

BACKGROUND MUSIC TO LIVING

A lecture given on
20 January 1955

I want to tell you something about the human mind. The human mind thinks of something, it doesn't get acknowledged and it gets solid. You got that?

Male voice: Yeah.

The human mind thinks of something, it doesn't get acknowledged, it gets solid. You got this real clean now? And I'll go over this again. The human mind thinks of something, it doesn't get acknowledged and it gets solid. What then is mass?

Male voice: Condensed thought.

What is it?

Audience: Unacknowledged thought.

Audience: It's a solidified unacknowledged thought. The human mind is solid.

Okay. What is memory?

Audience: No acknowledgment. The human mind. The mind.

What's memory?

Audience: Facsimiles. Unacknowledgment. For me, the massing of moments into this solidity.

I'll give you the fullest definition of memory that you could grasp here right at the moment and which is observably true: the MEST universe.

Male voice: A bad accident.

You got it?

Male voice: Yes.

All right, the human mind thinks a thought, it doesn't get acknowledged, gets solid. You've got a mass, which is actually a thought, so that we have this idea about it, that it is remembering.

Now, let's go over that. That this is remembering.

The human mind thinks a thought, doesn't get acknowledged and there's that thought - solid. So then we think of this mass as remembering.

Male voice: It's a record or something.

It's a record, that's right. This is the basic anatomy of the entire facsimile system.

All right. Now, we get smart, clever and significant and we do these things up so they will remember more easily. Get the idea?

Now, for instance, that wall has only one thought. It says, "I'm a wall located at 401A East Roosevelt, Phoenix, Arizona." You got the idea?

Well now, it could be several consecutive thoughts consolidated to make that wall. Just take the various parts that go into the wall; take the various thoughts that have been thought to make the solidities and to park them and to move them around and condense them and build them and construct them. And we've got a whole series of thoughts which are being represented by it.

All right. Then the more you would think of something without getting acknowledged, the solidier it would get. Is this right?

Female voice: Yup.

The more you would think of something without getting it acknowledged, the solidier it would get. Therefore, self-auditing doesn't work. See that? It's the only reason self-auditing doesn't work. Oh, I beg your pardon, it is the only reason that self-auditing doesn't work well, but it's remediable actually.

Now, let's look at this mechanism. Now, an auditor sits up there in front of a preclear and monitors his somatic strip and file clerk and shoves all around these memory masses and they echo to the auditor but not to what the preclear thinks. This is curious, isn't it? All right. Now, if that's the case, then an individual should be able to handle his bank much more ably by putting a thinking machine, which is himself an ordering machine or a command machine or just a commanding spot, out in front of himself someplace and give himself an order. And that order ought to work better.

The auditor sitting out in front of the preclear has better control of the somatic strip and the file clerk than the preclear. So, therefore, all a preclear would have to do is to put a spot out there where the auditor would normally sit and simply give the somatic strip orders and the file clerk orders and the masses orders in general and they would obey, wouldn't they? And so they do.

So anybody trying to think inside of his head is being a schnook because the body doesn't obey commands easily which are given inside the head.

I'll say that again. The auditor sits out in front - and we know this from 1950 - and gives that somatic strip and energy masses and facsimiles and engrams all kinds of orders and they do that. But the preclear sitting by himself can't do that. So he's very mystified, very mystified. All right, this means that an external control - this is all this means - that an external control of this mechanism is more feasible than an internal control of the mechanism. So an individual exteriorized can then tell his body to get well and it will get well. But an individual interiorized says, "Get well," and the body just closes in on him because something is thinking a thought in there, and it's hungry for thoughts.

Now, if you thought a thought and it didn't get acknowledged and it got solid, and then you thought the thought again, what's likely to happen?

Female voice: More solidity.

Hm?

Female voice: More solidity, more mass.

Well, that's true, except this time it will get acknowledged by the first mass. That's restimulation.

And I'll go over that again. Do you see that? You think a thought, it doesn't get acknowledged, it gets solid. All right. Now, we think a thought - the same thought again - only remember we're kind of hungry by this time for an acknowledgment and so we acknowledge it with the first mass.

Do you get the idea? We use a mechanical answering mechanism or acknowledging mechanism, you see? So that is restimulation. There is no mystery about what restimulation is.

Restimulation is the body or the individual himself acknowledging with mass what he just thought.

Female voice: That would account for pictures, like I was getting.

Oh, this sure accounts for pictures. You've said it.

Female voice: That's the echo.

All right.

Now, we know that this is a universe of two, not a universe of one. This is very curious. This is a universe of two, not a universe of one. This is real cute. This universe starts with a unit of two. Actually, when you even try to build it geometrically it has to start with the unit of two, not with a unit of one. If you start to build the mass of this universe with this unit of one, you get no place because one doesn't have an outside and an inside. See, since you got an outside and an inside, you got two. The second you get two, you start to get interaction. We see this now? Real clear? It's a universe of two. I give you Buckminster Fuller, if I remember.

Female voice: Oh, you remember that night he came in?

Oh, that wonderful demonstration of building tetrahedrons, and so forth. Exactly what geometric shapes does it take to build space. And he went on and on and on. A fascinating demonstration. And he made it adequately clear that the basic unit of structure of this universe or for any solid was two, not one. So you start with two, not one. Papa and Mama. You get the idea?

Now, an individual who decides to be Papa and Mama simultaneously gets mixed up, doesn't he?

Male voice: Well, how about if you could actually hold two points apart when you process him?

Oh well, if he's holding two points apart and saying this is papa and this is mama, he's in the swing. There's nothing wrong with that.

But an individual who thinks that he can be only one in this universe is perforce very aberrated indeed. He's got to have two. So we get the auditor and preclear combination working out very handsomely.

We get a thetan and the body working out fairly well. But a guy interiorized thinking he's the body and is only one walking around, he doesn't function worth a nickel. In fact, he's Homo sapiens. I would go so far as to say that a Homo sapiens was an interiorized individual. And more or less what we define as Homo sapiens - it's never been defined. It means a guy who is savvy; somebody who could think. So let's just push it on over to somebody who figure-figures, and this would be a guy who is interiorized.

You can handle something with direct communication as long as you're in one place and it's in another place. But when you are in the same place it is, you'll have a little difficulty handling it.

I ran an experiment - which is what I'm telling you about - of an individual remedying havingness on himself. He sat inside his head and tried to remedy havingness on the body. This was a gorgeous boo-boo. This was horrible to behold because he was inside of his head trying to handle masses, and this was very difficult, so he couldn't get out. He was a nonexteriorizable - you know, completely impossible, you know, this type of case - utterly convinced that he couldn't get out.

And so I had him put up a spot where an auditor would be and start handling his bank. Well, he hadn't had much auditing, so this didn't count as far as a restimulation of an auditor is concerned. And he can put that spot out there and have him - you know, have the spot have him mock up things and pull them in, and he got brilliant three-dimensional, solid density mockups. Something that was utterly impossible for this individual to get before.

So we would simply go so far as to say that a black case was somebody who was trying to handle things from inside a mass. That he was trying to handle a mass from inside the mass, not outside of it, and himself believes that he is this mass to some degree. Now, we would say that would be an occluded case.

Now, the funny part of it is it ceases to be an occluded case the moment you could even get him to start putting new rings of occlusion around. If he happens to slide outside, as a preclear did in a class demonstration one day, to make sure that he just put a new sphere of blackness around his original sphere of blackness, he all of a sudden is exteriorized and on his way from there on out. You get the idea. He's simply taken a new position.

The esoteric value of exteriorization may be very great, very probably very great - the aesthetic value. But I'm afraid we're dealing here with nothing but geometrics; nothing more solemn than geometrics.

It takes two to make a universe; it takes two to produce action; it takes two to produce time.

Do you know that time is absent in the presence of one and the absence of any other. It is the co-motion of particles. Well, that certainly takes two to co- . You're not going to co- on one. Some people try.

So, you get this fellow who gets this "only one" computation. He's inside trying to figure and handle his body. Being the body and trying to handle his body, he immediately runs out of time. This is one of the weirdest manifestations you ever saw. This fellow presses time, has trouble with time, is upset about time and so forth.

Now, if things have become so unreal to this individual that he is sure of himself where he is but is not sure anybody else is present, of course, we almost have a gone time problem. Then this individual, of course, cannot move easily out of facsimiles and incidents, can he? He can't easily move these masses around. Why, he's inside and it takes a co-motion of particles to have time. So the timing of the particles goes haywire because there is no time being made. So, the only time there would be a couple of old engrams. And these things have their own position in time. So when he gets those in restimulation, why, he's stuck in some other time.

The actual truth of an individual having trouble with time - it's not what wall? but what hour? what day? what month? what year? There is his real trouble. What time is it? A "gone o'clock" case. This type of action, then, is simply produced by the single position. And the individuality, the unity of the per whatever you want to call it - mono-, mono-ality of the individual - it's an old Greek word - the monality (I'm translating it more literally into English) the monality of this individual forbids him to have time. Isn't that cute? So when

somebody begins to play the “only one,” his time track goes haywire. Why? He’s starting to count on it to have time it’s because the only particles around - the old facsimiles and so on - but they each have their own time so he gets stuck all over the time track.

Now, do we get the manifestation there? Do you see how that would be? He’d have to have two particles to make time.

He’d have to be - at least have to be outside looking at the body in order to have a co-action of particles which would furnish new time for him, so that he would then not have to depend upon old facsimiles moving around to give him a sense of time. You follow me?

So, once more the monality of the individual is discovered to be a highly aberrated factor.

All right. Now, let’s go over this again. Let’s go over this again. A fellow thinks a thought; the thought doesn’t get acknowledged; it becomes solid. Therefore, a solid mass could be said to be a memory. Any solid mass could be said to be a memory. Solid masses are memories. Space, less so. All right, that’s just something for the masses to be in.

All right. Now, we got this clean? All right. Now, that means that solidities are memories. Now, what is a memory? It’s an unacknowledged thought. If you want to accumulate a lot of mass, make sure you don’t get acknowledged.

All right, next thing. The individual has thought a thought, it hasn’t been acknowledged and he’s got a mass. Got that? All right. Now, he thinks another thought, there’s nobody around to acknowledge this thought so he acknowledges it himself with his first mass. He thinks a similar thought and that first mass will answer this as the acknowledgment. In other words, he gets a solid acknowledgment.

Female voice: That’s a good idea.

Well, sure.

Female voice: That’s a good idea. Well, sure. That’s a fine idea.

All right, that’s a wonderful idea. The only difficulty with this idea is, that is restimulation. You got that? That is restimulation. Now, after we get a heck of a lot of masses around, of course, we get interactions which are quite peculiar. We get a thought thought and a mass, not acknowledged by the mass, and so we get a picture of the mass. Now, we think a thought, the wall. The wall doesn’t acknowledge, so we get a picture of the wall. See that? So we got a facsimile.

Now, that is masses merely interacting with masses. Actually, that wall is a thought, so you get a copy of the original thought, but the only reason you get a copy is because the wall didn’t really acknowledge. So an individual just keeps picking up mass, mass and more mass until he’s a mass.

Okay, now let’s take a fast look at this. We’ve accounted for, one, the physical universe, which is a memory. We’ve accounted for, two, restimulation.

All right. Now, let’s account for mono-ality - monality - horrible stuff Individual, all by himself, is trying to command a mass while in it and thinking he is it. See, he’s in it and he thinks he is it and he’s trying to command it. How can he command it since there will be no time for the command to take place in?

All right. Now, how do we get that? Time is the co-motion of particles. To have a co- you have to have two. If the individual is sitting in a gorgeous state of monogamy - that means just one present, doesn’t it - the wife or the husband. If he’s sitting in a gorgeous state of monality, we discover, then, this boy is operating in a no-time bracket. So how can he

command the body except by picking up old memories which did have time. So he starts handling the body with masses and facsimiles. You see that?

Well, these things get keyed-in and they have their own time factor. It says 1776 right down there on the corner of that facsimile, see. And so it is 1776. And after a while he loses present time with the greatest of ease. Why? He doesn't have a present time as long as he is inside a mass, which he thinks he is, trying to handle the mass which he's inside of. The reason he can't handle it is there's no time in which to handle it, and this is the first thing he will tell you. He doesn't have any time to do anything. Well, of course he doesn't have any time because there's only one of him there.

All right. His reality usually is poor enough so that he doesn't clearly recognize the existence of somebody else. But he would have to handle others without being able to handle himself. He would expect from them to handle him then. You see, he would expect them to handle him. You see, he's inside, stuck. And they're inside, stuck. So he could give them orders and they can give him orders because the existence of the two of them there - if their reality is not so bad that they can still recognize that somebody else is present - why, then, you see, it is a very simple thing. They just get along splendidly. One of them gives the other one orders and that other one gives this fellow orders and they can handle each other. But they're not handling themselves.

This is what's known as "duo foul-up determinism."

All right. This, of course, is inherent in the communication formula. An individual who has lost to some degree the ability to duplicate himself you know, and to have a duplicate out there, then, can't have time. If he's lost this he's lost time. Why has he lost this? Because he has lost time. It's one of those snake-eating-his-tail propositions, you know, where one is proved by the other, and the other, back and forth. You see, the reason he can't handle or control himself is he doesn't have any time in which to do it because he doesn't have two particles. He doesn't have the ability to duplicate himself he thinks. So therefore, if he doesn't have the ability to duplicate himself there is no time in which to handle it unless he's with somebody else and is ordering them and they're ordering him.

Okay. So we take an exterior order on the part of an auditor, and he finds that the somatic strip and the file clerk go immediately and obediently under control. What a pipe. An auditor who doesn't recognize this clearly, that in dealing with people who are not exteriorized, he actually can say, "Well, now, let's see. The file clerk will make you desperately ill and the somatic strip will move you." And it's liable to happen without the victim being able to do anything about it at all. This is why PDH and other things like that work.

All right. He, then, is in command of this other person's file clerk and somatic strip. In other words, in control of this person. Because this person is handling things with masses. Memories become masses and the individual handles himself with memories which are all mistimed. So his time track gets all fouled up, naturally.

All right. This being the case, then it should be possible for an individual simply to mock up a spot somewhere outside the body and have that spot then give him auditing commands which would remedy his havingness and do everything else.

And sure enough this can take place. The individual, sitting inside of his body, being his body and auditing his body at the same time, cannot accomplish any auditing beyond chewing up energy masses. You understand that? He's not giving commands, really, to this body at all. He's merely taking old energy masses and pushing them in on top of old energy masses until he looks something on the order of an old clothes bag. You see what he's doing?

But the moment he put a spot out there and had the spot give him orders, he would find that he would obey them. Oh, but they're his orders, aren't they? No, they're not his orders,

they're the spot's orders. Oh, but he gave them to him originally. That doesn't matter; there are two present. Basic unit of the universe is two.

What's the name of that? Dymaxion geometry isn't it? Buckminster Fuller's dymaxion geometry. Gorgeous, just utterly gorgeous in its demonstration; tetrahedrons and octahedrons, and so forth. Well, the basic unit is two, certainly. If you don't have two, you don't have a universe. There is a process known as, "What could occupy the same space as you're occupying." Remember that process?

All right. The second that you don't have two spots occupying the same space you've got no universe. So individuals, in their anxiety to have universes, are so thoroughly holding on to the universe memory - which imposes position - become very afraid of disturbing this arrangement at all and so get stuck in the past, and so forth. They get afraid of disarranging masses. So you ask this fellow, "What wouldn't you mind occupying the same space with?" And he has a horrible time. But he finally finds something he wouldn't mind occupying the same space with.

Well, you see, basically he knew this - that he had to be two in order to get anything done. See, he knew he had to be two in order to have any time. And you've just asked him to be one with something. Well, what happened? His memory of trying to be two all the time has finally wound up in some other species of duality. See, it's gotten way off the deep.

Now, his oneness has been resisted in an effort to make twoness until he got oneness. See, he resisted oneness so long that he's now oneness. And the biggest swindle that anybody ever tried to impose upon man was "unity," "singularity," "one-ity."

You see? "One God." And then they promptly write in all their books, "Two Gods." The God of good and the God of evil.

Male voice: One nation.

Yes.

Male voice: Indivisible.

One nation indivisible with the Democrats and the Republicans.

All right, we've got one. One, one, one, one, one, one, one, one, and so on, all the way along the line. Got to be two.

Now, I'll give you an example today of something which is quite curious. We no longer have one science. Trying to give the public the - not you, but the public - the reason why we have two sciences is very, very difficult indeed because it's a technical reason. There can't be one science. So we can break it down and say, well, there's Dianetics which is the material side of life, and then there's Scientology which is the spiritual side of life.

And this makes a duality and actually people are much happier with this. You'll find people don't know anything much about either one of them, arguing violently in favor of one and violently in favor of the other - the Blues and the Greens. You get the idea?

They argue. They say, "Dianetics was really good, really good. This Scientology is no good at all." "Scientology is really the stuff; but Dianetics is no good." Well, fine. It's just a discharge between two points. If they get mad at one, they can always go over to the other one. Well, what if we just had Scientology? If they got mad at that, they're trapped. You got the idea there?

All right. This duality then makes for saner organization in spite of the fact that the boys keep trying to get a joint control council which would then manage with one board all existing

corporations. No, it's the most wonderful thing you ever saw how the animosities, and so forth, of either side of this organization discharge against the other side.

Now, there was an outfit one time called the Holy Roman Empire, and that was preceded by an organization known as the Roman Empire. It didn't go batty and become the Holy Roman Empire, which was an empire in psychosis, it had dropped squarely through every single step of the Tone Scale before it hit the Holy Roman Empire.

That's, by the way, history, not my prejudice talk - I've got no prejudice about that one way or the other. You may get the idea sometime I have very definite prejudices. I don't have prejudices, I have belly laughs.

Where the Roman Empire is concerned, there's been one writer back on the track who utterly fascinates me with the speed and twists of his paragraphs and so on, and the motion of his words at large and his thoughts. And that happens to be Edward Gibbon. And Edward Gibbon is very amusing anyhow because here is the most violently anti-Christian book you ever saw in your life. Here is a book which just froths on the subject of Christianity but does it under a satirical, ironic level, which is for sale in every Christian bookstore in the land because nobody's ever read it.

And there it sits - they all know it's a classic and they all know this is very good, but it takes the dimmest findings - the only thing it does is take the dimmest findings and the earliest beginnings of the Roman Catholic Church - Christianity at large - and then just proceeds, page by page, chapter by chapter, to paint a blacker and more wicked and more vicious picture of this. It's gorgeous. I don't know how it possibly could have survived in Christian society since 1790, but it has. It's quite a triumph.

The triumph is occasioned by its being unreadable for the most part. Most people don't read it; they look at the paragraphs and they're too long and the words are big, and so forth. I remember when I first tackled it I said, "Well, there's one thing I haven't done in this life which I'm going to do before I get a pair of oars, and that's - I'm going to read Edward Gibbon from cover to cover." I didn't know anything about this. This is two years ago.

I started plowing along into Gibbon. Believe me, it was plow. I remember every once in a while I felt like calling for a bulldozer for awhile because typical of the 18th-century writer, he starts slowly and then proceeds to get nowhere in a leisurely fashion.

And I swear about, oh, I don't know, fifteen or twenty chapters deep, just plowing, till all of a sudden the man started to wake up and I saw what he was getting at. And he was getting very solidly at just this one thing. This mock-up called Christianity was the biggest roar that had ever come upon the stage. And that book is alive today in the bookstores. He proves it. He proves it with their own documents.

All right. What was wrong with this cockeyed organization in the first place? There was something wrong - this is not Gibbon now, that's a little side pass - there's something very definitely wrong with the Roman Empire. Gibbon says what was wrong there, but he doesn't recognize the point from which it stems.

The point is this "oneness." Gibbon, in one very long and involved and extremely well-written paragraph, says the trouble with the Roman Empire was nobody had anyplace to run. You couldn't go anywhere. You were in the Roman Empire and that was that. And if you went out to the barbaric boundaries you found people who were wearing smelly skins, eating rats with butter on one border - and no man of any kind of civilized digestion could even vaguely tolerate that - you went in another direction and you were amongst cannibals.

There was no civilization that the Roman Empire did not embrace, and it was the total world. And if a man got in bad with the Holy Roman Empire, he was a dog forevermore. The only thing he could do was revolt the government of the Roman Empire. He could turn it over

And that's what a thetan starts to do when he decides he is the only one in the body there. The only way he can get any surcease or change in this body, or his kidney or his heart or his liver can get any slightest justice, is by revolution. You see that?

So this oneness leads to revolution, and we wonder why in the name of God, God had such a rough time amongst the Christians. We wonder about this. We don't have to wonder very darned long. We find out that there was - they were always trying to make two organizations.

And they would have greater or lesser success. But then as soon as one organization became dominant it would eat up the other organization, go for a short time and then, bang, you have to have a revolution and two more organizations.

Now, the psychiatrist railing against schizophrenia - which he, by the way, can't define anymore. I asked a psychiatrist, a very well educated one, not too long ago, exactly what schizophrenia was, and he gave me the old-time definition for dementia praecox. And I pointed this out to him, that he had actually defined dementia praecox, and he said to me, "Yes, that's what we call schizophrenia today." And I made him aware of the fact that, schiz, schizo, schizoid and the rest of it had to do with scissors, meaning a split personality. A duality. And he said, "Oh, that's - probably was the word, but that's been used like that for a long while." The only truth in psychiatry has gone by the boards, that people can have dual or more dementia. All right. They don't even think this could occur anymore, I guess. They are trying very hard to get everybody to be one person. And they revolted against any duality of personality. And you will find in Karl Menningitis's book, *The Human Mind*, a popular text, he said. I don't know what it's a text of. It's a collection of observations of psychotics with some comments by the author. Hardly a textbook, hardly popular. But it was the only book out at the time with the title *The Human Mind*, so it sold well. Nyar-meow.

Anyway, he points out, he points out there that we had a very horrible fellow in this sanitarium. He was a perfectly charming fellow, and he was getting along fine with everybody and he had a lot of charm about him. But at one moment he was writing a very loving and affectionate letter to his wife and his family, and by the way, he was not - had not left them destitute; he was simply at this sanitarium to get perked up a little bit; too many drinks or something - and the next moment he was writing one to a girl friend. And the horror with which Karl Menningitis points out that this boy was leading two lives is interesting to observe unless one recognizes this tremendous overwhelming impulse toward oneness. See? So, psychiatry itself has backed off from the idea that a person could wear two hats.

Actually, I've traced various careers and I've found out that people were the best people at the time they were wearing a half-a-dozen hats, at least half-a-dozen, you see. Two or more - all this is. And when they were only wearing two hats they were having a little bit of trouble; and when they started wearing one, you might as well have taken them out and shot them.

Actually, they began to have no time. That's the most curious thing in the world. They have no time. Yet if you carefully traced over the man's day you would find out that he had nothing but time during the whole day. This is the result of wearing one hat.

You'd be amazed - auditors have stopped revolting - maybe out of apathy, I hope not - against the idea that an auditor ought to have a couple of hats. He should wear with perfect aplomb the role of a psychotherapist and the role of a minister. With perfect aplomb he should wear these two hats with the greatest of ease. And certainly he should be able to wear the third hat - the role of an educator. These are the solidified labels of the society today for healing, teaching and spreading the good word in general, you see? So it would - you'd actually have to have three or four good, solid labels in order to get anywhere.

If you go out and you say, "Well, now I am going to be just a psychotherapist, that's all I'm going to be." And you'll find all of a sudden one day you'll reach back there into your quiver and it's empty; and there come all these degenerate Norman knights

There's supposed to be something faintly bad about wearing a couple of hats, you know. It's a little bit declassé. It's something you really shouldn't do. What you should do is to be bold and honest and stand up forthrightly wearing exactly one label. Well, I'll tell you the label people will eventually wear if they start to wear just one label. It's spelled g-o-d. Only no such God could possibly exist because he would have gone batty long ago. He would have had no time and could control nothing. One - never. When the Christian church said that the devil had been banished or gave people to understand that he was no longer in business, they did a very bum turn for themselves. You could always go and worship the devil and at least that was worshipping something. Whereas if people could no longer worship a good God - devil merely means "little God," by the way - if you could no longer go and worship the good God, then the thing to do was to just back off from the whole thing. Whereas the social activity of the community might still be revolving around this single deity.

A nation and a civilization is as well off as it has many gods. I one day adventured interestingly upon the codification of the pantheon of modern America, pantheon of modern America. Who were and what were the gods worshipped today. And of course, they're the obvious ones, the very obvious ones.

The God - well, one of the first gods that is worshipped, uniformly and without much thought about it by the country at large, is "Luck," Lady Luck. She is worshipped. Another one, not called by that name very often but occasionally called by that name, Mammon, the god of wealth and gold.

There's a great many cults of various kinds. There's a cult known as Wall Street. And they even have god symbols. They have a bull and a bear. And they join in two cults there worshipping the same god.

So you get these things - it's very amusing. You break it down and you find out there's a pantheon in the United States. You find out the mechanics out here rather worship at the feet of one motor company or another. This fellow's all sold on Lincoln-Mercury-Ford, you see, and this other fellow, he's a GE man, and so forth. Their gods are pretty solid, but they're gods just the same.

These aren't just preferences. If GE puts out to one of its GE men the fact that this new torquo-dynamic distributor potboiler is the greatest thing that ever rolled up a window he ever heard of; he will tell every customer he has that this torquo-gimmegahoojit is the thing. And if Lincoln-Mercury put out the same thing under a different title and said this was the thing, this fellow would know it wouldn't work and it would be no good, that he doesn't worship at that cult. Amazing. Amazing. Their gods are solid.

Female voice: But there are two.

Oh, yes, yes. They very carefully have different gods. And the reason they have different gods is because they can't possibly exist under a - what do you call it - monodeistic system. It can't happen, can't happen. The second that you told the public that it now had to bow down only to this altar, you would immediately get a number of the public saying, "Well, there's this altar over here." Well, there wasn't one until they were told to bow down to that one altar. You get the idea? So we always have to have a couple of terminals to get any discharge or action or time in this universe.

Now, as far as we're concerned, us guys right here, what we're mainly concerned with is time. Because when the individual can no longer make time, he no longer has any choice but to key in and restimulate engrams. You understand? See, this is his choice. He either makes time or keys in.

Now, we know very well from our experience what we can object to and clear up in somebody's head who isn't hitting on all cylinders. It's the handling of things with facsimiles

and engrams. And if they're handling things with facsimiles and engrams, then they must be living under a monodeistic individuality. They are themselves; they are no other person. They have this mechanically. They have no point out here or three feet in back of their head which is somebody else.

Actually, a psychotic will get so bad off at times that he will actually bypass all rationality to have a witch or a spirit or something walking around with him all the time, see. He'll have another point over there that's giving him all the orders. The ease with which an individual under hypnosis will put the great god Throgmagog (Dianetics: Evolution of a Science) out here and have it do all of his thinking for him is wonderful to behold. Oh, he does it with the greatest of ease.

Now, I ran across this here in a demonstration a couple of days ago where I told her to put a thinking machine out there several times. You remember my doing that? A very momentary flip on the line. One of the darnedest things you can ask a preclear to do is to think a thought three feet in back of his head. See, he's interiorized, and you ask him to think this thought three feet back of his head. It doesn't matter what kind of a thought as long as he thinks that thought three feet back of his head which might be, "I have a cat," you know, or "I am a man." Just as long as he thinks this thought, no matter what it is, three feet back of his head.

Now you have him think this thought in different positions, each time yourself acknowledging the fact that he has thought that thought, you see? And he very often will run the most fantastic obsession out to be in his head so he can use his brain. You get the idea? He's so fixed on the idea that all the thinkingness happens in the skull that if you make him put thinking out there, he then gets much more willing to exteriorize. Why does he get willing to exteriorize? Hm?

Male voice: To have a place to think at.

The damn fool thinks you have to think with something. Well, now obviously if you have to think with something, he must be just completely beaten down on the subject of thinking a thought and then not getting it acknowledged, you see?

Male voice: A little 8-C.

Yeah. Well, the way a thetan interiorizes is to think a thought at the body or put a beam on the body, and then the body doesn't pay any attention to him at all. And he has a tendency to interiorize into it, of course. He's outside; there's no acknowledgment from the body and so he interiorizes.

What does he use for his acknowledgment? What does he use for his acknowledgment?

Female voice: Mass.

Mass! What is the mass present?

Female voice: The body.

The body! And so he interiorizes. He brings in the body for an acknowledgment.

All he'd have to do is - all you have to do is acknowledge it or put an acknowledgment up there and he would exteriorize. And yet nearly everybody on the track has waited for this body - you know, there's a body out there; there's a hunter or a dog or something out there - and then he puts a beam on it, you know. He says, "Nyah," or something of the sort, and "Don't do that," or "Go away," or "Do something," you know. And this body pays him no attention whatsoever, so he brings in the body for an acknowledgment. Spat! And so goes inside and thinks, well - . You get the idea, "How did I get in here? What's this all about?"
Reasons, reasons, figure, figure. And of course the more he figures the more he re-stimulates

that body because he's thinking in one unit position. He'd have to get back outside again in order to get himself shaped up so that he could order that body around. You see?

Now therefore, exteriorization is solved just directly on acknowledgments. But the funny part of it is, is an individual isn't just at length interiorized only into a body; he's interiorized into a universe, into space, into masses, into secondary bodies, into engrams and facsimiles and into the body he's sitting in. So we just run this backwards and we will get him on out. He will certainly go on out.

But what dogged determination on his part - since we know that it's only a consideration in the first place - what dogged determination on his part to continue to insist that these things all acknowledge him. Do you see that? You might say he stays batty to the end. But eventually he'll kind of change his mind on the subject and he'll say, "Well, I didn't always - I can put up all the acknowledgments I need, why do I have to have all these acknowledgments from other units?" Well, the answer to that is it makes a good game. And that's the only answer to it.

All right. Now, we get ourselves in games, and we find out it requires two. But if we think this just applies to games, we are overlooking the fact that life is a game gone serious. And we always have to have a couple around in order to have not just a game, but time. In order to have any time at all we have to have two things around.

Now, you start this process, which is kind of what I'm talking to you about, the single process, "Make some time." And a guy will discover as he runs it what he has to discover in order to actually make some time. And he will start this and he will do that and so on, but as he runs it - it's not a short process, it's a long one - he eventually discovers exactly how to make some time and that moment recovers the command of the body in which he is. It's kind of fabulous. Kind of fabulous. But he all of a sudden starts making time. The moment he starts making time, he then has time in which to relay an order. Up to that moment he is dependent on old masses and their times. See that?

8-C actually is a rather crude process for making time. The individual does stand there and look at a wall. Spotting spots does this too. He gets a spot out there, you see?

Now, there's only one reason really for all this and that's one reason. You get the idea? One thought not acknowledged. Now, let's reduce this back down to its most absurd form. What is a nonacknowledged thought? It's one thought. You got this. A nonacknowledged thought is just one thought, isn't it? There wasn't another thought there to acknowledge it, was there?

Female voice: No twos.

Huh?

Female voice: No twos.

No twos, that's right. And out of no twos you get mass. So that the whole study of mass is a study of an "only one" situation. It's the study of an unacknowledged thought.

Now, in view of the fact that a thetan can directly make the postulate that mass will appear, then mass can also exist that doesn't have this characteristic, but by golly, it's got a thought in it - that it appeared. So it doesn't violate this definition.

So we have the "only one" thinking one thought. Of course, he had to be the one that thinks this one thought, huh? Nobody else is going to think this thought, see, because he thought this thought. And this doesn't get acknowledged, so therefore he runs out of time, right that instant. And if he thought a great thought or a big thought, he will stick on the time track at the moment he thought it, couldn't he? And it would be a mass right now, wouldn't it?

Now, just why we've gone seventy-six trillion years without any recognition of the fact that our own "Okay" out there is just as valuable as somebody else's "Okay," was it hard to - what to say unless we just rig it this way to make a good game. The game which avoids becoming an "only one" and which resists becoming an "only one" winds one up as an "only one."

So we have pantheons becoming monodeisms. We have all of the motor car companies in the country becoming the Cartel Motor Car Company. We have a two-party system becoming a fascism sooner or later or communism or something - a one-party system. The moment, however, that we merge everything in the one we get a revolution. It would be a lead-pipe cinch that sooner or later the communist regime in Russia is going to be overthrown: (1) in a riot by revolution against the one-party system, and (2) it had to maintain itself with great ardure against two-party countries. So it began to despise this type of political action. And so we got ourselves a country here on Earth which is trying to run things on a one-party system. It's being the "only one."

Well, the only thing which really kept them from boiling over was the fact that they get pretty distracted here and there amongst the various republics in trying to keep down the revolution.

The revolutions have been jumping up quite considerably. There was a revolution down in the Ukraine a couple of years ago; a real violent one. They were mowing people down with machine guns in all directions. Stalin, to keep himself in power, himself said that he had to kill ten million peasants. So evidently it can be done, but it's rather arduous. And I would say, to some slight degree, hazardous. We have Herr Hitler on a rampage with a one-party system, and it didn't last long. We have all kinds of experiments in this direction of one-ism.

Now, you will find the thetan holds onto truth harder than anything. He holds onto truth. He actually does not have mass, meaning or mobility. And so, some sooner or later, at no matter what point of inversion, you will find him asserting that he doesn't have mass, meaning or mobility.

Let's take mobility. An individual, he starts getting bad off; begins to reassert the fact that he actually doesn't have mobility. He'll start to reassert this fact. And so a thetan asserts, as he goes down the line, that there isn't any universe, that all things occupy the same space. He'll try to assert this reactively. Having created a universe, he will try now to condense the whole universe. And this is the action which we know as you inflow, piling things up and so on.

Well, the solution to all this is get him in comm; get him answered; get another spot out there and get some time. There's quite a process in just making somebody put a spot out there and make it think. Put a spot out there after he's made it think, give him some orders. Put a spot out there and have it make some time. Of course, he is making time while he's doing just that. So we get sanity, as we see it, existing in only two areas: no universe whatever or in a well-ordered universe with spaces amongst terminals and time flowing freely.

We just have two conditions here that are optimum conditions: either no universe of any kind whatsoever, not a scrap of energy or space to be seen in any direction, not a single action or effort taking place of any kind whatsoever or everything nicely spaced and things in good order, separate and distributed and not piling all up in one place. Now, any time we violate either of those two conditions - which is an optimum spacing and positioning, or no universe at all - we have an individual who conceives himself to be in very desperate trouble indeed.

Now, this that I have talked to you about is actually the background music of any life or livingness. And you as an auditor can, I am sure, apply it with considerable benefit.

Okay. Thank you.