

SIX BASIC STEPS—SOME FUNDAMENTALS OF AUDITING

And you say, “Well, you might find something interesting about it. It’s a book by Gibbon, interesting book.”

And, “Well, all right, so I’m looking at it. So what?”

And you say, “Fine. Thank you. Now pick it up.” And whatever his attitude is, he usually has comments of one kind or another. He makes all sorts of remarks and comments as he’s running the process, and the trick is to answer these, not to break two-way communication, to get the preclear to volunteer comments while he’s running this thing, and at the same time never vary the procedure one iota. Because you’re talking with him and he’s talking with you, never *never* forget that the next step is temperature—what is the temperature of the book.

You see, the auditor isn’t doing duplication of anything except the auditing commands. It isn’t a test of whether or not the auditor can sit there and reel off a certain set of commands over and over and over and over and over. It is no test of this. But an auditor who hasn’t had it run on him will think it is! So this horrible torture, this Dirty 30—this horrible thing that should never occur—if run with two-way communication on a preclear who has been run properly on the earlier steps, will produce fabulous results.

What results does it produce? It gets him over the idea of preventing everything from happening again. It makes it possible for

6 JUNE 1955

him to see. It also makes it possible for his body to duplicate, in a little more relaxed fashion, its environment—because the body's bank does just that.

Do you know a lot of the things that a fellow thinks are engrams hanging on the front of his face, are simply the body duplicating obsessively the wall he is facing? He merely has some sort of a mass around his body somewhere which obsessively duplicates everything by feeling instead of sight. The flat feet of a cop are simply an obsessive duplication of the floor and the pavement. If you wanted to get him over fallen arches, you'd certainly better get his feet over being upset about duplication. But we're not interested in fallen arches. We're just interested in living.

If a person cannot do the same thing twice, he's in bad shape. Look at how much *newness* he has to face all the time, just to live, if he can't do the same thing twice. And yet many people find it very, very dangerous to do the same thing twice. Why? Because it makes them predictable, and they know everybody is after them. Why is everybody after them? Well, they've been punished, haven't they? So they're guilty.

13 Well, so a person running Opening Procedure by Duplication after a while is perfectly willing to have himself located, which is a great oddity all by itself. You know, he's willing to be there, he's willing to

wear clean clothes, he's willing to dress up and show a bright face to the world, he's willing to talk to people. It's not dangerous to be there, he can do it again. You see? There are many people who can't do it again. In fact, the bulk of the race.

And already, by Opening Procedure by Duplication, you are moving out of the capabilities of Homo sapiens. And the second you start to move him out of the capabilities—which is someplace in Opening Procedure of 8-C, you start to move him out of that—you move him on into Opening Procedure by Duplication and a new man starts to show up. Any time—if you've run everything smoothly in these Six Basic Steps, any time during Opening Procedure by Duplication you can expect an exteriorization. And if you don't get it during that process and yet you flatten the process, you can get an exteriorization by the next step, which is Remedy of Havingness. One of the more fantastic steps.

Remedy of Havingness is a very simple thing. You have the individual mock up things and shove them into himself. Have him mock up a mass and shove it into himself. You don't care what the significance of the mass is. You could make it much more entertaining by giving the mass significance, but it's just a matter of mass. You can have it black planets, pink planets, blue planets—anything that he could mock up.

6 JUNE 1955

You could have men, women, children, cars, cats, kings, coal heavers—it doesn't matter, as long as it's a mass. And you have him mock this up and have him shove it into his body.

Now get that as a very important change that I made a few months ago. You have him *shove* it into his body. You never let a preclear *pull* anything into his body if he's interiorized. And don't even let him pull anything into himself if he's exteriorized. "Mock up a planet and pull it in," is a wrong command. "Mock up a planet and thrust it into the body," if you wish to be Bostonian (or "shove it in," if you wish to be Arizonian), is the correct command. You want this individual to *shove* the mass in.

Now, you get him to shove in masses into the body from various quarters—and what do you know? All of a sudden he's back of the body here someplace, throwing masses into it. You say, "Where you throwing these in from?"

"Oh, way back here—oh *wooo!*" And this was the fellow who told you, "*Science* is going to win, and religion and the spirit, that's a lot of bunk. And Scientology—ah, what's this business about three feet back of your head?" You know, that guy—if you ran him up these steps and then had him start shoving in masses, boy, would his thetan be red!

SIX BASIC STEPS—SOME FUNDAMENTALS OF AUDITING

Now, the three principal buttons of this exteriorization are found down in Significance Processing. And if you have any feeling at all that the preclear is not going to exteriorize easily or something of the sort, you certainly better run Consequences, or Problems and Solutions, on those three buttons. And those three buttons are: Ownership, Responsibility and Control. And you better hit those on this Tone Scale. Because he's so obsessed and so worried about controlling this body, he's got such a crushing hold on it without knowing it, he's practically smashing it in from all sides and saying, "Joe is doing it." Or demons are fighting him. Who's the demon? Him—he is.

This kind of a condition is remedied in the significance band, and so normally in running the significance band you would simply hit those three buttons. Because if they aren't remedied, the person doesn't even exteriorize on Remedy of Havingness with any certainty. See, he'll run it and have a vague feeling of being out, but if he keeps this up very long you just drop back to Significance Processing and get him upscale on Ownership, Responsibility and Control. "What would happen if you controlled something? What would happen if you didn't control something?" The model command. See? And get this flat, get this straightened out so that he's not quite as upset. 14

6 JUNE 1955

I processed a medical doctor, a very good friend of mine (no cracks—he was a very good friend of mine). He'd been in trouble for about thirty years, and I processed this fellow—he's a splendid man, but I knew he'd always had trouble in processing—and I asked him this one question over and over and over and over until we got it flat. And after that, a thirty-year difficulty—a physical thirty-year difficulty—went away. And of course, being a doctor and being concentrated on healing, all he kept talking about was that a thirty-year-old difficulty, which had resisted everything, had gone away. And this was very startling to him and he didn't notice that he was now willing to talk to people and his wife. I was processing him so he could communicate with people, and he thought he was getting processed so that he'd get well over this thing. It just went away incidentally. And all I asked him was this: "How do you go about controlling people? Give me some methods of controlling people. How do you go about it? Give me some methods. How do you do this? How do you control people? Give me a good way to control people. Come on, how do you go about controlling people?" And I just kept this up, hour after hour.

Blew his case sky-wide and handsome. Couldn't help it. Because he was fixed on such methods of controlling people, and his difficulties in life was his chief method of controlling himself as a "people." His body was a "people" and he was controlling it. And how

SIX BASIC STEPS—SOME FUNDAMENTALS OF AUDITING

do you control people? You emasculate them. Interesting, huh? He was having all sorts of fantastic difficulties, just like that. Time after time through life, these things had occurred. All right.

So Control is a very important button. Ownership, Responsibility and Control have to be cleared up with a preclear—if you get him into Remedy of Havingness and he doesn't exteriorize with certainty, then you know very well that you skimmed down there in significances, and you'll have to drop back down and handle those three buttons and handle them very well. Now of course to handle those buttons—you might have been processing a guy way over his head; he might be down there in Waiting. So you'll have to use your head to figure this out—this is a rough case. All right.

So what is the next step? Remedy of Havingness. We don't care what we have him shove in—when he's outside of his body, we also have him shove things into himself, which is an oddity, you know? He'll be back here shoving things into himself as a thetan. And usually for some time he won't notice that he's doing this. But a thetan should be able to be in two places at once, and if he can't be, he's an "only one." All right, so you remedy that with Remedy of Havingness.

Now let's take the whole category, the whole next category of processes, which are called "Spotting Spots." Now, there is a process

6 JUNE 1955

called Spotting Spots, which is simply just that: spotting spots. You have him spot a spot here, and spot a spot there, and spot where he was born, and spot here, do various things. It's curious—an interesting process.

“Now spot a spot; now throw some hellos and okays to it.” You know, “Now spot a spot here. Now spot where you were born and throw some hellos and okays to it; have it throw some hellos and okays to you.” Get a lot of razzle-dazzle processes which are very beneficial. But this whole category (I suddenly woke up) is called Route 1. Spotting Spots is Route 1. That's all you do in Route 1 is spot spots. What's Route 1? It's the basic exercises of exteriorization as a thetan as given in *The Creation of Human Ability*. You just have him spot spots and communicate with spots until he's finally fairly used to the idea and he isn't obsessively avoiding spotting spots, and he's in good shape.

And those are the Six Basic Steps of auditing and the things that an auditor should know. And the things which will get, today, results by the ton for the auditor. How many hours should a person be audited? He ought to be audited until he's an Operating Thetan.

Thank you very much.



THE MECHANISMS OF OWNERSHIP IN LIVING

A LECTURE GIVEN ON 6 JUNE 1955

61 MINUTES

Thank you. How are you today?

2

Audience: Fine.

Good. Good. Group Processing getting anywhere with anyone?

Audience: Yes.

Well, that's fine.

A couple of small misnomers—as usual, rumor and conflict goes rife. Wherever you have a human communication line, you have a communication—heh!—line. If you realize all these walls, all these walls are made out of second postulates which are incorrect, and they have to perforce contain a lie, then you can see that communication very often contains an error.

6 JUNE 1955

The HASI in Phoenix, Arizona continues—continues to teach the HCA, BScn Course as always, and the Hubbard Guidance Center there continues to process as always; no upset along these lines at all. The HASI goes on. As far as organizations in Scientology is concerned, these go on too. There are a great many more of them coming up than there are now. Of course the central proprietor, you might say, of the trademarks of Scientology, and so forth are the HASI; so the HASI stays in a control position with regard to these things, simply to guarantee an excellence of processing—without which Scientology would not go a foot. Now, we owe that to the public. We owe that to you.

Now, here is another thing. The training courses which are available, are available from people who have the right to train—who operate training establishments. And there are two or three of these in the East and training is very good. However, the HASI continues to train.

Now, in the whole problem of training and processing, it is a very poor thing to give somebody less than everything one has to offer. In other words, the auditor who does the auditing should at that time be in possession of the very best processes he knows and the very best he can do at the time. The PABs are remarkably responsible for this sort of thing. I haven't heard too much lately—fan mail, you might say—on the

PABs, but they continue to come out. I write them. I put them out. I try to keep people up to date with the *Professional Auditor Bulletins*.

These are mailed from the HAS London, another organization. And London is very punctual with these; one of the most punctual publications we have. I believe there was only one issue which was even vaguely missing on the PABs on this coast. Only one issue. And that was in a plane that crashed. And if anybody is missing one of his PABs, just write to London and say he didn't get it; because there was a planeload of PABs that did crash and burn, I think, in Greenland. And the mail was recovered to some extent and a few fragments of these PABs were sent through. It must have been *very* explosive material! (*laughter*)

But the special memberships and professional memberships in the HASI continue to bring you publications.

Now, here we have the fourth day of this very fine congress. You 3 certainly are great people. And on this day I would very much like to fill in, with a few fast rushes, the material which I've been going over. My brain thought all this up, by the way. That's the best way to remember this, you know. Say, you know, you think up something and you say, "Boy, I sure got a nice brain there that thought that up." Get a misownership on it and you've got it. One of the reasons people don't retain anything they learn in school is merely because they continue in the considerable and terrible error

6 JUNE 1955

that the information belongs to the school. And if you continue to say, "Well, that's arithmetic there—the property of the arithmetic teacher," and if you don't feel that you made it all up yourself, you're not going to remember arithmetic. And in that is the secret of how to study. That is the secret of how to study: Own the information.

Now, every now and then we get an HCA student—we have quite a time in the Phoenix HCA class, because the Instructors are all eager beavers and they work real hard with a student. And there's a week of indoctrination now before they even go into the HCA Course—just bring them up to date so they won't mess up auditing, and so forth, and so the school runs along very calmly. And one of the students was trying to memorize the Axioms out of *The Creation of Human Ability* which you have here at this congress, and he was trying to memorize these Axioms—they were not in the book at that time, they were simply on a mimeographed sheet—and would come around to me every day or two and tell me how wonderful it was for me to have thought up and put together all these Axioms. "But the only trouble," this student would keep saying, "is that I can't seem to remember them. I read them and they're gone. And it's just such a wonderful job that you did."

Instructor got hold of her and said, "Now . . . now, will you please get the idea that you wrote these Axioms." She never had any trouble

thereafter. She remembered them all verbatim. Of course I got less admiration, but we got a better student!

Well, now that is the secret of how to study and that's a little datum that you might find useful—you might find very useful.

The ability to possess information or objects depends upon the ability to misown it. In the view of the fact that your parents and teachers worked so hard and so arduously for so long to get you to be a truthful character, I can't then conceive of how, if you were made to be such a truthful character and how everything had to agree with absolute fact, you're here remembering or owning anything. How do you fit these together? If you know you have to tell the truth *all* the time and must *never* under any circumstances lie about *anything* or misrepresent a single fact *anywhere*, it is a certainty—a certainty—that your havingness will get shot. Why? Because if you continue to pick up the absolute correct ownership of every subject you study, and if you never tell yourself the little fib that “well, I did it,” or “somebody else did it,” you'll get no persistence of the data. Do you follow me?

You'll never own a car if you were totally truthful about it. There's the car: it was created by Detroit. You go on saying, “Well, I've got a slip of paper here; that's a lie, however. Detroit owns my car.” It'll be an awfully thin car you'll be driving down the road. It won't be very real.

6 JUNE 1955

You have to have the faculty of saying to yourself, “Well, I’ve certainly got a nice car here.”

- 4 Now, if you wanted to assert a better ownership or control of the body, you would do exactly what people do all the time when they are difficult to exteriorize, which is to say, “Me. My body. My body.” And if you had difficulty in getting out of your familial arena, you would have made *this* mistake (you know, you couldn’t exteriorize very easily from your family, or you couldn’t exteriorize your wife or your husband from the family; that’s one of the more difficult problems, trying to exteriorize the marital partner from the family, comes up every now and then)—we would have this kind of a lie going forward: “*My* family. *My* father. *My* mother. I am *their* child.” And you’d be interiorized into the family; you’d be a very close member of the family.

Now if we go on the basis that all proximity and contact with anything alive or any group is bad, this will make you very unhappy. Little child is going around all the time saying “*my* mother.” Well, let’s look over what happens here. *My* mother? No. Body’s mother, if you please. See, “Body’s mother” is the correct statement. And that will as-is all these terminal closures. Well, body’s mother—“How are you, body’s mother?” And you’d never get stuck in Mama’s universe. Just never would, you see? You’d never get stuck and start thinking Mama’s

thoughts and having Mama's lumbosis. See? But if you go around saying all the time—the incorrect ownership, the misownership of Mother—“*my* mother.” This thetan (understand) who came here from—well, he just narrowly missed a very long rap in the penal colonies of Orion or something, he got here (that's Para-Scientology), he got here, you see, and he took over this body and he's never had much relationship with Earth or this family or the genetic line or anything, and then starts to say “*my* mother” and starts to call himself an Earthman, and then wonders why he gets so heavy. You see, he's stated a misownership which gives him mass.

Now, let me go into this a little more carefully with you because it's absolute black magic when you start looking this over. It's very simple—extremely simple.

In order to have any space or mass or the persistence of any object or even idea, the element of misownership has been injected by this race, this planet, in this universe at this time. That doesn't mean that you couldn't make a postulate if you were good and Clear. You could simply make a postulate and say, “There is a mass. It will persist. It is persisting,” and that would be that. And it would stay there on and on because you said it would, until the moment when you remembered that you said it, at which moment it would go *whish!* and that would be

6 JUNE 1955

the end of that mass. To keep yourself from thus accidentally as-ising your wife, you then say "*my* wife." And they were so anxious about this from cave times forward up till the beginning of this century that wives were chattels—they were owned. I think you could even mortgage them and borrow money on them from the finance companies. So they were property.

Now, we wonder why the knights of old, and so forth, got so stuck on horses, you know, and got so hepped about it; or why the girls down here at Warrenton, Virginia are so stuck on horses. You ever run into any of these "horsy" girls down from Warrenton? They're quite interesting people. They keep talking about "*my* horse" implying they created the horse. My, that's a nice solid horse, you know? "*My* horse, *my* stables, *my* farm." And then you say to them some fine day, "Let's take a ride in a car" or "Let's take a run up to New York"—they're not going to exteriorize from that situation. They're not even going to be able to pull the body out of it. Because it's all misowned, and therefore they've closed terminals with it and it is terrifically solid.

5 Now, gravity itself depends on ownership. So if you kept talking about "*my* planet Earth" or if you concocted or went along with this fantastic lie: "Man was born by Earth out of a sea of ammonia, and it was all an accident but Earth gave birth to us all"—boy, you'd get

heavy. That's why the modern scientist has flat feet. He keeps subscribing to this theory that Earth produced him.

Now, how far can we go on a via? Now, the test is, by saying "Earth made me" and just by believing that consistently and continually, would a person get any lighter and finally levitate? No. Crunch! Crunch! Crunch! He would get into such a pass eventually that he would not be able to carry even the smallest suitcase. It would just be too heavy. Work would be unsupportably terrible. "What? Having to pick up that sofa pillow? Having to pick up these feet?" See? "I am an Earthman, I am a body." You get the idea? "Earth made me. It is my planet. My farm. My land. My mother. My horse." All implying that you made Earth, planet, Mother, horse, you know? Or that Mother made you—a thetan. And boy, you'd certainly get dead in the head after a while, believe me. And then you'd kind of start skidding. And you'd finally wind up where the Greeks kept their thetans. You know where the Greek interiorized into? He interiorized into the stomach. It's fantastic, but he did. You find it in all of his scientific writings. Thinkingness is done by the stomach, and so forth. You look back in very ancient literature. They believed that the soul was in the stomach. All right.

We look this over and we find out, then, that these principles of ownership and misownership permit us to acquire, to have or not to

6 JUNE 1955

have, practically at will. And if you had this factor under good control you could exteriorize out of any situation or off of any planet or out of any trap—if you had this right down (*snap*), you see. Now, very often a person has to come up to a point of where he can face this idea of ownership. That is merely a matter of how well his postulates stick. That chart I gave you the other day is a gradient scale of how easily an individual can make his postulates stick. And when he can't make his postulates stick very well, and is below the level of ownership—you see, he would be well down—then he thinks “I own this and I own that” and he does such a faint job of it that he doesn't as-is everything.

But as soon as he comes upscale and gets into pretty good shape, you'd say, “All right, now get the idea that you own your mother.”

“That's funny, I feel different.”

See, you'd get an instantaneous separation of universes—if the fellow was in real good condition, you see? Instantaneous.

He'd find himself working for the bureau of external securities, or working for the committee that is going to probe the security of all the security agencies or something like that, and he'd keep talking about “*my* committee, *my* job,” and his wife would less and less find herself capable of getting him out to a movie or getting him out to a bridge game or a picnic or getting him to take a little run up to New York and see a play

or something like this. His wife would just find it harder and harder to do this. Well, what's happening is the individual, every time he says a misownership which is "*my* job, *my* office," you see, and "I have to do this and that," and so on, he's just pinning himself down tighter and tighter and tighter—he's getting a terminal closure because he's getting more and more solidity, more and more mass, and more and more electromagnetic attraction. And as he gets more and more electromagnetic attraction, he is less and less able to pull himself off of those bulkheads.

Now, every once in a while you say to somebody, "Be three feet back of your head"—he is. You say, "All right, copy, copy, copy," and the rest of Route 1 and he's not going along too well. And he goes over and he happens to touch the back of his chair with a (quote) hand (unquote) or something like that, and then he goes "*Nynng-nynng-nynng-nynng-nynng-nynng*—huh! That's horrible stuff, that MEST. That's terrible! Terrible! You get stuck on it." What's he done? What's the answer to this? The answer to this situation is simply that he has so much misownership on that wall that he sticks to it. It has enormous gravitic attraction for him, a thetan.

And after a person has been on this planet and told this lie long enough and often enough and believes it thoroughly enough, he, as a thetan, accumulates mass to such a degree that gravity has an 6

6 JUNE 1955

attraction for him and this condition could exist: You say to somebody, "Be three feet back of your head," and let's say he got out, as occasionally he does—"Be three feet back of your head," he goes out and he goes right down to Earth, bang! See, gravity is working on him. And you would say that a solid body is simply something which has been so thoroughly misowned and which is so thoroughly misowning, that it is sufficiently in gravitic attraction with Earth that it sticks here regardless of the centrifugal force. That's gravity. That's also weight. That's also thinness.

Now let's take this terrifically thin person. They see a wall and they go *zong!* You ask them to eat something and they say, "All right, I'll eat a hearty dinner. Have you got any toast?" No, they won't eat, they won't acquire mass, and so forth. Now this person is probably doing something obsessively quite in reverse—but obsessive, you understand. This person is obsessed with the idea that they cannot have and cannot own and all this is—all the total obsession is—is they cannot tell a lie.

And a person who is absolutely obsessed with telling the truth—where we define truth, you see, as agreement with this universe. You see, that is—there are two kinds of truth. Truth is one, what's true, and two, is what is in agreement with what has been and is being at the moment, which same contains a lot of lies.

See, there is two kinds of truth. This fellow, he says, "Well now," he says, "I am basically a static. I can do this and that." All right, that's a truth. There's another kind of truth. He was down at Joe's Bar last night until 10:03 drinking Scotch. And he says to somebody—asks him the next morning, "Now, where have you been?"—and he said, "I was down at Joe's Bar last night until 10:03, drinking Scotch." See, now that is agreed-upon truth. Other people saw him there, and so on. He can prove it, in other words. Actually, it doesn't matter a darn. Somebody says, "Where were you last night?"

"Oh, I went to the opera."

Person says, "But there's no opera playing in Washington at this time."

"Huh! There isn't? Well I just created some."

Now, this is not really a departure from truth; it is a walk into imagery—creative living. He just creates a time track. But a person who has been utterly and absolutely convinced that he must not at any time create any time track even vaguely independent of what everybody else has experienced, is pinned into an obsessive truth. They really don't know they're doing this, and they'll get pretty darn thin. They will lose things. Things will disappear on them. They have a tendency to fade away. Why? Because they've got to state the exact and correct ownership of everything

6 JUNE 1955

all the time and they're doing this all the time. So they're not owning anything. And boy, if you could just be this person as a thetan for a little while, you'd look out at the wall and boy, that wall would be thin. You run this person on 8-C and this person is very doubtful of how deep the fingers will sink into that wall. You know, everything is light, filmy, no substance or substantialness to existence, and these people are thin.

The other person is misowning on a grand scale, see? This gives him weight, gravity, and so on. The other person is owning, as obsessively, on the exact correct scale, and he hasn't any weight. Fantastic, but you'll see this happen.

Now, if you want your car . . . And you see, if you know the secret behind all this, it's very simple for you to own and misown at will. Now any time that you had a car and you liked the car and then you sold the car and felt bad and experienced loss, you see—well, you, of course, must have ceased to misown the car—I mean, you didn't go about it properly. You said, "There goes *my* car." Well, the moment you sold it, you should have simply given yourself the new postulate, and you simply said something like "Made by Detroit, his car. Goodbye." You'd feel no grief. You know, "It's gone. So what?"

All right. Now we take a departed ally. People going around and saying, "My grandfather is dead. (*sniff*)" Or black screens, and so forth,

see? What's the thing? You could have said "my grandfather"—that would have made him very solid—right up to the moment he died. And you would have said, "Genetic line body's grandfather no longer exists. Cause of death, his. Picture of death, mine." No reaction. That's cancellation of reaction. Merely state the truth of the situation. In other words, when you stop playing a game, straighten out its ownership before you leave the field; because if you don't, you won't leave the field. So how do you get off a playing field? Just get the correct ownerships of everything. You loused all these things up so you could have a game. Now let's admit that we did this and then admit the correct ownership of all the pieces and spaces in which the game was being played and you can leave the playing field.

Here's your football player who was the star of the college team, and so forth, and now he's selling bonds. And they say, "Well, that's Mr. Grange or somebody, and he was all-American for such and such a time." We look at this fellow and we say, "Why in the name of common sense can't this individual stop playing football? He's now forty-two years of age. He was once an intelligent man. Why is he still playing football?" Well, you don't recognize entirely the complete mechanism behind it. He's not only playing football; he never left the game with Army. He's still there. And he gets to be forty-six and all of a sudden

6 JUNE 1955

develops what they call athlete's heart. Why should he develop athlete's heart? His heart is still playing football.

- 8 In other words, any playing field is a playing field because you're misowning the game and players and the ground on which it's being played. The musician says, "My music, my organ, my piano." Says this very consistently, and so keeps in mass form, music, the instrument—stays in there playing the game. And then one day for some reason or other decides to be a painter. You should ask yourself, why doesn't a musician every now and then suddenly become a painter? Well, the oddity is, they do. They do. They get tired of playing music and start painting or something like this—they'll swap fields. But oh, my goodness, the person who does this is practically a Clear—I mean, they're just natural, you know—and boy, are they in good shape if they can do this.

Now, we take this person who is not in this terrific condition and they're saying "My musical instrument, my music, my career," so forth, and they're talking about this, you see, and then one day they find they're not getting much attention for this or something, and they decide to paint. Where are they? Where are they, really? Where are they stuck on the track? They're sitting at that instrument. They'll be there for years, because they never left the playing field.

Now, sharpen up your ears, you people who know your Dianetics. This is the mechanism of getting stuck on the track. And although the word can stick a person on the track—a phrase and all that, a person can get stuck on the track with these—there is a more basic, a more fundamental mechanism than this. And that is, they misowned things till they had a playing field, and then when other factors entered and the game ceased to be playable, they never left the playing field. In other words, they never straightened out the misownership they started with. They had to have misownership. You know, it wasn't their field at all. They didn't have anything to do at all with making this field—nothing whatsoever. And then they say, "*my* playing field." See? Misownership. They have a body, a doll—a biological doll, such as you wear. And this biological doll is the piece they are using to play the game. And so they say "*my* body," you know, "*I* made it." But they make very sure that they stole one, so they didn't. And they say "*my* fellow players." Well now, that is actually correct. So they have to find something a little bit wrong with them so they don't quite own them. You know, they have to be a little critical, introduce some feeling of doubt about the "*my*-ness" of "*my* fellow players." And that keeps a crowd around!

And then they say "the enemy"—*they* belong to "them." But the funny part of it is, to have a really good enemy you had to have a lot to

6 JUNE 1955

do with creating him, and then you had to say "I didn't have a thing to do with it," and you'll have a nice, solid opposition. Nice enemy. See how easy it is? Then when the game is over, just straighten out the factors of ownership of that game. There's no consequence or liability to it; you exteriorize from that game.

- 9 Now let's take language. Why is it if your genetic entity was once French, you do not like a nightingale speak French? In the first place, you haven't stirred it up. In the second place, the GE has never left the French playing field. And it's sort of a stuck line on the whole thing. This is a fascinating fact. The GE isn't going to up and talk French anyhow. You've got to talk the language that the GE talks.

But why, if *you* as a thetan had a French body, why don't *you* talk French now? Why can't you talk French? Well, as a matter of fact if you did an improper jump out of the French playing field, if you didn't separate from it at all well, you'll get yourself into the beautifully stuck condition of being so confused about French, not being French, that the whole thing becomes a mystery. "I can speak French, but obviously I am not French, so why should I be able to speak French? But I can't speak French, and that makes a nice mystery." And you go around not even able to learn French.

Because, in the first place, when you separated from the French race, you did an immediate "they," if you were a smart thetan—"those

Frenchmen." See, you got about twenty-five feet above that dead body and you said, "Look at those Frenchmen down there." There went your French. Because you were very, very careful to say so if you were smart. If you wanted your French back, just start realizing how French you are. One liability goes along with it, however. You're liable to get out of your head and find yourself over Nîmes or Reims. You'll move back over the old playing field and you will move back out of present time and will things look funny! See how you would go about that?

So if you were at all able, when you exteriorized from a dead body you said, "*Their* body, *those* Frenchmen, *their* Earth," you know—*bing, bing, bing*—"partially mine, not mine," and you'd have it, you see, because you do have some slight series of incidents connected with it that you *did* contribute to. But the ordinary job that is done on exteriorization of death is simply this one: they say, "*Those* Frenchmen, *that* body"—no more, wipeout, forgotten, gone, period. In other words, the guy does an almost violent proper ownership of the whole works and detaches from it and still leaves himself with a little fragment of the whole thing by then introducing some other factor and then by saying, "Now I will have to forget it all."

See, that is another factor and not a necessary one at all unless you're trying to convince somebody that you shouldn't be locked up in

6 JUNE 1955

the Bastille. Most thetans have a fear of past crimes, so on. You know, what I told you yesterday—they're hit and then they think "I'm guilty," you know? They get hit and then they say, "Well, I must be guilty of something because I was hit." So they're killed, so they say, "Well, I must have been guilty of something, because there it is, dead." His immediate conclusion is, "I'm wanted, by the wrong people." You get the idea? The shock of death is sufficient to convince somebody that he's done something. That's why he very quickly reverses on the responsibility scale. And that's why he has a dwindling spiral.

10 So an exteriorizing thetan ordinarily is not going through a really proper procedure at all. He's merely saying, "No responsibility." But he just happens to hit this Ownership button properly and then he adds the extraneous (*snap*) "Forget it"—you know, otherwise he's liable to be arrested or something of the sort—and that's that. And he's gone, he's out, he's no longer interested, and that's the end of that game as far as he's concerned. So he does this—bang-bang! (*snap*) Just—he knows enough to do this.

But there is extraordinary pressure on it that shouldn't be there. Because he's dead, he must have been guilty of something. This proves it, doesn't it? He's dead, isn't he? There was a blow or a shock or an explosion or something happened, because even a quiet (quote) natural

(unquote) death—whatever that is—generally, on exteriorization there will be some explosions of ridges or something like that. There will be a disturbance, an electrical disturbance—there will be a shock-back as far as the thetan is concerned. He goes then believing that it was he who killed the body. That's about the least thing he'll believe. And maybe in the next life he floats along with the body, you know, killing it. Why? Because he's a killer. Well, why is he a killer? Well, the last body he had died, didn't it? See the stupidity of—there is no real logical . . .

Now, if you wanted to rehabilitate this—*just that*—you start exteriorizing by whatever process, Ownership or anything else, you exteriorize somebody from his body and then have him get again the correct ownerships of the forgetters. Who said, "Forget it"? This between-lives area thing is merely so a person can say, "*They* said forget it." And that makes the forgetter persist. See, the forgetter has been misowned and this gives a bad memory that psychology talks about, and so forth, and about which we are not interested. See, the forgetter has to be misowned to be effective. But the odd part of it is, the memory doesn't. Because a thetan basically knows everything, so the only thing he can misown is his stupidity if he wants it to stick. That's why you can change people's IQs—you just get the ownership of their stupidity. Very simple.

6 JUNE 1955

Now, you see how you would use this practically? Let's get it real straight. If you want to possess and have, you'd better misown. See? And by "misown," we say just assign the wrong creator, and you'll have something and it'll persist. Assign the wrong creator. "This car was built in Florida." "It was made by *me*." "This beautiful John Alden yacht that I designed." You see? And then when one changes his game, to go through the very nice little ritual of assigning back the proper ownerships, and bother the forgetter. First thing you know, you'll wind up with all your experience intact, and none of the playing fields.

There are people walking up and down the street all day long, they're stuck in playing fields all over the place. They're in a factory in their youth, they're in space opera way back when, they're in a time when they were a priest. You say to some old-time Dianeticist who's come into Scientology, "Now, we're going to ordain you as a minister."

And the fellow goes, "*Nnyyeeooww!* No! None of that!"

Well, rather than argue with the guy you simply say, "All right, now get the idea of being a priest. *(pause)* Well, what can you be that's real close to it?"

"Well, I could be a demon."

I just work him around, have him be various things of this character. The next thing you know, he'll tell you confidentially, "Well,

I . . . I feel a considerable confidence in the idea that I could probably be a cardinal, but not a minister.”

Have him be a few more things like that and he says, “I don’t know why I’ve been worried about this.”

Well, he’s been worried about it because some time or another he was either violently antireligious in some role or—he lived that life—or he was a persecuted monk or something of the sort. He’s led an unsuccessful life.

Now let me show you this: Every life we lead and die from, we catalog as unsuccessful. Let’s just look that over. Every life we lead and die from, we catalog as unsuccessful. Truth of the matter is, you successfully got through that one. All right.

Very germane to this subject of ownership and responsibility and control, because that’s all the same little ladder, I’d better tell you something about another process which is quite close to this. 11

Why won’t individuals uncommunicate—break communication? The fellow is stuck to the wall, he won’t let go of it. All right, ownership is your first key and clue. This brings about an obsession on his part that he must not break communication once started. And he begins to feel that he cannot possibly break a communication if he has begun it. Now, this is idiocy. Because you wrote Eisenhower a letter means now that

6 JUNE 1955

you have to write Eisenhower letters. Well, that's the way it figures, isn't it? You started to communicate. If you're unable to stop communicating any time you started communicating, you're being penalized to some degree, aren't you?

Now let me tell you about a completely and utterly and fantastically unworkable process. This is the most unworkable process that anybody ever investigated. It has no benefit; it's all liability. Would simply be this question asked over and over and nicely acknowledged—it'd sound just like an auditing session. I hope no psychologist gets hold of this, because he'd have to do it just to find out if it happens. He would! Have to. Now . . . So I'll give you the rest of it, how you would solve it. It's just an experiment. It's a wild thing that you could do to somebody. You say, "Now, give me some things you could go out of ARC with" or "Give me some things you wouldn't mind breaking communication with."

He gives you some and you say, "Fine. Fine. Good. Good. Give me some more things you could break communication with" or "go out of communication with."

And he'd say, "Fine"—then he'd tell you some things—"Fine."

And you say, "All right."

See? What a nice auditing session it sounds like, you know. Right up to there. Just sounds like the real McCoy. Sounds real good, you

know. And you say, "Give me some more things that you wouldn't mind going out of communication with." Well, this is so logical—so very, very logical. Because the truth of the matter is, the only reason the man is stuck on the track is because he won't go out of communication with the past. See, he just won't. He refuses to. Still got it. Wants it. So obviously we have to repair his ability to break communication. Otherwise, we won't get him cleanly breaking clear of the time track at all, will we? It's the theory behind this. Nice theory, isn't it? So we say, "Give me something else you wouldn't mind going out of communication with."

And he gives us something of "I wouldn't mind going out of communication with my mother."

And you say, "That's fine. Now, give me something else you wouldn't mind going out of communication with."

"Well, I wouldn't mind going out of communication with my boss."

And you say, "That's fine. Now, give me something else you wouldn't mind going out of communication with."

The fellow's saying, "The whole planet!" He'd simply go into a rage. And he'd go into enough, sufficient anger and rage that you would find him unauditable right at that point. He would blow—he would blow the session. I've done this several times just to test it out.

6 JUNE 1955

Having the antidote right to hand, it was very easy to do and get the guy turned around and back in and run the rest of it. Couple of auditors have done this just to make sure that this was the mechanism, and it *is* the mechanism. The effort to go out of communication with, eventually gets himself so stuck that he goes into a rage. And rage is the emotion which is designed to break communication, but doesn't. It just stacks it up. You recognize the emotion there. It's just the effort to go out of communication, that's all—and to keep on informing people you're going out of communication with them. And the boy does not come up above rage with the process, because he blows the session and goes out of control. Now this doesn't much matter what person you're running it on. That's what they do. That's the end of that. So it's an utterly unworkable process. (Day or so, they'll settle down and start living again.)

- 12 But here is this situation. A process which sounds like a legitimate process evidently is completely unrunnable. And obviously, if you wanted to get somebody unstuck on the time track, the most logical thing in the world that you would do would be to rehabilitate his ability to break communication. Certainly you've got to break communication with the past in order to get him totally in present time. He's got to be willing to let go of *something* on the time track before he'll come out of it.

All right, where's all this lead? It led immediately to Consequence Processing. The first edition of Consequence Processing ran this way—it's the very first one—"What would happen if you got angry?" On and on and on and on and on, and eventually cleaned that up and the fellow said, "Nothing," you know? He'd swerved. And then you can say, "What wouldn't you mind going out of communication with?" and you'll only get a little sputter and yap about it. You've already solved the consequences of anger. He's fighting anger, and as long as he cannot break communication, *time*, the single aberration, will continue to depress him down the Tone Scale. With each forward ticking moment, he will get stuck tighter and tighter and tighter down to anger and then blow it, and through to the lower harmonics.

And that is the mechanism of the dwindling spiral. There's no more complex mechanism than that about it. Do you see it now? With each ticking moment, time is breaking communication for him. And if this process "What wouldn't you mind going out of communication with?" winds him up in anger, certainly time, going tick, tick, tick, tick, tick—which is "Break communication, break communication, break communication, break communication"—certainly would wind him up in going downscale. And that's how people descend down that Tone Scale and why they wind up where they wind up. It was the most basic reason. How

6 JUNE 1955

do you clean it up? Consequence Processing or Ownership Processing—or consequences of ownership, so forth; you could combine these.

But the way that you would handle this would be—most basic and fundamental way—“What would happen if you got angry? What would happen if you got angry?” It is evidently apparent immediately that if we are going to get anyone totally above 1.5 on the Tone Scale, we’re going to have to run “What would happen if you got angry?” sooner or later.

Now, a *thetan* can get up above 1.5 on the Tone Scale with the greatest of ease, but you can get a body up there, too. It’s the body that gets stuck in covert—the game called society is covert hostility. Propitiation, politeness, so forth. That’s stuck below 1.5. It’s very dangerous when it’s stuck below 1.5. There’s no reason why this game could not be carried on above 1.5, but as years progress and arthritis sets in, the tickety-tick, tickety-tick, tickety-tick of time breaking communication, breaking communication, every cycle is saying, “Break communication, break communication, break communication, break communication.” Of course, it’s also saying, “Make communication.” It’s saying, “Make communication, break communication” for its whole cycle. And if an individual cannot have “Make communication, break communication, make communication, break communication,” he can’t ride along the time track. He’ll just simply stick harder and harder, and more and more into misowned incidents.

This is the mechanics of this universe. This is how this universe throws downscale the luckless thetan who is living in it. Because he believes, as everybody believes, that there are vast consequences to anger, and every time he starts to get angry—which is to say break *through* this—he’s said, “No, I mustn’t get angry. I’ll get sick and people will get mad at me and I will starve to death and there are horrible consequences will occur if I get angry, so therefore I’ve got to kind of float along with this time track one way or the other.” And he starts to pull loose from various points on the time track where he’s misowning and gotten stuck and he feels himself starting to get mad and he says, “No, no, no. I’ll just have to float along with this time track.”

We have to restore to the individual the freedom to be apathetic, if 13
he’s in pretty bad shape, and then the freedom to be angry—or simply the freedom to be angry.

One case, by the way, fooled me one time very recently right on this same fundamental. I started running this process, “Now, what would happen”—I knew this person was stuck all over the time track and this person was not high enough upscale to run Ownership Processing or Responsibility or anything else, so I simply started in, in just the fundamental that I already had, and this fundamental was simply this: “What would happen if you got angry? What would happen if you didn’t

6 JUNE 1955

get angry? What would happen if you got angry? What would happen if you didn't get angry?" by which we mean plus and minus running as is marked on these charts. "What would happen if you got angry? What would happen if you didn't get angry? What would happen if you got angry? What would happen if you didn't get angry?"

I was getting no comm lag. So I says, "Aha! Process too high. Let's start down at the bottom." I started down to the bottom and chose just at random, at the bottom, "sleep" or "unconsciousness," and ran this flat. "What would happen if you got unconscious? What would happen if you didn't get unconscious? What would happen if you got unconscious? What would happen if you didn't . . ." Got that cleaned up. That cleaned up fairly easily; came right on upscale through various other, you know, "What would happen if you hurt? What would happen if you didn't hurt?" which is above anger. No comm lag again, so I dived back downscale once more—said, "Couldn't be, because this person is not an apathy case." Well, as a thetan, this person wasn't an apathy case, but the person's body was stuck solid in apathy. And I said, "Well now, all right, let's just take the Tone Scale now. What would happen if you got apathetic?"

'Thubbb! Thubbb!' Terrific comm lags.

"What would happen if you didn't get apathetic?" Oh, terrific comm lags.

This person was stuck on the lower harmonic of anger—as a body. Cleaned this up, went up Tone Scale, got up—there was nothing much on grief—more or less cleaned up and got up to anger and cleaned that up rather easily and then ran “What wouldn’t you mind communicating with? What wouldn’t you mind breaking communications with? What wouldn’t you mind communicating with? What wouldn’t you mind breaking communications with?” and the person just ran like a well-oiled dream and soared right on up Tone Scale—2.0, boredom, conservatism, enthusiasm as a stable tone.

So I wonder how many cases in Dianetics and Scientology are parked below 1.5 as a physical body, or as a thetan and body, simply because they do not dare be apathetic or angry? How many? And is this the barrier which prevents a person from coming up Tone Scale rapidly? And yes, my experience in the last few months and weeks has told me that it is.

An inability to break communication will depress a person on the 14
Tone Scale. So we have a very interestingly simple mechanism for getting a person upscale. We have to get the consequences of these emotions and the consequences of no such emotion, see? Consequences of apathy, consequences of not being apathetic. We have to get the consequences of these emotions or anything else that occurs. Right along

6 JUNE 1955

with this are the consequences of unconsciousness and the consequences of pain. We have to clear these up to some degree.

If you wanted to solve an engram all the way across the board, you would certainly have to run something on the order of "What would happen if you became unconscious? What would happen if you didn't become unconscious? What would happen if you got hurt? What would happen if you didn't get hurt?" and run these things flat. Those are pretty high-toned, by the way. But that, of course, runs out the most holding basic of an engram. We knew in Dianetics that it was pain and unconsciousness which pinned the engram where it was. So you can run that by Consequences Processing.

But you won't get people up Tone Scale as long as they're afraid or unable on the subject of apathy and anger. Now that doesn't mean you want everybody going around mad-dogging with anger. The funny part of it is, they only go around mad-dogging with anger when they can't be angry. They only go around being obsessively apathetic when they can't be apathetic. They only go around crying, crying, crying because they can't cry. When they can do these things, they don't have to do them just to prove it—and we get into proof.

Neat process right along there, by the way, is proof. You say, "What have you got that would prove anything to whom?" Or "Invent some

proof.” Fabulous process. This whole category of “invent”—invent some time, invent a game, invent proof—rather fabulous processes.

Consequences, then, on the Tone Scale is the most vital process that you’d have to get rid of to get a case coming upscale. Because they’re going to hit a barricade. And the barricades, if they’re above apathy, will be anger, and if they’re apathetic or around there someplace, will be apathy. And the mere thought of breaking communication will put them into the solidity of apathy or grief or anger—the three ridges. Just the thought of coming up to present time would be enough to pin them into apathy or grief or anger. “What would happen if you got apathetic? What would happen if you didn’t get apathetic?” resolves this.

So this goes along to a marked degree with Ownership Processing. Of course, Ownership Processing is sort of a sledgehammer. You simply say to the person, “Get the idea who owned it and who didn’t own it,” and so forth. And there’s no energy left around to be stuck to. But this doesn’t mean he’s going to be terribly happy about it. No great liability connected with it such as other processes—Perfect Duplication, and so forth—but he doesn’t quite like to give up that much MEST, he thinks. He’ll have rationalizations; whereas “What would happen if you got angry? What would happen if you didn’t get angry?”—he comes out of that cleanly because you change his *consideration*. And when you change

6 JUNE 1955

the consideration or the ideas of a man, you make him well; and when you change his MEST, you've changed his MEST.

Well now, do you see these mechanisms? They are quite interesting and they bring processing out of the dark ages of "maybe" into a considerable certainty. Anybody whose case is lagging—he's getting lots and lots and lots and lots of hours, you know, and he keeps piling it up—can remember times when he kind of started to get mad or started to feel apathetic during a session, checked himself or the auditor checked him, and he went on running the process. In other words, he tried to come upscale and go past those bands, and social agreement says, "Thou shalt not rage" and so he just sticks right there. How many preclears have gotten parked below that band, there's no telling. But now that you know this, there's no reason why they should be parked there any longer.

Thank you.



GROUP PROCESSING: ADDITIONAL PROCESSING ON MEANINGNESS

A LECTURE AND GROUP PROCESSING SESSION
GIVEN ON 6 JUNE 1955

54 MINUTES

Thank you. I think it's highly probable 2
at this time that we could do with a little less data and a little more
processing. How about that?

Audience: (applause)

Now, I've already given you some example of the highest echelon in
Significance Processing, which is Meaningness Processing. Meaningness
Processing. We ran that day before yesterday, remember?

Now, in running this process it is quite necessary to understand that
the meaning one is to assign is preferably new, different and strange—
preferably.

6 JUNE 1955

In other words, ask you to have the wall up there assign some meaning and you just sit there and say—have it say, “Well, I’m a wall” or “I mean I’m a wall” or something like this, and then say okay to that, you’re not going to get anyplace—no place at all.

Why? Because we have a scarcity of meaning. Just no more important than that. And when you were a little kid running around, the world looked real bright, and that stick you had was a horse, and that doll you had was a live baby, and that house you had was a castle. Years later, you take a look at these objects and what do you see? You see a stick, a doll, and a very small house.

What’s happened? Why does the world look bright to a child? No more and no less than this: A child assigns meaning, and an adult has gone on a one-way flow so long that he lets everything assign meaning to him. He looks over there, he sees a wall, so that’s a wall. He looks at another person and he says, “Just a person—body, certain amount of education, certain amount of liability.” He’s saying to himself, “Now I know,” you know? “Now I know all about everything.” In other words, “I’ve stripped the meaning out of everything. I have the exact, proper assignment to everything.” And then we get what? We get a person who has a very dull world around him.

The oddity is, is that the fastest cognition change you will get on the preclear is with Meaningness Processing. He changes cognitions faster,

realizes things faster—and that's merely because it is the upper echelon of Significance Processes.

Significance Processes start right down there with "Hide," or—the boys, you know, have been very, very inventive here, very inventive here at this congress. Already had a suggestion, a possibly true one, that "Wait" lies just below "Hide," and that "Decay" lies just below "Wait," and that "Trance" lies just below there somewhere. How far south can you go? It's quite interesting.

Well now, there are meanings. There definitely are meanings, the woof and the warp of the meanings of the world. And as long as you are anxious about what things really mean and as long as things are upsetting to you—that is to say, you know, they might mean this and they might mean that—as long as you have these feelings about your surroundings, why, you have a tendency to be rather unhappy about meaning. You just keep—"What is the actual meaning of that wall?"—you've got a nuclear physicist. 3

He takes a look at a nonexistent atom which exists by agreed-upon postulate, and so forth, and he says, "Now this means . . ." and he has a total agreement of its meaning. See, it's just as nice—got it all settled, it's all buttoned up, he knows exactly what it is. But it's a damn lie and all he can do with it is blow things up. Do you see this? He then has invented, unknowingly, along with all other inventions, some new meaning and

6 JUNE 1955

then has agreed upon it and then has said that this thing is the truth and thereafter refuses to let himself put any other meaning into it.

Now he has learned his textbook. He's all set, you see. Well, the funny part of it is, is there is an exact way in which that wall got there, in which that man got there, and so on. There is this exactness. But listen, just because there is an exact way it all got there is no reason for you to lay aside your power of imagination and invention, because that's all the fun you'll ever have.

If a nuclear physicist could look at an atom and say, "What nice baking soda! That definitely means that if I mix it up with a professor, I will get an agency," if he had the freedom to do this, he could come home at night and pat the little kids on the head and be nice to the wife and eat a dinner without following it with bicarbonate of soda. But he doesn't do that. He stays in the laboratory all the time and the fact that the gamma goes by the square root of the beta which goes under the lambda and this is all agreed upon and is all nice—only it's kind of a desperate mystery, only he's got to find out more about these extant lies. And he says, "It means just so-and-so. And it's all mathematical, and I've got it all down in my notebook." And he comes home and he slaps a kid and he sits down and he—"What you got for dinner? *Rrrf!*" and takes the baking soda. Says, "To hell with the world, let's blow it all up."

GROUP PROCESSING: ADDITIONAL PROCESSING ON MEANINGNESS

Why does he do that? He's lost his power to put any meaning into it. He doesn't know where it came from, he's agreed with a lot of lies, and he's stuck with it.

By the way, you take most engineers who are thoroughly trained on exactly what matter is—you blow them out of their head, if they happen to touch a wall, they'll stick to it. Boy, will they stick to it—*tbunk!* Only you won't blow them out of their head. Now, why is that? That's because of the assigned meaning, and the assigned meaning is the agreed-upon meaning and that is the meaning and there is no other meaning and "I am now being told," he is saying to himself. 4

Now, just look at it as a stuck flow. Old mechanism—flow too long in one direction and you get a stuck flow. All right. All he's saying is, "It is telling me, everything is telling me." Now look at your Auditor's Code and you'll find, "Do not evaluate for the preclear." He's had the whole world evaluating for him. Everything is evaluating for him: the wall says it's a wall, the car says it's a car, the sky says it's a sky, the atom says it's an atom. You see? And that's all it says. And that is constant and continual evaluation.

What the preclear is doing obsessively, have him do it knowingly and you get Meaningness Processing, which overcomes evaluation. And so one can change one's cognitions. One can be free. And that is the heart and soul of Meaningness Processing.

6 JUNE 1955

Now, I didn't mean to give you a lecture on it. I wanted to show you very clearly where this process was going and not have you sit there and take a look at the wall and have it say, "I'm a wall; this means a wall is here," and then you say okay. Because the funny part of it is, you're doing that all the time and you're never going to run out that much track.

What I want you to do is take a look at the wall, say, "This means thundershowers are imminent. Okay." Simple as that.

5 Rehabilitate the ability to reconsider or consider, and you've rehabilitated a thetan. So let's do it.

Let's look at the front wall and have it tell you it means something.
Give it an okay.

Audience: Okay.

Fine. Now let's look at the back wall and have it tell you it means something.

Audience: Okay.

Give it an okay, attaboy. Now let's take a look at that right-hand wall and have it tell you it means something.

Audience: Okay.

Good. Now let's take the left-hand wall over here and have it tell you it means something.

GROUP PROCESSING: ADDITIONAL PROCESSING ON MEANINGNESS

Audience: Okay.

Well, fine. Now let's take a look at that ceiling, have it tell you it means something.

Audience: Okay.

All right. Don't let me rush you on this. Now take a look at that floor and have it tell you it means something.

Audience: Okay.

Well, good. Now take a look at the center of Earth—and let's get right down and knock gravity just to pieces here. Take a look at the center of Earth—go on—and have it tell you it means something.

Audience: Okay.

All right, good. Now take a look at the center of Earth again and have it tell you it means something.

Audience: Okay.

All right, fine. Now take a look at the center of Earth and have it tell you it means something.

Audience: Okay.

All right. Now let's take a look at the center of Earth and have it tell you it means something.

Audience: Okay.

6 JUNE 1955

All right. Let's take a look at the center of Earth and have it tell you it means something.

Audience: Okay.

Everybody get it?

Audience: Yes.

All right. Now let's have a nice look at the sky. You know, skies have been very significant. Let's take a nice look at the sky up there. Not that ceiling, the dickens with the ceiling—take a look at the sky. Now have it tell you it means something.

Audience: Okay.

All right, fine. Now take a look at the sky, and again have it tell you it means something.

Audience: Okay.

All right, fine. Now take a look at the sky and have it tell you it means something.

Audience: Okay.

All right. Now remember, we're inventing a meaning. You know? "This means that electric signs are at a premium." Take a look at the sky and have it tell you it means something.

Audience: Okay.