high, steep, difficult." *And to add the ardures of duplication would almost murder him in his tracks.* —*Instructing a Course (9 Aug. 57)*

as-is: cause to vanish or cease to exist. This is accomplished by viewing something exactly as it is, without any distortions or lies. For further information see the Scientology Axioms in the book *Scientology 0-8: The Book of Basics*, by L. Ron Hubbard. *It actually is that mechanism which handles and as-ises surprise.* —*Ability—Laughter (2 Aug. 57)*

assists: simple, easily done processes that can be applied to anyone to help them recover more rapidly from accidents, mild illness or upsets. *You'll find out that you'll have to run many, many assists while you're working with athletes.* —*The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes (29 July 57)*

ILLUSION OR TRUTH LECTURE TRANSCRIPTS

auditor: a person trained and qualified in applying Dianetics and/or Scientology processes and procedures to individuals for their betterment; called an auditor because *auditor* means "one who listens." *Providing the auditor can't duplicate.* —*The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes* (29 July 57)

Auditor's Code: a collection of rules (do's and don'ts) that an auditor follows while auditing someone, which ensures that the preclear will get the greatest possible gain out of the processing that he is having. *On a Comm Course, when you're just starting out with new people, he's also supposed to grasp an Auditor's Code.* —*Instructing a Course* (9 Aug. 57)

automaticity: a thing one is doing but is unaware or only partially aware he is doing; something the individual has "on automatic." An *automaticity* is something which ought to be under the control of the individual, but isn't. *I mean, it wouldn't run as an automaticity because I found out something the other day that's very incredible.* — *The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes* (29 July 57)

Axioms: statements of natural laws on the order of those of the physical sciences. Full lists of the Axioms of Dianetics and Scientology are contained in the book *Scientology 0-8: The Book of Basics*, by L. Ron Hubbard. *I have known of an athlete simply reading the Axioms—they're not stupid as everybody believes; they just don't think much.* — *The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes* (29 July 57)

Babylon, hanging gardens of: gardens rising in a series of terraces from the river in the northern part of the ancient city of Babylon (capital of the former empire of Babylonia in southwest Asia, which flourished from 2100 to 538 B.C.). The gardens were square, four hundred feet on a side at the base, and were provided with earth deep enough to accommodate large trees. *We would be rewarded with the beautiful scene of a ladder reaching up to the top of the hanging gardens of Babylon, all first hundred rungs missing.* — *The Scale of Withhold* (6 Aug. 57)

backtrack: the area in time prior to a person's present life. *Then we're very surprised when somebody runs us on the backtrack and we find a blue object sitting there.* - *The Scale of Withhold* (6 Aug. 57)

baling wire: wire used to tightly pack and wrap large bundles, such as cotton, hay or straw, for shipping. *They are normally, at the beginning of a game, patched together with glue and baling wire.* —*The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes* (29 July 57)

bank: the mental image picture collection of a person. The term comes from computer terminology where all data is in a "bank." It is a combination of energy and significance which comprises a mass sitting in its own made-up space, plotted against the person's own experiential track. *See also mental image picture and preclear* in this glossary. *You'd say immediately, maybe, parts of your bank, but. . . I dare say the thing was set up at one time or another on a problem basis.* —*The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes* (29 July 57)

bearcat: (*colloquial*) someone or something remarkable, wonderful, superior, etc. *Now, these are bearcats.* — *The Scale of Withhold* (6 Aug. 57)

Beck, Dave: (1894-1993) American labor leader; president of the Teamster's Union from 1952 to 1957. . . . *this amount of child labor and so forth won't get in the road of the trade unions and Dave Becks and Hoffas and other people.* — *Confronting* (8 Aug. 57)

beingness: existence; condition or state of being. *Beingness* also refers to the assumption or choosing of a category of identity. Beingness can be assumed by oneself or given to oneself or attained. Examples of beingness would be one's own name, one's profession, one's physical characteristics, one's role in a game—each or all of these could be called one's beingness. To *grant beingness* means to allow others to have beingness. *Be very happy in the future to recommend individual auditors throughout the length and breadth of the country and be very happy to publish rosters as to their whereabouts and be very happy to grant them some beingness, something that has been lacking a bit in the past.* — *Ability — Laughter* (2 Aug. 57)

between-lives area: reference to one of the locations of a thetan during the period of time between lives. *And somebody said, "You'd said earlier that you had a process to run out between-lives area."* — *Instructing a Course* (9 Aug. 57)

Black and White: short for *Black and White Processing*, processing in which the auditor gets the preclear to turn energy flows black and white, the two extreme manifestations of perception on the part of the preclear. For further information, read the book *Scientology 8-8008* by L. Ron Hubbard. *See also processing* in this glossary. *I don't care whether it's Rising Scale Processing you were doing, you were running Black and White or dichotomies or anything else, there's two things you'd have to include in it.* — *The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes* (29 July 57)

163

black eighteen: a humorous, made-up designation for a case in very bad condition. Variation of *black five*: a heavily occluded case (one whose memories are usually largely hidden or made unavailable to conscious recall) which is characterized by mental pictures consisting of masses of blackness. The term came from application of a process wherein the auditor tested the preclear at each step of the process to find a step the preclear could do and began auditing at that step. A preclear who had to be started at Step V of the process was called a "Case V." This level of case could not get mock-ups but only blackness, hence *black five*. *If we can turn on a full-scale mock-up on that wall in complete, solid 3-D on anybody, including a black eighteen, in about ten to fifteen minutes of auditing, which he will then take five days, sometimes, to get rid of, we can realize that there's nothing wrong with his ability to mock up.* — *Ability—Laughter* (2 Aug. 57)

blow: (*informal*) leave suddenly. *And after a while they blow.* — *The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes* (29 July 57)

Bonnie: a staff member in the Washington, DC Scientology organization at the time of this lecture. *Bonnie went down to find somebody out of the Central Files for me.* — *Instructing a Course* (9 Aug. 57)

ILLUSION OR TRUTH LECTURE TRANSCRIPTS

Book One: *Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health*, the basic text on Dianetics techniques, written by L. Ron Hubbard and first published in 1950. It is also known as the *first book*. See also **Dianetics** in this glossary. *And finally, on the first day, they get the rudiments, the Axioms, Book One, Dianetics 55!, AP&A, and then they memorize, toward the end of that evening, all the Dianetic Axioms in case they might miss something. — Instructing a Course (9 Aug. 57)*

Boston preclear: a preclear from Boston, Massachusetts; humorous allusion to the reputation of Boston as a center of education and culture, hence that people from Boston are particular about such things as proper grammar. *And make sure it is "whom." We might have a Boston preclear on that and he wouldn't understand "Who could you reach with your voice?" — Surprise — The Anatomy of Sleep (31 July 57)*

broad "A": the letter "A" pronounced with the tongue held low and flat in the mouth, as in the word "father." *He really would be interested enough in doing this so he'd never get off onto some pet bent of his own and start riding a hobbyhorse down into the ground, such as that broad "A's" should only be used, something of this sort. — Instructing a Course (9 Aug. 57)*

Busy Business Bureau: humorous variation of *Better Business Bureau*: any of a nationwide system of local organizations, supported by business firms, whose stated function is to receive and investigate customer complaints of dishonest business practices. *For instance, there's some peanut-whistle outfit sets up a racket in the United States called the Busy Business Bureau. — The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes (29 July 57)*

button: an item, word, phrase, subject or area that causes response or reaction in an individual. *If you had that one button — this is what's wrong with the one-button process, don't you see — and you had just one button and you just pushed that one button on the case, bing, and the individual at once stood forth like Jupiter or something — Apollo, no less! — Ability — Laughter (2 Aug. 57)*

Cadillac: the brand name of a large American luxury car. *When we start up from stoplights and I no longer am passing this year's Oldsmobile, this year's Cadillac, this year's thisa — and we won't even call it Fords and Chevrolets. — CCH (7 Aug. 57)*

Cal Tech: short for *California Institute of Technology*, a privately controlled college of engineering and science, and research institute in Pasadena, California. *Aeronautical engineer graduates from Cal Tech or some other of the people's schools, and engineer starts in and you say to him, "Build an airplane." — Thinnies (1 Aug. 57)*

canceller: a contract with the preclear that whatever the auditor says will not become literally interpreted by the preclear or used by him in any way. It prevents accidental positive suggestion. A canceller is worded more or less as follows: "In the future, when I utter the word *cancelled*, everything which I have said to you while you are in a therapy session will be cancelled and will have no force with you. Any suggestion I have

made to you will be without force when I say the word *cancelled*." *Probably because I didn't put a canceller in ahead of it or something.* —*The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes (29 July 57)*

case: a general term for a person being treated or helped. *Case* also refers to a person's condition, which is monitored by the content of his reactive mind. A person's case is the way he responds to the world around him by reason of his aberrations. *Now, here's a good question: "What would be the optimum one-week intensive to give on a case where one week of CCH 1 and 2 would just begin to crack it?"* —*The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes (29 July 57)*

catatonic schiz: (*psychiatry*) short for *catatonic schizophrenic*, a very fancy word which means a person who is in a state where he lies still, stiff and never moves. *Catatonic* refers to a seizure in which a person becomes rigid and unconscious. A *schizophrenic* is a person suffering from *schizophrenia*, a major mental disorder typically characterized by a separation of the thought processes and the emotions, a distortion of reality accompanied by delusions and hallucinations, a fragmentation of the personality, motor (involving muscular movement) disturbances, bizarre behavior, etc. The word *schizophrenia* means "scissors" or "two" plus "head"—a two-head, in other words. *Catatonic schiz is just rigidly "no more surprises."* —*Surprise — The Anatomy of Sleep (31 July 57)*

165

cave in: collapse mentally and/or physically to the extent that one cannot function causatively. *Cave in* is a US Western phrase which symbolizes mental or physical collapse as being at the bottom of a mine shaft or in a tunnel when the supports collapsed and left a person under tons of debris. *They'll cave in after a while.* —*Ability—Laughter (2 Aug. 57)*

CCH A: one of two sections of the 18th Advanced Clinical Course which taught the CCH processes. The first of the CCH processes were taught in the section called CCH A, the remainder in CCH B. Though students had to complete both sections, they could be started in either CCH A or CCH B. *See also CCH processes* in this glossary. *Much beefier than was being run in the CCH A course.* —*Instructing a Course (9 Aug. 57)*

CCH processes: abbreviation for Control, Communication, Havingness processes: a series of Objective Processes—counseling procedures which help a person to look or place his attention outward from himself. *Objective* refers to outward things, not the thoughts or feelings of the individual. Objective Processes deal with the real and observable. They call for the person to spot or find something exterior to himself in order to carry out the procedures. CCHs are specifically designed to bring a person into better control of his body and surroundings, put him into better communication with his surroundings and other people, and increase his ability to have things for himself. They bring him into the present, away from his past problems. For further information see HCOB 11 June 57, Training and CCH Processes in *Technical Bulletins* Volume IV, and HCOB 1 Dec. 65, CCHs in *Technical Bulletins* Volume VII. [*Definition of CCH A*] *one of two sections of the 18th Advanced Clinical Course which taught the CCH processes.*

CCH 0: a set of actions done at the start of an auditing session to assist the preclear's participation in the session and to assist the auditor in ARC.

ILLUSION OR TRUTH LECTURE TRANSCRIPTS

The purpose of CCH 0 is to make known the beginning of a session to a preclear and the auditor so that no error as to its beginning is made; to put the preclear in a condition to be audited. *See also CCH processes and ARC in this glossary. The best thing to do with an intensive here today—by which we mean a twenty-five-hour, straight-at-it series of processes—would probably be the first of the CCH, which is CCH 0, followed by a good test pass here of CCH 1, CCH 2, CCH 3, CCH 4, CCH 1.* -*The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes (29 July 57)*

CCH 1: Tone 40 "Give Me Your Hand," a Scientology process used to demonstrate to the preclear that control of his body is possible, and to invite him to directly control it. For further information see HCOB 11 June 57, Training and CCH Processes, in *Technical Bulletins* Volume IV. *Now, here's a good question: "What would be the optimum one-week intensive to give on a case where one week of CCH 1 and 2 would just begin to crack it?"* — *The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes (29 July 57)*

CCH 2: Tone 40 8-C, a Scientology process used to demonstrate to the preclear that his body can be controlled, orient him in his present time environment and increase his ability to duplicate. For further information see HCOB 1 Dec. 65, CCHs, in *Technical Bulletins* Volume VII. *Now, here's a good question: "What would be the optimum one-week intensive to give on a case where one week of CCH 1 and 2 would just begin to crack it?"* —*The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes (29 July 57)*

CCH 3: Hand Space Mimicry, a Scientology process used to develop reality on the auditor and get the preclear into communication by control and duplication. For further information see HCOB 1 Dec. 65, CCHs, in *Technical Bulletins* Volume VII. *The best thing to do with an intensive here today —by which we mean a twenty-five-hour, straight-at-it series of processes — would probably be the first of the CCH, which is CCH 0, followed by a good test pass here of CCH 1, CCH 2, CCH 3, CCH 4, CCH 1.* — *The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes (29 July 57)*

CCH 4: Book Mimicry, a Scientology process used to bring up the preclear's communication with control and duplication (control and duplication = communication). For further information see HCOB 1 Dec. 65, CCHs, in *Technical Bulletins* Volume VII. *The best thing to do with an intensive here today — by which we mean a twenty-five-hour, straight-at-it series of processes — would probably be the first of the CCH, which is CCH 0, followed by a good test pass here of CCH 1, CCH 2, CCH 3, CCH 4, CCH 1.* — *The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes (29 July 57)*

CCH 9: a process, also called Tone 40 "Keep It from Going Away." Its purpose is to increase the preclear's havingness and improve his ability to keep things from going away, which ability lost, accounts for the possession of psychosomatic ills. For further information see **CCH processes** in this glossary, as well as HCOB 11 June 57, Training and CCH Processes, in *Technical Bulletins* Volume IV. *Because I could point out to you, over here on your —CCH 9, Tone 40 Keep It from Going Away, is withhold.* — *The Scale of Withhold (6 Aug. 57)*

CCH 10: a process, also called Tone 40 "Hold It Still." Its purpose includes improving the preclear's ability to control his environment. For further information see **CCH processes** in this glossary, as well as HCOB 11 June 57, Training and CCH Processes, in *Technical Bulletins Volume IV*. *And that's why these three processes, CCH 9, 10 and 11, are where they are and are run in this fashion.* — *The Scale of Withhold* (6 Aug. 57)

CCH 11: a process, also called Tone 40 "Make It a Little More Solid." Its purpose includes increasing the preclear's havingness. For further information see **CCH processes** in this glossary, as well as HCOB 11 June 57, Training and CCH Processes, in *Technical Bulletins Volume IV*. *And that's why these three processes, CCH 9, 10 and 11, are where they are and are run in this fashion.* — *The Scale of Withhold* (6 Aug. 57)

CDEI Scale: a gradient scale consisting of the points Curiosity, Desire, Enforce and Inhibit. For further information see *Scientology 0-8: The Book of Basics*, by L. Ron Hubbard. *You have to —the anatomy of a problem would consist, first, of an inspection of the CDEI Scale.* — *The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes* (29 July 57)

Central Files: the files in a Scientology organization which contain all pertinent data about and correspondence with the organization's public. *Bonnie went down to find somebody out of the Central Files for me.* — *Instructing a Course* (9 Aug. 57)

167

Central Organization: the name given, at the time of the lecture, to a Scientology organization which provided services (training, auditing and certification) to the public. *Neither the organization in the field nor the Central Organization was actually there.* — *Ability—Laughter* (2 Aug. 57)

Chart of Attitudes: a chart which contains the major difficulties people have. It shows the attitudes towards life taken by people, and comes with the book *Handbook for Preclears* by L. Ron Hubbard. The chart consists of twelve columns with positive attitudes at the top of each column (such as "Survives," "Right," "Fully Responsible," etc.) and negative attitudes at the bottom (such as "Dead," "Wrong," "No Responsibility," etc.) and a gradient scale in between. For further information see the book *Scientology 8-8008* by L. Ron Hubbard. [*Definition of Rising Scale Processing*] *processing in which one takes any point or column of the Chart of Attitudes which the preclear can reach, and asks the preclear then to shift his postulate upwards toward a higher level.*

Chevrolet: the name of a popular American car manufactured by General Motors. *When we start up from stoplights and I no longer am passing this year's Oldsmobile, this year's Cadillac, this year's thisa — and we won't even call it Fords and Chevrolets.* — *CCH* (7 Aug. 57)

clawfest: (*colloquial*) a rough hand-to-hand fight; from *claw* and *-fest*, meaning "celebration," used to form colloquial and slang words. *He would have just had a knockdown-drag-out clawfest; it just would have been a tug-of-war to end all tug-of-wars, with enormous amount of power being put into it and a terrific amount of caterwaul.* — *The Scale of Withhold* (6 Aug. 57)

ILLUSION OR TRUTH LECTURE TRANSCRIPTS

Clear: the name of a state achieved through auditing or an individual who has achieved this state. A Clear is a being who no longer has his own reactive mind. He is an unaberrated person and is rational in that he forms the best possible solutions he can on the data he has and from his viewpoint. *[Definition of preclear] a person not yet Clear, hence pre-Clear; generally, a person being audited.*

closure: the phenomenon of terminals collapsing into each other or becoming identified, one with the other. *As we solve a problem over and over and over, get more and more solutions to a problem, we'll find out we get closure with the problem. — Thinnies (1 Aug. 57)*

Coanda, Henri: (1885-1972) French aeronautical engineer and inventor. *Well, there's a fellow down here, Henri Coanda, who's done a considerable study on that... — Thinnies (1 Aug. 57)*

Code of a Scientologist: a code which governs the activity of a Scientologist in general. It was evolved from many years of observation and experience and is supported by leading Scientologists. The code is included in the book *Scientology 0-8: The Book of Basics*, by L. Ron Hubbard. *You'd say, "Well, here's the Code of a Scientologist—should have some vague working knowledge of this situation. —Instructing a Course (9 Aug. 57)*

168

cognition: a new realization of life. Cognitions result in higher degrees of awareness and consequently greater abilities to succeed with one's endeavors in life. A cognition is a "What do you know, I..." statement. *Finally had this tremendous cognition. — The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes (29 July 57)*

comm bridging: using a *communication bridge*: a procedure employed by an auditor in starting a new process and changing from one process to another. In the first part of a communication bridge, the preclear has an auditing question discussed with him by the auditor and the wording agreed upon. The auditor also covers what he is going to have the preclear do and gets the preclear's agreement for these things to be done. In the second part, when the auditor is changing from one process to another, he uses the communication bridge to close off the process that he is running on a preclear, maintain ARC and open up the new process on which he is about to embark. *You know, starting him into session, comm bridging him from process to process and taking him out of session smoothly and so on. — CCH (7 Aug. 57)*

Comm Course: short for *Communication Course*, a course in which one gains the ability to effectively communicate with others. The Comm Course was included as part of the 18th ACC. *She used to beat this into the Comm Course and so forth, and I feel like I'm exposing a secret weapon that she had, to give you the answer to this. —Ability—Laughter (2 Aug. 57)*

comm lag: short for *communication lag*, the length of time intervening between the asking of the question by the auditor and the reply to that specific question by the preclear. The question must be precise; the reply must be precisely to that question. It does not matter what intervenes in the time between the asking of the question and the receipt of the

answer. The preclear may outflow, jabber, discuss, pause, hedge, disperse, dither or be silent; no matter what he does or how he does it, between the asking of the question and the giving of the answer, the *time* is the communication lag. *But if he was doing extremely well, was developing little comm lags of one kind or another, I would just go ahead and audit straight out from my assurance that he had found the auditor, the auditing room, was willing to reach.* — *The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes (29 July 57)*

communotomy: a humorous made-up name for a technical subject. *"It's all been disproved by modern communotomy!"* — *Ability—Laughter (2 Aug. 57)*

computation: the aberrated evaluation and postulate that one must be consistently in a certain state in order to succeed. A computation thus may mean that one must entertain in order to be alive or that one must be dignified in order to succeed or that one must own much in order to live. *See also aberrated and postulate* in this glossary. *[Definition of service facsimile] a computation generated by the individual to make self right and others wrong, to dominate or escape domination and to enhance own survival and injure that of others.*

confront: face without flinching or avoiding. *Confront* is actually the ability to be there comfortably and perceive. *"Does confront mean confront with something, like a body, or can a little old thetan confront all by his lonesome?"* — *Ability—Laughter (2 Aug. 57)*

congress: an assembly of Scientologists held in any of various cities around the world for a presentation of Dianetics and/or Scientology materials. Many congresses were addressed directly by Ron. Others were based upon taped LRH lectures or films on a particular subject. *I do this very often after a congress.* — *Surprise —The Anatomy of Sleep (31 July 57)*

Connectedness: a Scientology process used to help remedy a preclear who has disconnected himself to some degree from present time. For further information see *Scientology Clear Procedure, Issue One*, in *Technical Bulletins Volume IV. Old Start-C-S, just run that way, interspersed with Connectedness.* — *Ability—Laughter (2 Aug. 57)*

crick: (*dialect*) a creek; small stream. *There's a dead man over there, there's a girl dumped down there in the crick.* — *Death (30 July 57)*

cropper, come a: (*informal*) fail; be struck by some misfortune. *Doesn't make sense in view of the fact that it is so numerous and the body's cells are so numerous that we come a cropper at once.* — *Death (30 July 57)*

cycle of action: the sequence that an action goes through, wherein the action is started, is continued for as long as is required and then is completed as planned. *Now, if that's a cycle of action, I don't want one.* — *Confronting (8 Aug. 57)*

Das Kapital: a work written in 1867 by Karl Marx (German political philosopher, 1818-1883), dealing with economic, social and political relations within society and containing the tenets on which modern communism is based. *Das Kapital* is German for *the capital*. *And this inspired him to go back and write Das Kapital.* — *The Future of Scientology (16 Aug. 57)*

ILLUSION OR TRUTH LECTURE TRANSCRIPTS

Definition by Agreement: a procedure in which a definition of a term is read to a group, after which the group is asked to define the term until the group arrives at an agreement on a definition. *And the only thing that is done in that course is the basic definitions of existence, as contained in Scientology: Fundamentals of Thought, in Definition by Agreement. — Instructing a Course (9 Aug. 57)*

Detroit, story about: reference to an incident in Detroit, Michigan in early 1953, when police, sent on false premises, seized tape recordings of LRH lectures from a Detroit Scientology organization with instructions to find something on which to make a case against the organization; they could find no wrongdoing and the matter was dismissed. *You remember the story about Detroit? —The Future of Scientology (16 Aug. 57)*

Dianetics: comes from the Greek words *dia*, meaning "through" and *nous*, meaning "soul." Dianetics is a methodology developed by L. Ron Hubbard which can help alleviate such things as unwanted sensations and emotions, irrational fears and psychosomatic illnesses. It is most accurately described as *what the soul is doing to the body through the mind. The whole subject of death has been one of the more mysterious subjects to man and it has only been in Scientology itself—not in Dianetics —it's only been in Scientology that the mechanisms of death and so forth have been thoroughly understood. —Death (30 July 57)*

170

Dianetics 1955!: reference to the book *Dianetics 55!* by L. Ron Hubbard, which deals with the fundamental principles of communication. *Communication in Dianetics 1955! was better delineated. —CCH (7 Aug. 57)*

Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health: the basic text on Dianetics techniques, written by L. Ron Hubbard and first published in 1950. *And you will discover a dissertation on what it did and what it does in Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health. —Thinnies (1 Aug. 57)*

diaphragm: reference to the iris, the round membrane surrounding the pupil—the circular opening at the center of each eye. The iris has muscles which regulate the size of the pupil and so control the amount of light entering the eye. *I felt my eyes snakk and pow-w-w and the diaphragms dilated like that and I put the body in a chair and went over and sat on the molding for a while and let it get over it. —Surprise —The Anatomy of Sleep (31 July 57)*

dichotomies: pairs of opposites, such as black-white, good-evil, love-hate. Dichotomies are used in some types of processing. *I don't care whether it's Rising Scale Processing you were doing, you were running Black and White or dichotomies or anything else, there's two things you'd have to include in it. — The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes (29 July 57)*

dog off: (*slang*) avoid hard work, thought, or creating; make no or only slight effort. Variation of *dog it*. *We could run Locational so that we're asking a thetan to confront the walls while moving a body around, we would have the attention of the thetan himself under control and he himself would not dog off very badly. — Confronting (8 Aug. 57)*

dramatizing: repeating in action what has happened to one in experience; replaying now something that happened then. *Dramatization* is the duplication of an engramic content, entire or in part, by a person in his present time environment. The degree of dramatization is in direct ratio to the degree of restimulation of the mental image pictures causing it. When dramatizing, the individual is like an actor playing his dictated part and going through a whole series of irrational actions. *And most athletes get hung up in the ridges of counterposition to such a degree that they start dramatizing the past games and they become, therefore, problems.* — *The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes* (29 July 57)

Dresden doll: a doll made in Dresden, a city in Germany famous for its production of porcelain and china, including, during the late 1800s, elaborate dolls with china heads. ... *and end of session would be picking up his legs in one corner of the room, his arms in another and gluing his head back on like a Dresden doll.* — *Instructing a Course* (9 Aug. 57)

driv': (*dialect*) driven. *And the French objected and more and more people were brought in on the thing and finally, why, these cattle rustlers got driv' off.* — *The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes* (29 July 57)

drop-center: having an indentation in the center (of a wheel), designed to make it easier to mount or remove a tire. If a wheel has no drop-center, the tire must be stretched further in order to move it over the wheel's rim. See illustration. *They were working on a curb and they had a —in the old days automobile rims were not drop-center.* — *The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes* (29 July 57)

171



Wheel without drop-center



Wheel with drop-center

drowse-all: humorous made-up name for a type of sedative. *Now, hypnotics, taking hypnotics —Nytol, amphibinol, snooze-all, drowse-all, those things don't work.* — *Surprise —The Anatomy of Sleep* (31 July 57)

DScn: Doctor of Scientology, an honor award in the 1950s which could be made by nomination or selection for those who consistently produced excellent results in their own field. *And that is that an old time DScn, Peggy Conway, whom many of you know, passed away in Pretoria, South Africa yesterday from a sudden stroke.* — *Death* (30 July 57)

dwindling spiral: a condition characterized by continuous worsening, decreasing or shrinking. So *the whole of the dwindling spiral depends upon unfinished comm cycles.* — *CCH* (7 Aug. 57)

ILLUSION OR TRUTH LECTURE TRANSCRIPTS

dynamic: one of the eight urges (drives, impulses) in life. They are motives or motivations. We call them the eight dynamics. These are urges for survival as or through (1) self, (2) sex and family, (3) groups, (4) all mankind, (5) living things (plants and animals), (6) the material universe, (7) spirits and (8) infinity or the Supreme Being. *To understand this completely you would have to realize that the basis of war comes about through the fact that a third dynamic isn't a terminal.* —Ability—Laughter (2 Aug. 57)

Effect Scale: a scale which tells one how much cause an individual dare be, by measuring how much effect he's willing to suffer. At the top of the scale the individual can give or receive any effect, and at the bottom of the scale he can receive no effects but still feels he must give a total effect. For further information, see *Scientology 0-8: The Book of Basics* by L. Ron Hubbard. *And when you encourage him to shout, he really never does learn the elements of the Effect Scale.* —Instructing a Course (9 Aug. 57)

8-C: the name of both a Scientology process and a training drill (Training Routine 6). The term is also commonly used in Scientology to mean good control or the action of applying good control to someone. For further information see HCOB 11 June 1957, Training and CCH Processes in *Technical Bulletins* Volume IV. *And we found that old-time 8-C becomes utterly silly, after a while, on this basis: we say, "Look at that wall" and then insist the fellow turn his head.* — CCH (7 Aug. 57)

172

8-80: short for *Scientology 8-80*, a book written by L. Ron Hubbard in 1952 which contains his discoveries and methods of increasing life energy in man. The 8-8 stands for "infinity-infinity" upright and the 0 represents the static, theta. *See also theta* in this glossary. *You know the base of the motor that I used to talk about that's still talked about in 8-80? -The Scale of Withhold* (6 Aug. 57)

Emanator: an incident that contains a large, glowing body of radioactive material which hangs magically in thin air, a sort of a god, an all-knower. The outward pulsing of this body puts one into a trance. *By the way, we had this on Earth, which was a dramatization of the Emanator: it's the Mohammedan lodestone that was at Mecca.* — *The Scale of Withhold* (6 Aug. 57)

E-Meter: short for *electrometer*; an electronic device for measuring the mental state or change of state of *Homo sapiens*. It is *not* a lie detector. It does not diagnose or cure anything. It is used by auditors to assist the preclear in locating areas of spiritual distress or travail. *Oh, E-Meters, checking up with people, checking into children and so on.* —Death (30 July 57)

engram: a mental image picture of an experience containing pain, unconsciousness and a real or fancied threat to survival. It is a recording in the reactive mind of something which actually happened to an individual in the past and which contained pain and unconsciousness, both of which are recorded in the engram. It must, by definition, have impact or injury as part of its content. Engrams are a complete recording, down to the last accurate detail, of every perception present in a moment of partial or full unconsciousness. *See also mental image picture and reactive mind* in this glossary. *And yet that's why people hold on to impact engrams: fear of loss; fear they will lose a body.* — *The Scale of Withhold* (6 Aug. 57)

entheta: short for *enturbulated theta*, theta which is turbulent, or agitated and disturbed. *See also theta* in this glossary. *They talk obsessively, they interrupt people, they spread entheta around, they raise hell. —Instructing a Course (9 Aug. 57)*

enturbulated: made turbulent or agitated and disturbed. *And if that guy's going to blow, you want him to blow early, not when he's enturbulated everybody in the group. —Instructing a Course (9 Aug. 57)*

expulsed: expelled; drove out; ejected. *As a matter of fact, the Egyptians used to fight with the tax collectors, the tax collectors fought with the Egyptians, and they finally expulsed them. —Confronting (8 Aug. 57)*

exteriorize: move (as a spirit) out of the body; place distance between oneself and the body. *One doesn't have to be carried along to a point of where he exteriorizes in processing in order to get a reality on it. —Death (30 July 57)*

Fac One machine: a machine involved in an incident known as Facsimile One, or the "coffee grinder." The machine loosely resembled a camera (boxlike, two-handled, with an exit hole for blasts in front and a peek hole in back) and administered a push-pull force beam to the body. This was used by a group on the whole track to tame populations. Used humorously in the lecture. *Now, we have a very, very good party coming up here tonight and I am now going upstairs and arrange a Fac One machine so I can get all of your pictures, because I wanted to get the class pictures. —The Future of Scientology (16 Aug. 57)*

173

facsimile: a recording in energy of an incident or part of an incident from the past. The facsimile contains all the perceptics of the original. It is an involuntary duplicate or copy (*not* a perfect duplicate). *And you can turn on in most preclears —you can make him find around the body horrible facsimiles of dark, dark night, little algae bobbing on the sea and horrendous waves coming up and some shore with the breakers roaring, and he doesn't like that. —Surprise —The Anatomy of Sleep (31 July 57)*

Fairhope, Alabama: a small town in southwestern Alabama. *They consider as a high priority of business the appointment of the postmaster of Fairhope, Alabama, you see? —Surprise—The Anatomy of Sleep (31 July 57)*

FC: abbreviation for Founding Church, referring to the Founding Church of Scientology in Washington, DC (District of Columbia). *I have been given the datum that in the past it was the policy of the FC staff to recommend only auditor processing under your supervision. —Ability—Laughter (2 Aug. 57)*

figure-figure: a coined term describing a particular type of aberration consisting of always having to have a "reason for" or a significance. Given a fact, there must always be a reason for the fact. Hence we get figure-figure. *If you've got a very figure-figure case and he wants to discuss a lot of things about it and the ARC would break down rather easily with it, but you can control his thoughts to the degree of running this because it's a thinkingness process, you understand, why, you better run it Formal. —The Scale of Withhold (6 Aug. 57)*

ILLUSION OR TRUTH LECTURE TRANSCRIPTS

flatten: bring (a case) to a condition in which it no longer shows or produces change or reaction to a process. Also, to continue a process to the point where it no longer produces change in the preclear. *Now, Locational might itself—run ninety hours—might or might not flatten a case. —The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes (29 July 57)*

Ford: a car manufactured by the Ford Motor Company, a US automaking company founded in 1903 by American inventor and businessman Henry Ford. *When we start up from stoplights and I no longer am passing this year's Oldsmobile, this year's Cadillac, this year's thisa—and we won't even call it Fords and Chevrolets. -CCH (7 Aug. 57)*

Formal Auditing: a type of auditing which involves control of the preclear by ARC (as compared to *Tone 40 Auditing*, which is control by direct, Tone 40 command). Formal Auditing is not chatty; it has warmth, humanity, understanding and interest in it. *See also Tone 40* in this glossary. *These things can be run by Formal Auditing and are not necessarily Tone 40. -The Scale of Withhold (6 Aug. 57)*

174

.45 automatic: a pistol which loads automatically and fires each time the trigger is pulled, with nothing further required of the shooter. The .45 refers to the caliber, or diameter of the bullet, which is .45 inch. *But it is true that individuals at any level to some degree keep a finger on loaded .45 automatics when they're in the room, you know, they're —just keep the finger away from them, push them away. —Surprise —The Anatomy of Sleep (31 July 57)*

Foundation: any one of the first organizations of Dianetics in the early 1950s. *Now, looking this over we find out that the main difficulty with the Foundations, in enfranchising field organizations to do anything, was the same difficulty I have just outlined between Finland and France. —Ability—Laughter (2 Aug. 57)*

Freedom Congress: a congress given by L. Ron Hubbard from 4 July through 7 July 1957 in Washington, DC. *You saw the two processes—actually two hours of tape in the congress just past, the Freedom Congress—contain about the hottest processes developed out of pressures. —Ability—Laughter (2 Aug. 57)*

Frigidaire: (*trademark*) the brand name of an electric refrigerator which came to be a common term for any refrigerator. *He does not build a new body in this lazy time of manufactured items and Frigidaires and so on. —Death (30 July 57)*

fumble-dumble: (*slang*) a coined expression meaning bungle; be clumsy in work or action. . . . *for some modern witch doctor to fumble-dumble along and put something off on the public and then to get a serious review in Newsweek magazine, tells me it's darker than I thought. —Ability—Laughter (2 Aug. 57)*

Gadsden Purchase: about 19,000,000 acres of desert land in Arizona and New Mexico which the United States bought from Mexico for \$10,000,000 by a treaty signed June 30, 1854. The American minister to Mexico, James

Gadsden of South Carolina, negotiated the treaty in order to acquire a favorable route for a proposed southern transcontinental railroad to the Pacific. *It happened down in the Gadsden Purchase.* —*The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes* (29 July 57)

games condition: a state in which a person has a game. A game consists of freedom, barriers and purposes, and there is a necessity in a game to have an opponent or an enemy. Also, there is a necessity to have problems, and enough individuality to cope with a situation. For further information see the book *Scientology: The Fundamentals of Thought* by L. Ron Hubbard. *And then you have to work on them on a games condition and you really have to teach them games and what no-game conditions are and games.* —*The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes* (29 July 57)

GE: abbreviation for genetic entity, that beingness not dissimilar to the thetan that has carried forward and developed the body from its earliest moments along the evolutionary line on Earth and which, through experience, necessity and natural selection, has employed the counter-efforts of the environment to fashion an organism of the type best fitted for survival, limited only by the abilities of the GE. *See also thetan* in this glossary. *Now, in view of the fact that two exteriorizations take place, this could get very complicated as one looked at it — because the GE exteriorizes.* —*Death* (30 July 57)

175

General Electric: short for *General Electric Company*, a large US manufacturer. The company produces a wide variety of devices for the generation, transmission, distribution, control, measurement and consumption of electric energy, and maintains numerous research laboratories. *General Electric has some lightning that they group together into the symbols "GE" on the television screen and say, "Our most important product is progress."* -CCH (7 Aug. 57)

General Motors: a major American automobile manufacturer. *The president of General Motors can think a thought that all the wives of stockholders should get roses, and the roses appear.* —*The Scale of Withhold* (6 Aug. 57)

glass poisoning: poisoning caused by the dissolving (and drinking) of poisonous compounds sometimes used in ceramic glazes on cups, mugs, pitchers, etc. *He goes home, sits down in the kitchen, drinks a cup of coffee and dies of glass poisoning.* —*Surprise* —*The Anatomy of Sleep* (31 July 57)

Gog: (*biblical*) the personification of one of the nations (Gog and Magog) that, with Satan, are to war against the kingdom of God. *He comes to harm because of it, his abilities go to pieces, his penalties and that sort of thing all accumulate on him, everything he's done wrong he's carrying around in a little picture to remind himself how guilty he is so he'll shed three drops on the altar of Gog or whatever religion he happens to be in.* -*The Scale of Withhold* (6 Aug. 57)

gone dog: one of various colloquial phrases that start with "a gone ____" and denote someone who is hopelessly done for or in a hopeless situation. *A gone goose, a gone beaver, a gone coon, a gone horse and a gone gander*

ILLUSION OR TRUTH LECTURE TRANSCRIPTS

are other examples of these phrases which all have the same meaning. *He gets no willingness to perform, he feels there is no reward, he won't perform, he's a gone dog right away.* — *The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes* (29 July 57)

goon squad: (*slang*) assistant(s) to an auditor delivering Group Processing, working individually with group members who are having difficulty with the process being run. The term is a humorous use of "goon squad" as slang for "police" or a group of thugs. *See also Group Processing* in this glossary. *And if you're doing it, just two auditors doing it, your goon squad of course can be somebody who is very untried and who knows very little about it.* — *Instructing a Course* (9 Aug. 57)

Group Processing: Scientology auditing techniques administered to groups of children or adults. *And he had a Group Processing session going on, really, on a sort of a two-way comm basis.* — *The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes* (29 July 57)

Gulf, the: the Gulf of Mexico, an arm of the Atlantic Ocean east of Mexico and south of the United States. *Well, as a matter of fact, there are very few hurricanes gathering in the Gulf at the present moment.* — *Ability — Laughter* (2 Aug. 57)

176

GW: abbreviation for George Washington University: a large university (where L. Ron Hubbard studied engineering during the 1930s) located in Washington, DC, capital of the US. *Somebody down here at GW in the psychology department—I don't think I could be around their rat mazes more than two or three weeks without finding there was some curve in it.* — *Factors Behind the Handling of IQ* (5 Aug. 57)

half-life: the length of time it takes for half the nuclei in a particular radioactive substance to break down or decay. Scientists can estimate the age of an object, such as a rock, by carefully measuring the amounts of decayed and undecayed nuclei in the object. Comparing that to the half-life of the nuclei tells when they started to decay, and, therefore, how old the object is. *The mathematical computation involved would require as many lives back as there are cells in the body and we have so grandly exceeded the half-life of this universe (which is rather easily computable in numbers of ways) . . .* — *Death* (30 July 57)

Halpern, Jan: one of the instructors of the 18th ACC. *Now, surprise is the modus operandi, evidently, behind aberration because the first thing that a thetan wants to have anything do with—and as Jan Halpern once said, he mocks up a little black box and looks into the little black box to see if there's anything in it and there's something in it, why, he's surprised.* — *Surprise — The Anatomy of Sleep* (31 July 57)

HAS Course: abbreviation for Hubbard Apprentice Scientologist Course: a beginning course in Scientology at the time of the lecture. It consisted of training drills on communication and control. *So you can just take just one Instructor and run a whole HAS Course over and over and over and over.* — *Instructing a Course* (9 Aug. 57)

hat: a Scientology slang term for a particular job or area of responsibility, taken from the fact that in many professions, such as railroading, the type of hat worn is the badge of the job. The term *hat* is also used to describe the write-ups, checksheets and packs that outline the purposes, know-how and duties of a specific job or function in a Scientology organization. *Now then, myself or those people who have this in charge here —that's their hat, you see. —Ability—Laughter (2 Aug. 57)*

"have," "permit to remain," and "dispense with": reference to the three commands of a process known as "Trio": "Look around the room and tell me what you could have." "Look around the room and tell me something you would permit to remain." "Look around the room and tell me what you could dispense with." *See also Trio* in this glossary. *"How does 'handle' relate to 'have,' 'permit to remain,' and 'dispense with'?" —Ability —Laughter (2 Aug. 57)*

havingness: the concept of being able to reach. By *havingness* we mean owning, possessing, being capable of commanding, taking charge of objects, energies and spaces. *Havingness* also refers to various processes which increase the preclear's *havingness*. *And you take some Homo sap some place or another and you say to him—he's sitting down in the restaurant—you can produce some of the more interesting effects, tap him on the shoulder as you go by his table and bend over and say, "Sit there and eat your dinner. Good." —CCH (7 Aug. 57)*

177

Havingness Process: any of a number of Scientology auditing processes designed to increase the preclear's affinity, reality and communication with the environment, and to increase his ability to reach and get him stabilized in his environment. *See also havingness* in this glossary. *You consider it a Havingness Process, but he has to think the thought, "Yes, I can have that". . . —The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes (29 July 57)*

havingness remedied, having: being run on Remedy of Havingness: a Scientology auditing process that has a preclear mock up a mass in front of him and shove it into his body, and mock up another mass in front of him and throw it away, over and over. When the process has been done thoroughly and completely, the preclear should be able to reject or accept, at his own discretion, anything in his environment as well as anything in his engram bank. *Now, an individual then, in having havingness remedied with blackness, will usually go anaten. —Surprise —The Anatomy of Sleep (31 July 57)*

high C: a relatively high pitch. *A little further along the line, he was crying at high C and very upset and his fever fluctuating all over the place and he said no, he didn't want any processing. —Surprise —The Anatomy of Sleep (31 July 57)*

Hitler: Adolf Hitler (1889-1945), Austrian-born political leader of Germany; served as a corporal in the Bavarian Army during World War I; dictator of Germany from 1933 to 1945. In rising to power in Germany, he fortified his position through murder of real or imagined opponents and maintained police-state control over the population. He led Germany into World War II resulting in its nearly total destruction. He is also known

ILLUSION OR TRUTH LECTURE TRANSCRIPTS

for killing millions of Jewish people in the belief that they would contaminate the German people. *Hitler—Hitler on the Western Front as a corporal, this young Austrian upstart had a few too many shells land too close . . . —Surprise —The Anatomy of Sleep (31 July 57)*

Illinois Western: a made-up name for a financial institution. *And fellows think it'd spoil the game if they mocked up perfect Illinois Western bonds redeemable at face value at any bank, US Saving Certificates of one kind or another, just mocked them up and piled them. — The Scale of Withhold (6 Aug. 57)*

implant: an enforced command or series of commands installed in the reactive mind below the awareness level of the individual to cause him to react or behave in a prearranged way without his "knowing it." *And he gets mixed up into electronic ridges and implants and stuck in again. — Confronting (8 Aug. 57)*

Instructor: the person in charge of a Scientology course and its students. The job of the Instructor is to ensure that his students duplicate, understand and apply the materials of the course being studied. *But the Instructors in this ACC have been very, very strongly against too much "how to do it" with too little point, which confused the student. —Ability — Laughter (2 Aug. 57)*

178

intensive: a specific number of hours of auditing given to a preclear over a short period of time, as a series of successive sessions at regularly scheduled intervals. *Now, here's a good question: "What would be the optimum one-week intensive to give on a case where one week of CCH 1 and 2 would just begin to crack it?" —The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes (29 July 57)*

Internal Revenue: a division of the US Department of the Treasury, established in 1862. It is responsible for the assessment and collection of federal taxes other than those on alcohol, tobacco, firearms and explosives. It collects most of its revenues through the individual and corporate income tax. *For instance, the government has long since exceeded "enough" with Internal Revenue. — Confronting (8 Aug. 57)*

in the chips: (*slang*) in a good state or condition. "Chips" is a slang term for money. *And when we got back to that, why, we knew we were in the chips on that question. —Factors Behind the Handling of IQ (5 Aug. 57)*

jambled: jumbled; mixed up. *They're all jumbled up in the book, too. — Confronting (8 Aug. 57)*

joggle-pated: muddled; confused. Variation of *addle-pated*. *Pate* is a term for the head, or the brain or intellect. *And all of the chaos which he has been handled has got him so joggle-pated that he doesn't understand that things don't have to be horrible, terrible, miserable or dramatic in order to be confronted. — Confronting (8 Aug. 57)*

kicked the stuffings out of: thrashed thoroughly. *And just kicked the stuffings out of the fellow who killed him. —Death (30 July 57)*

Kingdom is at hand, the: reference to a statement made by Jesus Christ when he first began to preach: "Repent: for the Kingdom of heaven is at hand." *I have repented because the Kingdom is at hand, and all is well.* - *The Future of Scientology* (16 Aug. 57)

knockdown-drag-out: (*US slang*) characterized by great violence, especially hand-to-hand; rough; violent; raging. *He would have just had a knockdown-drag-out clawfest; it just would have been a tug-of-war to end all tug-of-wars, with enormous amount of power being put into it and a terrific amount of caterwaul.* —*The Scale of Withhold* (6 Aug. 57)

Kokokomo: a made-up name for a place. *There was a good auditor, let us say, in Kokokomo.* —*Ability—Laughter* (2 Aug. 57)

lead-pipe cinch: (*slang*) a doubly sure or doubly easy thing. *Lead pipe* refers to a midwestern and western US form of galvanized iron pipe (which looks as if it were lead). For saddling and cinching (fixing a saddle securely) the sort of horse that expands its belly, a short length of this so-called lead pipe was slipped under the saddle strap and turned like a tourniquet, the work assisted by a few knee jabs in the belly. Thus the horse was forced to deflate and the saddle was cinched tight, that horse now being double (lead-pipe) cinched. *So you have to go up a gradient scale of withhold in order to stay apart or out of a trap or out of a valence.* *Lead-pipe cinch.* — *Factors Behind the Handling of IQ* (5 Aug. 57)

179

Life magazine: a publication that contains many photographs and articles of current activities. *They're going to say, "That's all made in Hollywood, son; you better quit," or "carried in Life magazine."* — *The Scale of Withhold* (6 Aug. 57)

line charge: a period of sudden laughter, often uncontrollable, that a preclear experiences in a session and that results from the relief of painful emotion. *The mechanism of line charges is quite interesting.* —*Ability — Laughter* (2 Aug. 57)

Locational Processing: a type of Scientology auditing in which the auditor has the preclear notice objects and people in the environment. The object of Locational Processing is to establish an adequacy of communication terminals in the environment of the preclear. It can be run in busy thoroughfares, graveyards, confused traffic or anywhere there is or is not motion of objects and people. At the time of the lecture, Locational Processing was used as a training process, numbered "Training 10." For further information, see HCOB 11 June 57, Training and CCH Processes in *Technical Bulletins* Volume IV. *You could go this route very easily: instead of CCH 4, Book Mimicry, you could go into this department: Locational Processing.* —*The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes* (29 July 57)

lock: a mental image picture of an experience where one was knowingly or unknowingly reminded of an engram. It does not itself contain a blow or a burn or impact and is not any major cause of upset. It does not contain unconsciousness. It may contain a feeling of pain or illness, etc., but is not itself the source of it. For example, a person sees a cake and feels sick. This is a lock on an engram of being made sick by eating cake. The

ILLUSION OR TRUTH LECTURE TRANSCRIPTS

picture of seeing a cake and feeling sick is a lock on (is locked to) the incident (unseen at the moment) of getting sick eating cake. / *normally can trigger a line charge and get a release of a whole bunch of locks—just get a guy laughing all the locks off—but it is so unreliable, we have never said anything about the technique at all.* —Ability—Laughter (2 Aug. 57)

Lone Ranger: the hero of a radio program, "The Lone Ranger," first aired in 1933 and later made into a television program in 1949. The story is set in Texas in the nineteenth century and tells the tales of the Lone Ranger and his trusted American Indian friend, Tonto, as they track down and apprehend the notorious gang responsible for the murder of the Lone Ranger's brother and four other Texas Rangers. The Lone Ranger and Tonto cut a trail of law and order across seven states, forcing "the powers of darkness into the blinding light of justice." One of the Lone Ranger's hallmarks was his use of silver bullets. *But the Lone Ranger's got all the silver bullets and we haven't been able to get hold of any to carry out the test.* —Surprise —The Anatomy of Sleep (31 July 57)

long bow, pulling a: exaggerating. Variation of *drawing a longbow*: a longbow is a large bow drawn by hand, such as those used by English archers from the twelfth to the sixteenth centuries. It is said that a good archer using a longbow could hit between the fingers of a man's hand at a considerable distance, and could propel his arrow a mile. The tales told about longbow exploits fully justify the application of the phrase. *Well, that is certainly pulling a long bow!* —Ability—Laughter (2 Aug. 57)

lookee: look. (From the imperative phrase "Look ye!" a command to look.) *"Oh well," he says, "lookee."* -Thinnies (1 Aug. 57)

Lyle: a Scientologist and professional actor at the time of the lecture. *Like the girl who was nervous on the stage, and Lyle told her, "But isn't it your fear that as you walk away from the mike you'll knock down all the scenery?"* -Ability-Laughter (2 Aug. 57)

mass V squared by the pi root of yak: a made-up, meaningless mathematical equation. *Gravity is not mass V squared by the pi root of yak.* - The Scale of Withhold (6 Aug. 57)

McGraw-Hill: short for *McGraw-Hill Publishing Company*, an international publishing company which produces reference books and instructional films. *Published by McGraw-Hill.* —Ability—Laughter (2 Aug. 57)

men from mud: a joking reference to the "man from mud" theory that man is an animal who arose as a result of a spontaneous accident from a "sea of ammonia" and by the stages of development called "evolution," arrived at his present level of intelligence. *The body reaction is his reaction, his reaction is the body's reaction and that's all there is to it and there's nothing you can do about it anyhow because we all know we're men from mud.* — Surprise —The Anatomy of Sleep (31 July 57)

mental image picture: a mental copy of one's perceptions sometime in the past; three-dimensional color pictures with sound and smell and all other perceptions, plus the conclusions or speculations of the individual. For example, if a person were in a car accident, he would retain "pictures"

of that experience in his mind, complete with recordings of the sights, physical sensations, smells, sounds, etc., that occurred during that incident. *Now, here we strike the first observable phenomena in death when we find out that the mind, in spite of mechanisms which seek to decay it and wipe it out, does maintain and preserve mental image pictures of earlier existences.* —*Death (30 July 57)*

MEST: a word coined from the initial letters of *matter, energy, space and time*, which are the component parts (elements) of the physical universe. Also used as an adjective to mean physical—as in "MEST universe," meaning the "physical universe." *If you got there while that person could still talk, still communicate MEST-wise with you, in the last moments they usually have something spotted, something planned.* —*Death (30 July 57)*

Metropolitan Museum: short for *Metropolitan Museum of Art*; an art museum located in New York City, housing the largest collection of art in the United States. *Now, because he had gone away and gotten lost someplace, as far as he was concerned he was on some other genetic line, he never would be particularly upset about his body or something of the sort because it had been hauled out of a tomb and left to rot someplace or been put up in the Metropolitan Museum, you see.* —*Death (30 July 57)*

Midshipman Easy: short for *Mr. Midshipman Easy*, a semi-autobiographical novel by Captain Frederick Marryat (1792-1848) published in 1836. It is about a young boy, Jack Easy, and his adventures as a midshipman on the high seas. Included in the story is a duel which occurred between Jack and two other parties (Mr. Biggs and Mr. Easthupp). There was some initial confusion on how this was to occur until it was decided that each party would stand equally spaced in a triangle. In the duel, Mr. Easy fired at Mr. Biggs, Mr. Biggs fired at Mr. Easthupp, and Mr. Easthupp fired at Mr. Easy. *There was such a duel fought once: Midshipman Easy, the great triangular duel—if any of you ever read Marryat's masterpiece on that.* — *The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes (29 July 57)*

181

millicurie: one thousandth of a *curie*, a unit of measurement of radioactivity. The unit is named for Marie Curie (1867-1934), Polish-born chemist and physicist who discovered the radioactive elements radium and polonium. *I imagine they get their thoughts on a sort of a radioactive scale and do their mathematics and so on at the rate of consumption of so many millicuries.* — *CCH (7 Aug. 57)*

misemotion: a coined word in Dianetics and Scientology, often used loosely to refer to anything that is unpleasant emotion, such as antagonism, anger, fear, grief, apathy or a death feeling. The full meaning of *misemotion* is an emotion or emotional reaction that is inappropriate to the present time situation. It is taken from *mis-* (wrong) + *emotion*. To say that a person was *misemotional* would indicate that the person did not display the emotion called for by the actual circumstances of the situation. Being *misemotional* would be synonymous with being irrational. One can fairly judge the rationality of any individual by the correctness of the emotion he displays in a given set of circumstances. To be joyful and happy when circumstances call for joy and happiness would be rational. To display grief without sufficient present time cause would be irrational. *Other words for out-of-controlness*

ILLUSION OR TRUTH LECTURE TRANSCRIPTS

are hysteria, anxiety, fear, misemotion in general. —Surprise—The Anatomy of Sleep (31 July 57)

mocked up: created. In Scientology, the word *mock-up* is used to mean, in essence, something which a person makes up himself. A *mock-up* is more than a mental picture; it is a self-created object which exists as itself or symbolizes some object in the physical universe. The term was derived from the World War II phrase for miniature models that were constructed to symbolize weapons (airplanes, ships, artillery, etc.) or areas of attack (hills, rivers, buildings, etc.) for use in planning a battle. *And they have this huge problem mocked up of the public versus these businesses, see? —The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes (29 July 57)*

Mohammedan lodestone: reference to the sacred Black Stone, an oval stone of dark red material, approximately seven inches in diameter. It is embedded in the Kaaba, the most sacred shrine of the Mohammedan religion (Islam), located in the city of Mecca, Saudi Arabia. The stone is believed by some Moslems to have been sent down from heaven. *By the way, we had this on Earth, which was a dramatization of the Emanator: it's the Mohammedan lodestone that was at Mecca. — The Scale of Withhold (6 Aug. 57)*

182

Monitor and Merrimac: two armored warships that fought a battle in March of 1862, during the American Civil War—the *Monitor* belonging to the Union, the *Merrimac* to the Confederacy. *Monitor* won the battle, forcing *Merrimac* to withdraw after four hours of battle. The iron armor plating of both ships was at the time considered a major innovation in warship construction. *And you say, "Well, iron hulls are quite recent — Monitor and Merrimac." — Thinnies (1 Aug. 57)*

Moola: (*slang*) money. *"Everybody should get down and worship the great god Baal or the great god Moola." —The Future of Scientology (16 Aug. 57)*

morpho: (*slang*) a morphine addict. *So we get a whole race of people known as the psychos —they're not quite like the morphos. —The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes (29 July 57)*

motivator: an aggressive or destructive act received by the person or one of the dynamics. The reason it is called a motivator is because it tends to prompt that one pays it back—it "motivates" a new overt. *See also dynamic and overt act* in this glossary. *The overt act becomes the motivator at once. —Surprise —The Anatomy of Sleep (31 July 57)*

Newsweek magazine: a US weekly newsmagazine with a worldwide circulation. *It contains the reviews contained in Newsweek magazine about a book called Beyond Laughter by Professor Goofwoofle, a psychiatrist from Woof-waffle, Beverly Hills, California. —Ability—Laughter (2 Aug. 57)*

New Yorker: an American weekly magazine founded in 1925 which specializes in short fiction, cartoons, verse, reviews and commentary. *Now, I'd already been studying the subject of the mind for several years since I'd been in the university and this added just a little fillip to the sauce, and I shortly after that wrote a book which has never been published called*

"Excalibur" and which according to the New Yorker anybody can have a copy of for \$1,500. -Death (30 July 57)

1984: reference to the satirical novel *1984* by George Orwell (1903-1950), written in 1949. Set in a society of the future, it is the story of a man and a girl who rebel. In this terrifying society there is no place for truth, for historical records are destroyed and propaganda replaces information. Thought and love are punished, while privacy is impossible. The official language "Newspeak" progressively narrows the range of ideas and independent thoughts. The society is dominated by slogans such as "War is Peace," "Freedom is Slavery," "Ignorance is Strength," etc. *You know, in some advanced society such as 1984—and you'll find that a thetan will sort of hang around and say, "Well, let's see, can't we push this thing in the creek?" -Death (30 July 57)*

no-game conditions: states in which a person has no game, reached by a preponderance of win (no-game) or a preponderance of lose (no-game). *See also games condition in this glossary. And then you have to work on them on a games condition and you really have to teach them games and what no-game conditions are and games. — The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes (29 July 57)*

Northwest Mounted Police: former name of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, Canada's federal police force. Known as the Mounties, their motto is "The Mounties never come in without their man." *There's many a girl has failed to get her man; the Northwest Mounted Police and women have the same motto, and that's very true. — CCH (7 Aug. 57)*

183

not-ised: attempted to put out of existence by postulate or force (something which one knows, priorly, exists). *In other words, he knocked out of existence and not-ised prime thought. —The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes (29 July 57)*

Nytol: (*trademark*) the name of a brand of sedative made in the US. *Now, hypnotics, taking hypnotics—Nytol, amphinol, snooze-all, drowse-all, those things don't work. —Surprise —The Anatomy of Sleep (31 July 57)*

Objective Process: any one of a number of Scientology counseling procedures which help a person to look or place his attention outward from himself. *Objective* refers to outward things, not the thoughts or feelings of the individual. Objective Processes deal with the real and observable. They call for the person to spot or find something exterior to himself in order to carry out the procedures. Objective Processes locate the person in his environment, establish direct communication, and bring a person to present time. *And it gives you—actually, your best confrontingness Objective Process is simply old-time Locational. —Confronting (8 Aug. 57)*

obnosis: a coined word meaning "observing the obvious," from *nosis*, know, and *ob*, out. *Now, get obnosis. — CCH (7 Aug. 57)*

Oldsmobile: brand name of an American passenger car produced by the Oldsmobile Division of General Motors. *When we start up from stoplights and I no longer am passing this year's Oldsmobile, this year's Cadillac, this year's thisa—and we won't even call it Fords and Chevrolets. —CCH (7 Aug. 57)*

ILLUSION OR TRUTH LECTURE TRANSCRIPTS

1.5ing: manifesting the tone level 1.5 on the Tone Scale: anger. *See also **Tone Scale** in this glossary. Now, the psychiatric principle which I just mentioned—you just thought I was just 1.5ing about psychiatry, didn't you? -The Scale of Withhold (6 Aug. 57)*

1.1: the level of covert hostility on the Tone Scale. *See also **Tone Scale** in this glossary. But from one lifetime to another one carries the mind along with him and lets it teach him sub rosa, on a 1.1, sub-1.1 basis what it's all about... —Thinnies (1 Aug. 57)*

only one: an individual who is operating on only the first dynamic and is not actually aware of or operating on any other dynamics. In this state the individual must have no effect on self and total effect on everything and everybody else. *See also **dynamic** in this glossary. Except the problem of the "only one," where the only problem is that there is only one. — The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes (29 July 57)*

Opening Procedure by Duplication: a Scientology process which has as its goal the separating of time, moment from moment. This is done by getting a preclear to duplicate his same action over and over again with two dissimilar objects, such as a book and a bottle. The auditor has a preclear walk over to each object in turn and pick it up, then the auditor asks three questions: "What is its color?" "What is its temperature?" and "What is its weight?" *And the earliest version of Opening Procedure by Duplication—Book and Bottle —the earliest version is undoubtedly the best version. — Instructing a Course (9 Aug. 57)*

184

origin: short for *origination*: something said or done by a person concerning himself, his ideas, reactions or difficulties. *The first place, origin is getting in his road. —Instructing a Course (9 Aug. 57)*

OT: abbreviation for Operating Thetan, a being "at cause over matter, energy, space, time, form and life." *Operating* comes from "able to operate without dependency on things." *See also **thetan** in this glossary. "What considerations and disabilities chiefly stand in the way of exteriorization and stable exterior and OT?" —Ability—Laughter (2 Aug. 57)*

overt act: an act by a person or individual leading to the injury, reduction or degradation of another, others or their persons, possessions or associations. An overt act can be intentional or unintentional. *The overt act becomes the motivator at once. —Surprise —The Anatomy of Sleep (31 July 57)*

overt act—motivator sequence: the sequence wherein a person commits an overt, then believes he's got to have a motivator or that he has had a motivator. For instance, if he hits somebody he will tell you immediately that he has been hit by the person, even when he has not been. *See also **motivator and overt act** in this glossary. We wanted to get the overt act—motivator sequence off the case. —Factors Behind the Handling of IQ (5 Aug. 57)*

PAB: abbreviation for Professional Auditor's Bulletin: one of a series of issues written by L. Ron Hubbard between 10 May 1953 and 1 April 1959. The content of these bulletins was technical and promotional. Their

intent was to give the professional auditor and his preclears the best possible processes and processing available at the moment it became available. *Actually if you just had him waste healthy bodies for a while, like I told you way back when—PAB 1, I think it is —why, he'll exteriorize and stay exteriorized. —Ability—Laughter (2 Aug. 57)*

Paddock, Charlie: (1900-1943) US sprinter who, during the 1920s, achieved and held world records in several running events; he won two gold medals and a silver medal in the 1920 Olympic Games. *And the runner thought for a long, long time and he said, "Well," he says, "I'm going to try to equal the record of Charlie Paddock." —The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes (29 July 57)*

pat-a-cake: (also "pattycake") a term used since 1950 to mean not handling cases. It comes from a children's game played by clapping the hands alone and with another child while chanting a nursery rhyme which begins as follows:

"Pat-a-cake, pat-a-cake, baker's man! Bake me
a cake as fast as you can, Shape it and prick it,
and mark it with 'B,' And put it in the oven for
Baby and me!"

That was a pat-a-cake. —Instructing a Course (9 Aug. 57)

Pavlovian: having to do with Ivan Petrovich Pavlov (1849-1936), Russian physiologist. Noted for behavioral experiments in which he sounded a bell while presenting food to a dog, thereby stimulating the natural flow of saliva in the dog's mouth. After the procedure was repeated several times, the dog would salivate at the sound of the bell, even when no food was presented. *If you wanted to make a person who would not control anything control something, along the Pavlovian, Russian, Stanford University type of abuses, you could actually use this datum and advance their technology up to a point where at least some of it worked. —Surprise —The Anatomy of Sleep (31 July 57)*

pc: short for *preclear*. See also **preclear** in this glossary. *Now, the funny part of it is, is when this happens to him—I'm telling you about this guy with malice aforethought because it explains a lot about your pcs — this guy, when it goes off, goes booooo! —The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes (29 July 57)*

PE: abbreviation for Personal Efficiency Course: an introductory course for new Scientologists which contained lectures, communication drills and auditing. *How about the PE type of instruction? —The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes (29 July 57)*

peanut-whistle: (*informal*) small and unimportant. A coined expression from the slang usage of *peanut*, meaning something small, insignificant or unimportant; and *whistle-stop*, a small town, originally one at which a train stopped only upon signal. *For instance, there's some peanut-whistle outfit sets up a racket in the United States called the Busy Business Bureau. —The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes (29 July 57)*

ILLUSION OR TRUTH LECTURE TRANSCRIPTS

"Peg o' My Heart": reference to Peg, the main character in the play "Peg o' My Heart" written in 1912 by American playwright John Heartley Manners. The play was one of the most successful in the history of American theater. *But she was —don't know if many of you knew this, you might have—she was the original "Peg o' My Heart" in the stage play and many other stage successes. —Death (30 July 57)*

pitcher's box: reference to the *pitcher's mound*, the raised mound on a baseball field occupied by the pitcher during play. *And one is in the funny situation of being out in a vacant lot and he picks up the bat and he swings madly through the air and then he runs to the first base and then he jumps over into the pitcher's box and he throws a ball to first base and goes over to first base and tags himself out. —The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes (29 July 57)*

pledge, the: a solemn, formal vow to abstain from intoxicating drink. *He gets into a section of his life where as a little boy he signed the pledge—his mother was a member of the WCTU and so on. —Thinnies (1 Aug. 57)*

postulate: (1) (*noun*) a conclusion, decision or resolution made by the individual himself to resolve a problem or to set a pattern for the future or to nullify a pattern of the past. *And picked up the postulate at the beginning of the half-hour and washed that out and looked at the clock and got up. —The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes (29 July 57)*

(2) (*verb*) make a postulate. *And if you expect anything else, you're just trying to postulate out of existence the behavior of man. —The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes (29 July 57)*

pre-c: short for *preclear*. See also **preclear** in this glossary. *You're liable to tie into a pre-c, you know, and with great enthusiasm you're auditing and you just know you're going to get him there and so forth ... —Confronting (8 Aug. 57)*

preclear: a person not yet Clear, hence pre-Clear; generally, a person being audited. See also **Clear** in this glossary. *We know that it would place the preclear's attention under control. —The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes (29 July 57)*

Prelogics: statements of the common denominators of knowledge, written by L. Ron Hubbard in 1952. A full list of the Prelogics can be found in the book *Scientology 0-8: The Book of Basics*, by L. Ron Hubbard. *The great oddity is, is the Prelogics are the axioms of education . . . —The Future of Scientology (16 Aug. 57)*

present time problem: a special problem that exists in the physical universe "now" on which the preclear has his attention fixed. It is any set of circumstances that so engages the attention of the preclear that he feels he should be doing something about it instead of being audited. *It would be very well if all the present time problems occurred on Sunday and you were going to start the preclear going on Monday. —The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes (29 July 57)*

Problems of Comparable Magnitude: a process in which the auditor locates the actual problem the preclear is having, has him describe it and then has him invent problems of comparable magnitude to that problem. *Therefore, Problems of Comparable Magnitude, "dream up more problems," "invent problems," "figure out a problem you could make out of that," and that sort of thing is all very necessary.* — *The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes (29 July 57)*

Problems of Work: a book by L. Ron Hubbard on the subject of work. It contains solutions to the basic difficulties associated with work, such as overcoming exhaustion, the secrets of efficiency, handling confusing situations and much more. *The actual cure for it is walk around the block, as given in Problems of Work.* — *Surprise —The Anatomy of Sleep (31 July 57)*

process: a set of questions asked by an auditor to help a person find out things about himself or life. More fully, a process is a patterned action, done by the auditor and preclear under the auditor's direction, which is invariable and unchanging, composed of certain steps or actions calculated to free the preclear. *The best thing to do with an intensive here today —by which we mean a twenty-five-hour, straight-at-it series of processes . . .* — *The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes (29 July 57)*

Q-and-A: (from "Question and Answer") in Scientology, a coined expression which means "fail to get an answer to one's question, fail to complete something, or deviate from an intended course of action." An auditor who starts a process, just gets it going, gets a new idea because of a pc cognition, takes up the cognition and abandons the original process is Q-and-Aing. *Now, that's all very well, but the point is that havingness is cut down to the degree that one has to insist upon this Q-and-A with his own survival, with every havingness, see?* — *CCH(7 Aug. 57)*

187

quad-trillions of quad-billions: a made-up term for a very, very large number.... *we've gone back so many trillions of trillions of quad-trillions of quad-billions of years, that there is no such concatenation of life and there couldn't be any such operating activity.* — *Death (30 July 57)*

randomity: a consideration of motion. We have plus randomness and we have minus randomness. We can have, from the individual's consideration, too much or too little motion, or enough motion. What's enough motion measured by? The consideration of the individual. The term *randomity* is often used to mean simply too much motion or action. *And all of it is for want of problems, want of game, want of contention, want of randomness and so on.* — *The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes (29 July 57)*

reactive mind: that portion of a person's mind which works on a totally stimulus-response basis, which is not under his volitional control and which exerts force and the power of command over his awareness, purposes, thoughts, body and actions. The reactive mind is where engrams are stored. *See also engram* in this glossary. *That's the basis of the reactive mind.* - *CCH (7 Aug. 57)*

reactor-type motor: a *reaction engine*, a type of engine, such as a jet or rocket engine, which generates thrust by the reaction to an ejected

ILLUSION OR TRUTH LECTURE TRANSCRIPTS

stream of hot exhaust gases or other material. *You take an airfoil and some kind of fuselage and you take a tractor propeller or the reactor-type motor and there's your airplane.* — *Thinnies* (1 Aug. 57)

reality: agreement upon perceptions and data in the physical universe. All that we can be sure is real is that on which we have agreed is real. Agreement is the essence of reality. *Recall a past life, with great reality.* — *The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes* (29 July 57)

Reality Scale: a scale of degrees of reality, beginning at the bottom with solid communication lines, then moving up through masses, agreements and considerations to postulates at the top. *See also reality* in this glossary. *All right, you tie in with something like the Reality Scale and you give him a reality on a comm line, you give him a reality then on terminals at the other end of the comm line and he finds the auditor.* — *CCH* (7 Aug. 57)

reconsciously: a made-up term for a way of using the mind; extension of the terms "consciously," "subconsciously," "unconsciously," etc. Used as a humorous reference to the complex and meaningless terminology of psychiatry, psychology and psychoanalysis. *Maybe they subconsciously — pardon me, reconsciously practice them.* — *Confronting* (8 Aug. 57)

188

Registrar: the staff member in a Scientology organization directly responsible for enlightening individuals on Dianetics and Scientology services and signing them up for training and auditing. *Now, the only other thing that happens that monitors this, is when you have a good Registrar, you have students; when you have a bum one, you don't have any.* — *Instructing a Course* (9 Aug. 57)

repeater technique: an auditing technique, given in the book *Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health*, in which the auditor has the preclear repeat over and over certain phrases found in engrams being run. Repetition of such phrases can cause the preclear to come into contact with the engrams which contain them. *Now, let's go back to repetitive repeater technique, old repeater technique.* — *CCH* (7 Aug. 57)

restimulation: the condition of having a past memory reactivated due to similar circumstances in the present approximating circumstances of the past. *But here is the point here, that a preclear gets into restimulation and telephones George.* — *The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes* (29 July 57)

ridge: a solid accumulation of old, inactive energy suspended in space and time. A ridge is generated by opposing energy flows which hit one another, and continues to exist long after the energy flows have ceased. *And most athletes get hung up in the ridges of counterposition to such a degree that they start dramatizing the past games and they become, therefore, problems.* — *The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes* (29 July 57)

Rising Scale Processing: processing in which one takes any point or column of the Chart of Attitudes which the preclear can reach, and asks

the preclear then to shift his postulate upwards toward a higher level. It is simply a method of shifting postulates upward toward optimum from where the preclear believes he is on the chart. It is essentially a process directed toward increasing belief in self by using all the "buttons" (attitudes towards life) on the Chart of Attitudes. *See also Chart of Attitudes* in this glossary. / *don't care whether it's Rising Scale Processing you were doing, you were running Black and White or dichotomies or anything else, there's two things you'd have to include in it. —The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes (29 July 57)*

rocks, water under: reference to the biblical story of Moses, who is said to have drawn water from a rock by striking it with his staff. *And in the Dead Sea wilderness, why, they used to keep their water under rocks. —Confronting (8 Aug. 57)*

roodles, round of: a version of poker (a card game where players bet on the value of the cards in their hands, forming a pool to be taken by the winner). In a *round of roodles* every player must ante (put one's stake into the pool before receiving cards) and the betting limit is usually doubled, making very high stakes for the winner. Used figuratively in the lecture. *Well, we can tell a person what to do in a little round of roodles here: he goes round and round on this, concentrating on first one part and then another part. —Instructing a Course (9 Aug. 57)*

Roosevelt Pictures: a made-up name for a motion-picture production studio, playing on the name of Franklin Delano *Roosevelt*, president of the United States during World War II. *You see, these big shows that they put on —Warner Brothers and Roosevelt Pictures and so forth put on there in 1941 and so forth, they were actually colossal productions but nobody was any part of them, see? —The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes (29 July 57)*

Rosina: one of the students attending the 18th ACC. *Poor Rosina! She used to beat this into heads of auditors in London. —Ability—Laughter (2 Aug. 57)*

rudiments: those steps or actions used to get the preclear in shape to be audited in that session. For auditing to take place at all the preclear must be "in-session" which means: (1) willing to talk to the auditor, (2) interested in own case. Rudiments are actions done to accomplish this. *And finally, on the first day, they get the rudiments, the Axioms, Book One, Dianetics 55!, AP&A, and then they memorize, toward the end of that evening, all the Dianetic Axioms in case they might miss something. —Instructing a Course (9 Aug. 57)*

run out: cause (through auditing) something in the reactive mind to vanish entirely, at which time it is filed as memory and experience. *But you start to run out a surprise and you'll find each one of the steps I just gave you is there. —Surprise —The Anatomy of Sleep (31 July 57)*

saddle boot: a sheath attached to a saddle, used to carry a rifle safely while riding. *I'd go out and there'd always be a rifle stuck in a saddle boot. —Thinnies (1 Aug. 57)*

ILLUSION OR TRUTH LECTURE TRANSCRIPTS

Schicklgruber: another name for Adolf Hitler. Hitler's father, Alois (born 1837), was illegitimate and for a time bore his mother's name, Schicklgruber, but by 1876 he had established his claim to the surname Hitler. Adolf (born 1889) never used any other name, and the name Schicklgruber was revived only by his political opponents in Germany and Austria in the 1930s. *See also Hitler* in this glossary. *Some thirty million human beings died because of Adolf Schicklgruber, but he was a "great leader."* — *Surprise —The Anatomy of Sleep (31 July 57)*

Science of Survival: a book by L. Ron Hubbard, published in 1951, which covers the different aspects of the Tone Scale and how this technology can be used in processing and in life. The book is dedicated to a number of outstanding philosophers and scientists of the past. *See also Tone Scale* in this glossary. *As a matter of fact, look at the dedication of Science of Survival, things like this.* — *Factors Behind the Handling of IQ (5 Aug. 57)*

Scientology: comes from the Latin *scio*, which means "know" and the Greek word *logos*, meaning "the word or outward form by which the inward thought is expressed and made known." Thus, Scientology means knowing about knowing. Scientology is an applied religious philosophy developed by L. Ron Hubbard. It is the study and handling of the spirit in relationship to itself, universes and other life. *Rightly or wrongly, Scientologists to some slight degree, to people who are interested in Scientology but aren't yet, have a reputation of not answering questions.* — *The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes (29 July 57)*

190

scythe, old man with the: reference to the Grim Reaper: death, especially when personified as a man or skeleton with a scythe. *You can even mock up something —the old man with the scythe, and there are many people who believe this utterly, that there is a fellow named Death who comes along and takes the body away.* — *Death (30 July 57)*

service facsimile: a computation generated by the individual to make self right and others wrong, to dominate or escape domination and to enhance own survival and injure that of others. This computation will cause the individual to deliberately hold in restimulation selected parts of his reactive mind to explain his failures in life. For example, a person may keep an old injury in restimulation so that his family has to look after him. *See also computation, reactive mind and restimulation* in this glossary. *When that finally peels off totally to a thought level, you are looking at somebody who has a service facsimile.* — *The Scale of Withhold (6 Aug. 57)*

session: a precise period of time during which an auditor audits a preclear. *So that they couldn't then communicate and say what a bad session it was.* — *The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes (29 July 57)*

shirt, sue (someone) for their: (*slang*) sue (someone) for a lot of money. Variation of *sue the pants off of*. *Somebody's suing them for their shirt and they say, "Well, that's all illegal and illogical, and I wasn't there, didn't even know the girl's name, never took a drop of liquor in my life!"* — *The Scale of Withhold (6 Aug. 57)*

siege gun: a large gun employed in a siege. *Be something on the order of being shot up with siege guns twenty-four hours a day. —Surprise —The Anatomy of Sleep (31 July 57)*

significance: any thought, decision, concept, idea, purpose or meaning connected with something as opposed to its mass. *Well, when you run a thinkingness process on a preclear with lots of significance in it, he runs into things which makes him obsessively come off of it... — The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes (29 July 57)*

"Sit in the chair": reference to a training drill, the main command of which was "Sit in that chair." The drill was developed by LRH for and used during the 18th ACC; its purpose was to give the student actual processing to drill, integrating the skills learned in earlier drills. For further information, see HCOB 17 July 57, Changes in Training Drills, in *Technical Bulletins* Volume IV. *That made the Comm Course integrate all the things they'd been doing in the week, and do them all at the same time with "Sit in the chair," and then we even comm bridge it over into "Touch that chair," and it was an actual process, not a coached process. —Instructing a Course (9 Aug. 57)*

SLP 7: short for *Six Levels of Processing, Issue 7*, a series of processes developed by L. Ron Hubbard and released in January 1956. The purpose of this set of processes was the clearing of every case. For further information, see Professional Auditor's Bulletin 69 in *Technical Bulletins* Volume III. *So that CCH isn't just a process like SLP 7 or SOP 8 or something like that where you did one step, flattened it, did another step, flattened it and did another step. —The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes (29 July 57)*

snap terminals with: collapse into or identify with (something or someone). *So the government of Finland and the government of France, in trying to communicate, snap terminals with two "isn'ts" and this results in war. —Ability—Laughter (2 Aug. 57)*

snooze-all: humorous made-up name for a type of sedative. *Now, hypnotics, taking hypnotics—Nytol, amphibinol, snooze-all, drowse-all, those things don't work. —Surprise —The Anatomy of Sleep (31 July 57)*

somatic: a physical pain or discomfort of any kind. The word *somatic* means, actually, "bodily" or "physical." Because the word *pain* has in the past led to confusion between physical pain and mental pain, *somatic* is the term used in Scientology to denote physical pain or discomfort. (Also used humorously as a verb, in the lecture.) *You take this particular string of facsimiles and somebody who sees that much agony and perception and so forth, and the somatics begin to somatic and somebody moves. —The Scale of Withhold (6 Aug. 57)*

SOP 8: short for *Standard Operating Procedure 8*, an auditing procedure which emphasizes positive gain and the present and future rather than negative gain of eradication of the past. The goal of this procedure is not the rehabilitation of the body but of the thetan. Rehabilitation of a body incidentally ensues. For further information see the book, *Scientology 8-8008*, by L. Ron Hubbard. *So that CCH isn't just a process like SLP 7*

ILLUSION OR TRUTH LECTURE TRANSCRIPTS

or SOP 8 or something like that where you did one step, flattened it, did another step, flattened it and did another step. — The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes (29 July 57)

space opera: of time periods on the whole track millions of years ago which • > concerned activities in this and other galaxies. Space opera has space travel, spaceships, spacemen, intergalactic travel, wars, conflicts, other beings, civilizations and societies, and other planets and galaxies. It is not fiction and concerns actual incidents and things that occurred on the track. *Broken-down space opera mechanics scattered around Earth here are the debris of an old cops-and-robbers game which has now disappeared. — The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes (29 July 57)*

spinning: (*slang*) in a state of mental confusion. *A person, you know, sort of believes he's going wog and spinning and so forth and you ask him that question. —Death (30 July 57)*

spout, (go) up the: (*colloquial*) become lost, ruined. A spout was a lift (elevator) formerly in use in pawnbroker's shops, up which the articles pawned were taken for storage. *Now, sleep is a necessity to a psycho and if somebody does not sleep and cannot sleep, he can be counted upon to get more and more and more agitated and to go up the spout further and further and further. —Surprise —The Anatomy of Sleep (31 July 57)*

192

square root: (*mathematics*) the number that is multiplied by itself to produce a given number. (Example: 3 is the *square root* of 9 [$3 \times 3 = 9$]). Used as part of a humorous example in the lecture, with no particular significance. *"This shows us conclusively that the interrelationship between alpha and beta particles is the square root of bull." —The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes (29 July 57)*

squirrel: an individual who alters (materials, procedures, etc.) from the original. *This had been done by Homer Lane many, many years ago, who was a squirrel, a psychiatric squirrel in England. —Instructing a Course (9 Aug. 57)*

Stanford University: a university in northern California which offers courses in the fields of medicine, psychology and also has a research institute including laboratories and other experimental facilities. *If you wanted to make a person who would not control anything control something, along the Pavlovian, Russian, Stanford University type of abuses, you could actually use this datum and advance their technology up to a point where at least some of it worked. —Surprise —The Anatomy of Sleep (31 July 57)*

stark, staring goofy: (*colloquial*) completely insane. Variation of *stark, staring mad*. *Get somebody who is stark, staring goofy and you don't think you are communicating with him at all; and you just sit down in a chair and start a Tone 40 "Don't give me that hand," and all of his covert bestiality starts rolling off at an enormous rate of speed. — The Future of Scientology (16 Aug. 57)*

Start-C-S: short for *Start-Change-Stop*, a process which addresses the three parts of control (start, change and stop). This process is run on either an

object or a body. For further information see PAB 97 in *Technical Bulletins* Volume IV. *Old Start-C-S, just run that way, interspersed with Connectedness.* —Ability—Laughter (2 Aug. 57)

static: an actuality of no mass, no wavelength, no position in space or relation in time, but with the quality of creating or destroying mass or energy, of locating itself or creating space, and in re-relating time. *Of course, if you look at the preclear as a thetan, you're then conceiving a static—so you better be able to.* —Ability—Laughter (2 Aug. 57)

Stop, Change and Start: a variation of the process Start-Change-Stop, specializing in improving the preclear's ability to stop the body. *See also Start-C-S* in this glossary. *Amongst those processes —the key process that produces the phenomena without any great shock is old Stop, Change and Start—produces the phenomenon of exteriorization rather easily.* - *Death* (30 July 57)

Straightwire: an auditing process which includes the act of stringing a line between present time and some incident in the past, and stringing that line directly and without any detours. The auditor strings a straight "wire" of memory between the actual genus (origin) of a condition and present time, thus demonstrating that there is a difference of time and space in the condition then and the condition now. The preclear, conceding this difference, can then rid himself of the condition or at least be able to handle it. *We'd ask that as sort of a Straightwire or present time basis.* — *Factors Behind the Handling of IQ* (5 Aug. 57)

193

Subzero Scale: reference to the tones of the Tone Scale that are below zero (death), down to complete unbeingness as a thetan. For further information see the Tone Scale in Full in *Scientology 0-8: The Book of Basics*, by L. Ron Hubbard. *He's actually gone into the Subzero Scale.* —*Death* (30 July 57)

Swanson, Gloria: (1897-1983) American film actress; a leading lady of the screen who acted in over twenty well-known movies and made many comebacks. *Matter of fact, it was Gloria Swanson who phoned up and gave the information through here yesterday.*

sweetness and light: (*British slang*) the exhibition of unusual tolerance, understanding or sympathy. *Be sweetness and light and "everybody's right but you" just before the intensive and afterwards, if you insist on this social pattern; but during the intensive, run it!* —*Instructing a Course* (9 Aug. 57)

Swizenstein: humorous made-up name for a politician (the president of the US at the time of the lecture was Dwight D. Eisenhower). / *imagine that somebody like Swizenstein or whoever is president at the moment might very well profit from such a study, but it just never occurred to them to study what would be a government.* —*Confronting* (8 Aug. 57)

taped: (*colloquial*) sized up, ascertained or understood fully. *Well, okay, you got this surprise pretty well taped?* —*Surprise* —*The Anatomy of Sleep* (31 July 57)

terminal: a point that receives, relays and sends communication; a man would be a terminal, and a post (position, job or duty to which a person

ILLUSION OR TRUTH LECTURE TRANSCRIPTS

is assigned) would also be a terminal. *But when the war ceased, when there was no longer another terminal, when there was no longer this thing with two terminals fighting and so forth, the weapons and other bric-a-brac used in that conflict tend to drift around.* —*The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes (29 July 57)*

Then and Now Solids: CCH 14, a Scientology process which accomplishes a great number of things, such as straightening out the time track of the preclear and giving the preclear practice in handling time. For further information see HCOB 11 June 1957, Training and CCH Processes, in *Technical Bulletins Volume IV*. *But when we run him on the process known as Then and Now Solids, we rather easily steer him back along these courses and have him pick up these old viewpoints.* —*Thinnies (1 Aug. 57)*

theta: thought or life. The term comes from the Greek letter *theta* (θ), which the Greeks used to represent *thought* or perhaps *spirit*. [*Definition of **entheta** short for enturbulated theta, theta which is turbulent, or agitated or disturbed.*

thetan: the person himself—not his body or his name, the physical universe, his mind, or anything else; that which is aware of being aware; the identity which is the individual. The term was coined to eliminate any possible confusion with older, invalid concepts. It comes from the Greek letter *theta* (θ), which the Greeks used to represent *thought* or perhaps *spirit*, to which an *n* is added to make a noun in the modern style used to create words in engineering. It is also θ^n , or "theta to the *n*th degree," meaning unlimited or vast. *In the first place, man is composed (as you well know) of a body, a mind and what we refer to as a thetan.* —*Death (30 July 57)*

third dynamic: a group. *See also **dynamic** in this glossary. To understand this completely you would have to realize that the basis of war comes about through the fact that a third dynamic isn't a group.* —*Ability — Laughter (2 Aug. 57)*

thisas and thatas: (*informal*) various things (used to give only a general indication of what is being referred to). *They're busy building atomic thisas and atomic thatas and they're having a great time with it.* —*CCH (7 Aug. 57)*

thunk: humorous variation of "thought." *But what concatenation of thought have you thunk that finally got it down to a point of where you've got a total inversion?* —*The Scale of Withhold (6 Aug. 57)*

time track: the consecutive record of mental image pictures which accumulates through a person's life. It is a very accurate record of a person's past. As a rough analogy, the time track could be likened to a motion-picture film—if that film were three-dimensional, had fifty-two perceptions and could fully react upon the observer. *Now therefore, demonstration of past existences by running somebody (quote) back down the time track (unquote) and having him look at a picture is not very convincing.* —*Death (30 July 57)*

Tinny-Tin: nickname for LRH's son, Quentin. *Little Tinny-Tin, ill, processing him a second time, properly open session, processing—he started to go right on out the window.* —*Surprise —The Anatomy of Sleep (31 July 57)*

- Tone 40:** using a positive postulate with no counter-thought expected, anticipated or anything else; that is, total control. The name *Tone 40* comes from the top position of the Tone Scale which is serenity of beingness. *See also postulate and Tone Scale* in this glossary. *And then I would run enough Tone 40 8-C, let him find the auditing room and—so that he wouldn't kick up any fuss that way particularly. —The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes (29 July 57)*
- Tone 40 8-C:** a process, CCH 2. *See also CCH 2* in this glossary. *And then I would run enough Tone 40 8-C, let him find the auditing room and—so that he wouldn't kick up any fuss that way particularly. — The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes (29 July 57)*
- Tone 40 "Give Me Your Hand":** reference to CCH 1, which contains the command "Give me your hand." *See also CCH 1* in this glossary. *Why does Tone 40 "Give Me Your Hand" work? —Surprise—The Anatomy of Sleep (31 July 57)*
- Tone 40 on an Object:** the name of Training Routine 8, a drill which trains a person to get his intention across to others, to clarify intentions as different than words, to start the student on the road to handling objects and preclears with postulates, and to obtain obedience not wholly based on spoken commands. *See also Tone 40* in this glossary. For further information see HCOB 11 June 57, Training and CCH Processes in *Technical Bulletins* Volume IV. *Then you can get something in the order of postulate communication, which you're doing with Tone 40 on an Object. - CCH(7 Aug. 57)*
- Tone Scale:** a scale, in Scientology, which shows the emotional tones of a person. These, ranged from the highest to the lowest, are, in part, serenity, enthusiasm (as we proceed downward), conservatism, boredom, antagonism, anger, no-sympathy, fear, grief, apathy. An arbitrary numerical value is given to each level on the scale. There are many aspects of the Tone Scale and using it makes possible the prediction of human behavior. For further information on the Tone Scale, read the book *Science of Survival* by L. Ron Hubbard, and the Hubbard Chart of Human Evaluation which accompanies it. *But then we were striking where thetans ordinarily were on the Tone Scale. —Death (30 July 57)*
- "Touch that chair":** one of the commands used in a training drill, the main command of which was "Sit in that chair." *See also "Sit in the chair"* in this glossary. *That made the Comm Course integrate all the things they'd been doing in the week, and do them all at the same time with "Sit in the chair," and then we even comm bridge it over into "Touch that chair," and it was an actual process, not a coached process. —Instructing a Course (9 Aug. 57)*
- TR:** abbreviation for training regimen or routine: often referred to as a *training drill*. TRs are practical drills which can greatly increase a student's ability in essential auditing skills, such as communication and control. *Do any of the TRs apply? —The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes (29 July 57)*
- TR 0:** *see Training 0* in this glossary. *TR 0 and TR 1 do not leave much two-way comm between the coach and student. —Ability—Laughter (2 Aug. 57)*

ILLUSION OR TRUTH LECTURE TRANSCRIPTS

TR 1: a drill to train a student to send an intention from himself to a preclear in one unit of time without vias. For further information, see HCOB 11 June 57, Training and CCH Processes, in *Technical Bulletins* Volume IV. *TR 0 and TR 1 do not leave much two-way comm between the coach and student. —Ability—Laughter (2 Aug. 57)*

track: short for *time track*. See also **time track** in this glossary. *In support of this, you can pick up on the track times when a fellow backed out of his head and was mad as the dickens. —Death (30 July 57)*

tracks: in a circus tent, the pathway around the outside of the rings where the main acts are performed. *Not just three rings, they had five rings, with the same performance going on in each ring, with different troupes, and with at the same time two or three shows going on in the tracks. —Confronting (8 Aug. 57)*

Training 0: short for Training Routine (TR) 0, a drill to train a person to confront. In this drill a student and coach sit facing each other, neither making any conversation or effort to be interesting, but just sitting and looking at each other and saying and doing nothing. See also **confront** in this glossary. *Training 0 is there because an individual gets into problems in the middle of an intensive, as well as at the beginning. —The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes (29 July 57)*

Training 10: Locational Processing. See **Locational Processing** in this glossary. *And the other is Training 10 (I think it is) to direct the attention here, there and everywhere. —The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes (29 July 57)*

Trio: CCH 8, one of a series of processes which have as a goal the separating of time, moment from moment. This process is called "Trio" because there are three different sets of commands for the process. For further information, see HCOB 11 June 1957, Training and CCH Processes, in *Technical Bulletins* Volume IV. *And you understand that Trio is in itself a thinkingness thing. —The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes (29 July 57)*

true, for: certain; without doubt. Variation of *for sure*. *That's for true. —Instructing a Course (9 Aug. 57)*

Tums: the brand name of a chewable digestive aid which comes in small, white, round tablets. *Sat there with a bottle of milk of magnesia and a couple of packages of Tums and studied what America considers, at this moment, great literature to be. —Confronting (8 Aug. 57)*

2.0: the level of *antagonism* on the Tone Scale. See also **Tone Scale** in this glossary. *He's below 2.0 on the Tone Scale and his main thought is to grasp another body. —Death (30 July 57)*

two-way comm: short for *two-way communication*: a two-way cycle of communication. For example: Joe, having originated a communication and having completed it, may then wait for Bill to originate a communication

to Joe, thus completing the remainder of the two-way cycle of communication. Bill does originate a communication, this is heard by Joe, answered by Joe, and acknowledged by Bill. Thus we get the normal cycle of a communication between two people. *Well, this Scientologist spent the remainder of the luncheon working this out on two-way comm with practically everybody present. — The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes (29 July 57)*

unit: one of the three training sections into which the 18th ACC was divided. The first unit was the Communication Course, the second was the Upper Indoctrination Course and the third was the CCH Course (which itself was divided into two parts, "CCH A" and "CCH B," each part teaching one half of the CCH processes). Students went through each of the three units twice in order to complete the course. The term is also used to refer to an ACC in its entirety. *They're expended, probably, at the end of the unit. —Factors Behind the Handling of IQ (5 Aug. 57)*

untap: release; allow to flow. *A sudden, heightened willingness untaps a tremendous ability, of course. — Confronting (8 Aug. 57)*

Upper Indoc: short for *Upper Indoctrination*: a series of training drills designed to bring about in the student the willingness and ability to handle and control other people's bodies and to cheerfully confront another person while giving that person commands. Also to maintain a high level of control in any circumstances. *I notice there are a few cases present of what they call "Upper Indoc voice." — Surprise— The Anatomy of Sleep (31 July 57)*

197

USO: abbreviation for *United Service Organizations*, the name taken by a civilian group in the United States organized in 1941 to improve the morale of the Allied armed forces during World War II; it opened recreation centers and organized entertainment for servicemen. *And the war came along and she went out with the USO. —Death (30 July 57)*

US Saving Certificate: a certificate issued by the US government, showing that the holder has deposited an amount of money for a specified period of time, at a fixed rate of interest. *And fellows think it'd spoil the game if they mocked up perfect Illinois Western bonds redeemable at face value at any bank, US Saving Certificates of one kind or another, just mocked them up and piled them. — The Scale of Withhold (6 Aug. 57)*

viewpoint: a point of awareness from which one can perceive. *In other words, you look at the wall and the wall looks solid to us, right here and now, and then it — in that instant of time that you first looked at it an instant ago — now is thin, with a remote viewpoint still in front of it. — Thinnies (1 Aug. 57)*

visio: perception of light waves; sight. *And if the auditor keeps giving the auditing command, the preclear will come up on the opposite side of the anaten with clear visio and no more blackness even though he didn't remember finishing it all the way through or not. — Surprise —The Anatomy of Sleep (31 July 57)*

Vistavision: (*trademark*) a form of wide-screen motion-picture photography which results in a large projected image. *Hollywood got the idea and, I*

ILLUSION OR TRUTH LECTURE TRANSCRIPTS

imagine, laid a tremendous multibillion-dollar egg with their Vistavision and wide screen and all the rest of this. — Confronting (8 Aug. 57)

wafer: a small disc of wax or adhesive paper, bearing the impression of an official design and used as a seal to authenticate a document. At the time of the lecture, different colored wafers were used on auditors' certificates to designate different levels of skill. *Have you now accomplished a sufficiently high training procedure so that you would be willing to recommend a gold or red wafer auditor? —Ability—Laughter (2 Aug. 57)*

Warner Brothers: a major US motion-picture studio, which finances, produces and distributes feature films. *You see, these big shows that they put on — Warner Brothers and Roosevelt Pictures and so forth put on there in 1941 and so forth, they were actually colossal productions but nobody was any part of them, see? —The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes (29 July 57)*

WCTU: abbreviation for Women's Christian Temperance *Union*, an organization formed to promote total abstinence and the abolition of liquor manufacture and sale. *He gets into a section of his life where as a little boy he signed the pledge—his mother was a member of the WCTU and so on. — Thinnies (1 Aug. 57)*

198

Western Front: the battle front in Belgium and northern France in World War I and World War II. *Hitler—Hitler on the Western Front as a corporal, this young Austrian upstart had a few too many shells land too close . . . — Surprise —The Anatomy of Sleep (31 July 57)*

Wheaties: brand name of an American breakfast cereal which calls itself "The Breakfast of Champions" and uses testimonials by American athletes in its advertising. *Eat more Wheaties, run more blocks. — CCH (7 Aug. 57)*

whole track: the moment-to-moment record of a person's existence in this universe in picture and impression form including past track, prior to this lifetime. *Now, that's nothing more than a whole track computation. —Thinnies (1 Aug. 57)*

wog: (*slang*) sick, especially to one's stomach. *A person, you know, sort of believes he's going wog and spinning and so forth and you ask him that question. —Death (30 July 57)*

wooden nutmeg: (*colloquial*) anything worthless passed off as genuine or valuable; a *nutmeg* is a hard, aromatic seed about the size of a marble, which is grated and used as a spice. *Society has a habit of weeding out the wooden nutmeg salesmen. — The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes (29 July 57)*

woof and warp: (*figurative*) the underlying structure upon which something is built; a foundation; base. Literally, the woof is the horizontal thread in a woven fabric, and the warp is the vertical thread. Together they make up the whole of a woven article. *Now, we're talking about the woof and the warp, the alpha and omega of confronting when we're talking right there in that process. — Confronting (8 Aug. 57)*

GLOSSARY

Woolworth: the name of a chain of "five-and-ten-cent" stores (stores that sell a wide variety of inexpensive merchandise) in the United States. *And there was an outfit once called Woolworth.* —*Instructing a Course* (9 Aug. 57)

works, shoot the: (*slang*) do everything; use everything. *And he suddenly realizes that he could shoot the works just in no time at all, and he's carrying on this game he's got very tenuously.* —*Ability—Laughter* (2 Aug. 57)

Wright Whirlwind engine: a type of airplane engine made by the Wright Aeronautical Corporation. *A tractor-type propeller, particularly one run by a Wright Whirlwind engine, is taking 50 percent of its power to cancel the other 50 percent of its power, and how it flies at all Lord only knows.* - *Thinnies* (1 Aug. 57)

yo-heave, give (someone or something) the: get rid of (someone or something). A variation of *give the (old) heave-ho* (from the sixteenth century sailors' cry of *heave-ho* when hauling). *An individual has to get almost entirely over the idea of acquisition, have, possession, mass, need-of and so on before he's in any kind of a state where he can accept very much "Pitch it away from you, give it the yo-heave."* — *The Scale of Withhold* (6 Aug. 57)