

SCIENTOLOGY AND DIANETICS

BOOKLET 11
of the
PROFESSIONAL COURSE

BY
L. RON HUBBARD

Resolution of Effort and Counter-Effort: Overt Acts

Ron's Org Grenchen
Switzerland

TO THE STEADFAST AND LOYAL SUPPORTERS OF
TOMORROW AND THE THINKING MEN OF YESTERDAY

COMPILED IN WRITTEN FORM BY

D. FOLGERE
AKA RICHARD DE MILLE

COPYRIGHT 1952
BY L. RON HUBBARD

ADDITIONAL STUDY MATERIAL FOR THIS LECTURE MAY BE FOUND IN
THE FOLLOWING BOOKS:

- ADVANCED PROCEDURE AND AXIOMS
 - SELF ANALYSIS
 - HANDBOOK FOR PRECLEARS
 - DIANETICS: MODERN SCIENCE OF MENTAL HEALTH (1950)
 - SCIENCE OF SURVIVAL (1951)
 - SYMBOLOGICAL PROCESSING
 - LECTURES OF L. RON HUBBARD
- PAMPHLET COVERS ONE LECTURE
- COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS (HOW TO LIVE THROUGH AN EXECUTIVE)
 - INDIVIDUAL TRACK MAP
 - WHAT TO AUDIT

RESOLUTION OF EFFORT AND COUNTER-EFFORT: OVERT ACTS

1. Effort is motion (force) directed by intention.
2. Counter-effort is any force of motion for which the individual has not yet taken responsibility or for which he has given up responsibility.
3. All perceptions of the physical universe may be considered as counter-efforts.
4. The main goal of processing is restoring the individual's self-determinism by the re-evaluation of past postulates.
5. Often the postulates are enturbulated by so much emotion and counter-emotion, effort and counter-effort, that they are relatively unreachable, and so cannot be re-evaluated.
6. When this is the case, it is necessary to "run off" this enturbation, by repeated re-experiencings of the facsimile. The emotion and effort seem to "wear out" by being "rubbed against" the present-time physical universe.
7. Sometimes only effort and counter-effort can be contacted at first.
8. Every effort which the individual makes was first learned by being received as a counter-effort.

The process by which theta builds an organism is simply one to taking all the counter-efforts which come from the environment and putting them to use later on as efforts. This is the only method which theta has for building an organism – at least, it is the only observed method. Theta enters upon a

conquest of the physical universe like an Eskimo building a house out of ice – it uses the materials and forces which are at hand.

A one-celled organism is created, and this organism begins to experience the forces (counter-efforts) of the environment. Sometimes the organism perishes quickly and sometimes it lives for a long time, but either way, the theta of that organism records the counter-efforts which are experienced and uses them later on, in both structure and function, to make efforts which will be appropriate to the environment and will produce greater survival for the organic line.

To digress slightly, this theory has interesting implications in the question of life on other planets and around other stars. An assumption, familiar to us all, has been made by scientists of the last hundred years that life is an accident of a certain combination of factors in the physical universe. Although this idea has been given up by the great majority of advanced workers in all branches of science, its effects still linger on. One of these effects is felt in discussions of life elsewhere in the universe than on earth.

If we assume that life is an *accident* of the particular arrangement of MEST which is found on this planet, then it follows quite conclusively that there must be little or no life among the other planets of this sun, since astronomy has demonstrated that our particular arrangement of MEST is not closely matched even on Mars, the most likely candidate for extraterrestrial life. Mercury is too hot on one side and too cold on the other. Venus is most probably covered by a raging dust storm. Jupiter, Saturn, Uranus, Neptune and Pluto are far too cold. The chances of there being life like the life

we know upon any of the other planets of this sun are very small.

This leaves still one more chance. Fred Hoyle bases his conclusions that somewhere in the universe there may be "a cricket team which could beat the Australians" upon the idea that there are a hundred million million planetary systems within the observable universe, and that each of these systems was formed in a manner similar to ours.

If this is so, numbers certainly favor life similar to ours at many places in the universe. But even this conjecture rests upon the assumption that life needs our arrangement of MEST in order to exist.

If we assume, on the other hand that theta can use whatever counter-efforts it receives from MEST in order to make an organism, then the whole picture is changed. The sulfur-breathing man, who lives at the temperature of a furnace, or the ammonia-breathing man, who lives at a temperature far colder than is found at the poles, or the thousand-ton man, who lives in a world of collapsed molecules, are no longer inconceivable. If life is not just an accident of these particular MEST conditions on this particular planet, then life might be found anywhere under any condition.

If we assume a middle ground and say that theta may prefer to use the kind of conditions which are found on earth, we may also assume that theta may prefer to build organisms which follow the general plan of man, and we may then begin to wonder why theta has chosen this particular form, or image.

On the other hand, we may ignore the Creator and say, simply, that theta has been building these organisms on the general plan of present man for countless ages, throughout the universe, and that naturally it would continue to do so when building them on this planet.

Or we may say that we have come as individuals from one or more points in the universe and that we retain our individual intentions about the building of organisms here on earth.

Or we may say – but enough of this...

9. Counter-efforts are turned into efforts by theta in order to make and operate an organism. Every counter-effort which is impinged upon that organism becomes the property of that organism. It becomes grist for the mill. It becomes fodder. It becomes knowledge which can be used in survival.

This is a simple example. Two children are fighting. One picks up a stick and hits the other. This is the counter-effort. This counter-effort immediately becomes the property of the second child, for him to use in his survival. He turns it around and makes an effort out of it. He picks up a stick and strikes the first child.

Not all counter-efforts involve destruction, but they all follow this pattern of learning.

10. So long as an individual retains his mastery of the counter-efforts which he has in his facsimiles of the MEST universe he can use them for his survival and he does not suffer from them.

Of course he may die as an organism if the counter-efforts are too severe when he receives them. But this does not mean that he is not still master of them in the facsimile.

When he builds a new organism, he can still use these counter-efforts as efforts for his further survival and for the survival of the new organism, even though these very counter-efforts brought about the demise of the old organism. The physical force of the counter-effort is not the aberrative thing. Aberration comes about when the individual loses his control over the facsimile of this counter-effort.

How does this loss occur?

Clearly, if this individual is impervious to the physical force – and, as a theta entity, he is – then there is only one thing, apparently, which can take away his control over his own facsimiles. That one thing is, of course, his own intention, his own decision.

11. The individual loses his power to use the facsimile of this counter-effort simply by deciding that he cannot use it.

Why does he make such a decision?

12. The decision that a counter-effort must not be used comes about when the individual, sooner or later, uses that counter-effort wrongly. In other words, he turns this counter-effort into an effort for his survival but diminishes it. This may be on as simple a level as hitting a brick wall and breaking one's hand, or it may be on as complicated a level as running away in battle and thereby causing one's father, who is the commanding general to die of shame.

The individual uses a counter-effort as an effort for his survival, and then he discovers that it does not produce survival. He discovers that he is wrong, that he has, in other words, miscalculated his effort.

Usually, this takes the form of an effort to benefit one dynamic, followed by the discovery that some other dynamic has been harmed. Since every dynamic is an integral part of the survival of the individual, he is wrong whenever he harms any dynamic – that is, he is somewhat wrong. When he discovers that the results of his actions are wronger than he thought they would be, that they have produced more destruction of the dynamics than benefit to the dynamics, he may make the decision, in the midst of his confusion and enturbulation, that the counter-effort he has been using is not his to use. He finds that he is wrong, and he gives up ownership of the tools (counter-efforts) which he has been using, so that he will not be wrong in this way again.

13. This action which results in being wrong and in giving up ownership of one's facsimiles is known as an overt act. It is an act of one's own by which one's own survival is diminished.
14. Following an overt act, just one course is taken, although this course has two aspects.

Following an overt act, the individual must prove that he is RIGHT. He has suffered a great setback, a great WRONGNESS. He has been seriously WRONG, and now he must prove that he is RIGHT.

The two aspects of this proof are SYMPATHY and JUSTIFICATION.

15. In SYMPATHY, the individual assumes the identity of the injured dynamic. He tries to undo the wrong by carrying on the life of the injured person, if the person is dead – or by defending the person, if the person is injured. He is saying, "I

didn't do it. Somebody else did it. I am not the attacker. I am the victim. I am not the one who miscalculated the effort. I am the one who was injured, and now I am protecting myself from further injury and taking care of myself, so that I will grow strong and healthy again after this terrible attack by an unknown assailant."

16. In JUSTIFICATION, the individual says, "Yes, I did it, but I was RIGHT all the time. He made me do it. He attacked me." This individual proceeds to merit attack, in order to prove that he is the victim and not the performer of an overt act. He torments people until they kill him. Then he has "proved" that he is not the attacker.

Unfortunately for him, he cannot undo the original incident. Neither can he control time so that the attack on him (which comes later) can be shifted before the overt act (which came first.) The force, therefore, of the overt act remains, and his aberration continues.

17. When the counter-effort is disowned by the individual, so that he can no longer turn it into an effort, it may come back at him as a counter-effort again. He may, because of the facsimile, feel the pain of the original counter-effort.

Naturally, since receiving the counter-effort originally, he has many times used this particular action as his own effort. He has come to think of it as his own. Now he disowns it, and he feels it as a counter-effort. If he does not remember where he got it – and probably he does not – this recurrence of it as a counter-effort may have a frightening effect.

Let us suppose that an individual has been stabbed with a knife. There is a pain in his chest. He dies. In a later life, he

uses this counter-effort as an effort, and becomes an assassin. He is a successful assassin. Then, one dark night, he makes the mistake of stabbing his wife, whom he mistakes for a prowler. He loved his wife, and now she is dead – stabbed in the heart. He is WRONG. He has wrongly estimated the effort necessary for his survival. He has used a counter-effort which diminished his survival. He has committed an overt act.

He then disowns stabbing as an effort. It was wrong and he must not use it. The facsimile which he has of being stabbed is no longer his to use for his survival. He denies himself any control over it. He assumes the identity of his wife in an effort to continue her life, He assumes her speech and her expressions and her habits, and her somatics. The effort of stabbing comes back at him as a counter-effort. He feels the pain in his chest.

He does not remember that he has actually been stabbed in the chest and has died from it. He thinks that there is no "natural" reason why he should have a pain in his chest. But he knows that if someone were going to punish him for his crime, they might stab him in the chest, for poetic justice. Therefore, he assumes that someone, God perhaps, is punishing him. He thinks that the pain he feels is caused by a "supernatural" agency. This confirms his lack of ownership of the counter-effort and makes him even more an EFFECT and less a CAUSE.

18. The original incident in which the counter-effort is received is called the MOTIVATOR.

The motivator supplies the physical-motion facsimile to the theta of the individual. That facsimile is then the property of theta, to be used for the survival of the organism or the organic line.

19. The incident in which this motion is wrongly used and is harmful to the survival of the individual is called the OVERT ACT.
20. The motivator is usually a heavy contra-survival incident. Often it is a death engram. The overt act is usually a heavy contra-survival incident on some dynamic other than the first dynamic (although it may also be on the first dynamic.)

The aberrated individual will wear the somatics of the motivator and the identity of the dynamic which was harmed by the overt act.

Oddly enough, therefore, when the auditor is looking for the source of some physical fault in the pre-clear, he will do well not to look for the original injury, but for the overt act in which the pre-clear inflicted this injury upon someone else. (This procedure has a somewhat moralistic ring, which may be upsetting to some students and which may cause feelings of superiority in others. The first group is suffering from sympathy and the second from justification. As their cases progress, they will not take such a local view of the matter.)

21. An individual who has been wrong many times has had to disown many counter-efforts as useful. Since the only tools he has to conquer the physical universe are the counter – efforts of the physical universe, this process of disowning gradually reduces his self-determinism with respect to the physical universe.

Overt acts are great reducers of self-determinism and the auditor will do well to use them as a main point of attack on the aberrations of the pre-clear.

22. It may be a good idea to take a somewhat historical view of this phenomenon for a moment. Just how big does an incident have to be to be worthy of the name "overt act?"

Well, the murder of a close friend or relation on whom one's survival was intimately dependent, the killing or maiming a child, the destruction of grain fields upon which the life of a whole village depended, the wiping out of a whole city by pressing a button which released an atomic bomb – these things might be severe enough to constitute overt acts. Of course, the lower an individual is on the tone scale, the less he can afford to be wrong, and so he sinks lower and lower, smaller and smaller acts may be considered overt acts.

Let us suppose that a man has lived fifty lives over a period of two thousand years. Let us suppose that in each of those lives he has brought about ruin and destruction and agony to all those who were closely associated with him, and has in many lives harmed everything which stood for spiritual values in human culture. How much self-determinism might we expect such a man to have in 1952?

The answer to that depends upon how much of a chance he gets to start anew in each life. This ratio has not yet been established. The student is invited to establish it.

It should be clear, however, that with hundreds of thousands of years behind us, we had ample opportunity to perform overt acts of considerable magnitude and number. The Hindu idea of a burden of Karma which must be worked off is a

nice paraphrase of this situation. No wonder it has been assumed that sin is original. No wonder there has been so much talk about "guilt". If every one of us is born with such a burden, whether active or inactive at the moment, it is obvious that a very small overt act (such as being caught stuffing the canary into the vacuum cleaner) might suffice to light up a whole string of red lights in the mind and deprive one of any number of counter-efforts.

But assuming that this burden is an *integral* part of the mind, a part which cannot in any way be removed, has led to such treatments as shock "therapy" and lobotomy. This assumption is worse than useless, it is an overt act in itself. Undoubtedly, one of the most serious overt acts which is being performed today by individuals is the "treatment" of the insane and the neurotic by punishment-drive methods. One might hypothesize that some of the individuals who are using such methods might build up such a prohibition against using counter-efforts, as they progressively realize what they are doing to human beings, that they might not even have enough self-determinism about the physical universe to make it possible for them to be born again. The student is invited to decide whether or not this would be a good thing.

23. One of the main things which makes it difficult for the pre-clear to run an incident is REGRET over overt acts. Regret is the wish that something had never taken place and that, having taken place, it might be undone.

When the individual is feeling regret about an incident, he resorts to a very nasty little trick with TIME in order to "undo" the incident – a trick which plays hob with his time track or, in other words, with his ability to differentiate inci-

dents in time. The individual finds the facsimile of time which immediately precedes the facsimile of the incident he regrets, and he pulls this earlier facsimile up to present-time and holds it there. In the old way of looking at time (known as the "time track"), the individual goes to a time which just precedes the incident he regrets and stays there. He would be, then, stuck on the time track. Now we say he has brought that incident to present – time, and he is stuck with it.

Whenever the individual tries to do anything about time, after that, he is liable to find himself following the natural sequence and moving right into the incident he regrets and does not want to have experienced. This is awful for him; so he just stops time altogether and will have nothing to do with it. He has to wear a wristwatch, and look at calendars, and he complains that he has "no time". Regret is probably the worst aberrator of the time sense.

24. As has been said before, in order to undo this knot, the incident should be run backwards. This will give the individual the chance to "undo" the incident, and will permit him to get enough of the charge off the incident to permit him to handle it properly.
25. A VALENCE is all the facsimiles which an individual has of the personality of some other person or thing. When an individual tries to continue the life of another whom he has killed or harmed, he uses this valence as his tool.
26. When the auditor observes that the pre-clear is in the valence of the opposite sex, he may assume that the pre-clear has an important overt act involving a member of the opposite sex

and that the illness which the pre-clear has is merely the counter-effort of the motivator which preceded that overt act.

The pre-clear may resemble his mother, but it is more likely that the overt act was performed, not against his mother, but against some woman in 5221 B. C. His overt acts against his mother, however, are locks on the original, and it will be useful to run them, or scan them.

There is an amazing continuity in the lives we lead.

27. The evidence which has come to light in Scientology should give a would-be murderer pause. He would do better to have his victim audited, since that is evidently the only lasting way to keep him from being troublesome. Mere murder only makes the victim more dangerous later on.
28. This is not to suggest that we lead the same lives century after century, or that we are puppets of fate. Any individual who is high on the tone scale is free of the past. It is misemotional behavior which repeats the pattern of yesterday and of fifty-thousand years ago.
29. The SERVICE FACSIMILE is the facsimile which the individual is using to prove that he is, was, and always will be RIGHT about all the times when he was actually so WRONG that in many of them he died. He uses it to excuse his overt acts, by letting it injure him and then showing the injury as good and sufficient reason both for attacking everything in sight and for failing at everything he undertakes. ("I've been sick" or "I'm all out of sorts today"). He holds up the counter-effort and says, "This was done to me, and so I am non-optimum. This was done to me, and so I am not responsible for anything."

30. The whole sequence of overt acts and regret reduces the self-determinism of the pre-clear, and the less self-determinism he has, the less well he can handle his facsimiles and the less readily he can contact and run the efforts and counter-efforts in an incident.

For this reason, the auditor may have to enter the case by looking for overt acts, and by running incidents backward at first to reduce the regret in them.

The resolution of efforts in an incident may depend upon the running of regret on some other related incident.

31. Sometimes it is necessary to start late in a chain of incidents and work back toward earlier and earlier incidents in that chain. The earliest available incident is run until an earlier one becomes available, and then that one is run until a still earlier one is available. This, in effect, is what is being done in lock scanning. Whole chains of late, mild incidents are de-intensified in order that earlier, more severe incidents may become available. Lock scanning produces this availability in general, by increasing the self-determinism of the individual, by restoring his control over his own facsimiles.
32. The name LIFE CONTINUUM is given to the efforts of an individual to continue the existence of someone who has died. This, as has been said, is done by assuming the personality of the dead person.
33. The life continuum is only undertaken as a result of overt acts. The individual has to prove that he did not kill this person. If there had been no overt act against this person, or against some other person who resembled this person, there would be no need for the individual to undertake the life con-

tinuum. He would simply express his emotions of loss over this person and maintain his own identity. It would, in other words, be *possible* for him to be RIGHT even if this person were acknowledged to be dead. He would not have to prove that he had not killed this person.

34. Individuals who cannot bear to think of killing anything are, according to this theory, obviously carrying a *great* burden of overt acts. They have diminished their survival so much and so often by misapplied killing that they have had to renounce killing as an effort which it is possible for them to use.

Such individuals have usually, however, picked some person or group as the "real" killer – they have, in other words, picked a substitute for themselves as the killer. And they will manifest hostility toward this person or group. In this way, among others, the auditor can tell the difference between the individual who is too high on the tone scale to use killing and the individual who is too low on the tone scale to use killing.

The auditor should remember, in this, that the individual who is afraid to kill may have borrowed some perfectly good attitudes from the individual who is too powerful to have to kill. The auditor should be careful not to invalidate those attitudes in his search for the overt acts and the motivators in the case.

SUMMARY BOOKLET 11

Seminar Questions

1. Define what is meant by an "overt act".
2. How is the "overt act" run?
3. What produces a "maybe"? What are the results of a "maybe"?
4. What constitutes a "service facsimile"?
5. Build up an "evolutionary theory" showing how theta might have used counter-efforts to build new organisms.