

THE MIND

A lecture given on 29 October 1956

[Start of Lecture]

Okay. Well, having had you in a fine state of restimulation all last week, I find it's very interesting today to be able to relax and have nothing to talk about. Just a homey get-together that doesn't particularly influence anything and certainly won't change your auditing procedures any at all. But in view of the fact that we have nothing to talk about, we better go over just one or two points here.

One of them is, Why don't you get fast results? That's a question that's totally an empirical question. It simply has culminated at a long look that possibly, in some way or another, an auditor by applying himself and staying awake during a session might possibly be able to get... well, gain two or three minutes out of each hour of processing he renders. And this is a very hard thing to sell an auditor who very often gets paid by the hour. And my answer to this is to raise the ceiling on How well can people get?

That is essentially what we have been doing. We have been stretching the span between how far south and how well, and we have continued to stretch this span, which of course gives us: the number of people on whom Scientology works then expands too. You realize there were probably upper-scale cases on whom Scientology did not produce a particularly fast effect.

One of those, for instance, is -- and this is very serious -- one of those was a chief athlete, the pillar that England was depending on at the Melbourne Olympics. And he started to go north and he couldn't go north very far. Well now, actually, he wouldn't have gone north very far at all in 1952. Somebody would have exteriorized him and he would have felt a bit better about it, something like that. Truth of the matter was, this fellow was right up there -- they would have exteriorized him better, let me say that; he was already an exterior.

Now, how much better could he be made? Wow! Wow, just doubled his record, that's all. I mean, just wham! Just put out of the range of athletes. Now, the other way to -- in other words, today we could do a great deal for this fellow, but he was in such good condition that in 1952 or '53 we would have had a very, very hard time doing anything for him. You get the idea?

All right. Now let's look at the other end of the spectrum and let's take, for instance, the notable black case. Just this black case, that's all. Now, that black case caused us an awful lot of worry along about 1950, '51, for the excellent reason that he couldn't see an engram. So, if he couldn't see anything, he couldn't run anything and that tended to put him out of our reach. Get the idea? We could do things like Straight-wire; we could do patch-ups of one kind or another. But until we got something like 8-C, Opening Procedure of, we really hadn't done too much for that case.

Every now and then we'd get one of these black cases, and somebody would run an engram on him. And it would turn out that he only had a little patch of blackness in the engram in which he was sitting, and it would all wash away and his field would come clear. And a great many of us have had cases that this happened to. In other words, it was a black case and we processed them, even way back when, and the field came clear. But this couldn't be said to be all black cases. Do you understand that?

We sometimes had cases that just were totally resistant to anything -- no change, no change, no change. Well, now, that phenomenon itself today is a forgotten mechanism as far as difficulty is concerned, but some of you may not be aware of the fact that this problem has for a long time been licked. It is done by a Subjective Remedy of Havingness, mocking up blackness and shoving it into the body. Now, he dopes off. And it is a very difficult thing to keep him in session because he keeps doping off and passing out and so on, but you tap him back together again and go ahead.

Now, the most successful running on such a case which I have done, I didn't tap. This was a very resistive case -- historical. Still had hopes that something could happen for him but had never really accomplished any real change. Now, this case was interesting, very interesting, because I said to myself, *„I'll bet you that regardless of how he looks while he's sitting there in the chair, I'll just bet you that he will go on doing the process.“* And just on that conclusion, I went ahead and kept up the auditing command. It was this, you know, of course: *„Now mock up a black mass and shove it into the body. Good. Mock up a black mass and shove it into the body.“*

Now, at first he could not differentiate the black mass he was mocking up from the blackness he was confronting. He went out like a light; he fogged out; he was not in communication with the auditor; he would not acknowledge; he would not do anything, apparently, to say he was still being audited. But I demanded no alertness on the part of the preclear. I just let him fog as far as he wished to fog and kept giving him the auditing command, just as though he was saying *„Yes, I did it“* and so on. I just kept it up.

And something very unusual happened with regard to this -- completely aside from the result -- is that a month later he couldn't remember the session. But the funny part of it is, is the field came totally clear, and during the entirety of the session he contin-

ued to obey the auditor's command. But he could not control his body sufficiently to signify that he had done so. You got that now? He'd gone right ahead and obeyed it just as nice as you please. And the field came clear. The field turned first to sort of a murky gray, and then got white, and then got painfully white and then settled down and got to be a comfortable stack of nothingness. And then when asked to mock up something else, did so, and mocked up something else and mocked up something else and mocked up something else.

Finally, I asked him, „*How big are these mock-ups?*“

And the reply was, „*Oh, just regular size.*“

And I said, „*Well, how big is regular size?*“

And he says, „*Oh, they're just about that big.*“

And I said, „*Where are they?*“

And he said, „*Well, they're just there, of course.*“

So I said, „*All right, let's see if we cant make them a little bigger,*“ and finally, by gradients, got him up to where he could make a mock-up there that was forty feet high, and everything was fine.

Now, from there we went into -- this was all in one session, by the way -- went into a Subjective Remedy of Havingness, a complete Remedy of Havingness of „*Shove it in*“ and „*Throw it away,*“ you see (these two), and naturally he couldn't get rid of anything.

Remember, you know, that state of case phenomenon and state of sanity are not necessarily comparable. You're aware of that?

All right. The case phenomena of blackness does not admit of the discard of anything, but the case computation is usually an obsessive discard of everything. You got that? They must discard everything, one way or the other. They get rid of things. If you don't watch them, they get rid of their watches, and your head and so forth. And if you don't watch them as an auditor -- if you don't watch them -- they'll just chew up energy and chew up energy and chew up energy, and then they will never really replace any of this energy and it pushes them right out the bottom.

Now, couldn't discard anything. In other words, a Remedy of Havingness is „*Mock it up, shove it in; mock it up and throw it away.*“

There's an intermediate step these days which is used, which came in with the Trio. The Objective Remedy of Havingness is used as the subjective. The objective, subjective -- you can do them the same. You can mock something up and let it remain. You can mock something up and shove it into the body. You can mock something up and throw it away. You see? That's subjectively, you can do these three parts.

All right. The first item that was mocked up that one wanted to push away was unfortunately an elephant. Now, I didn't give the preclear any inkling really of what I was going to do, beyond the fact that we were going to change a standard bridge, but got no agreement particularly on this because I was having a little difficulty controlling

this preclear and I didn't want to give the preclear too much food for figure-figure. That's different than food for thought.

And I said, „*Now mock up something*“ I said, „*This time we're going to do something else with it, if that's all right.*“

He said, „*That's fine.*“

And I said, „*Now mock up something*“ And my next command was going to be „*All right, now let's see how far we can throw it away.*“ And I said, „*What is it?*“

And he said, „*It's an elephant.*“

Well, I don't permit my auditing to be disarranged by the vagaries of a preclear's bank. I keep my auditing neat. And so I said, „*Well now, please tell me how we're going to throw this away.*“

„*I don't know,*“ he says, „*That's a problem.*“

We finally had the elephant walk away. And the elephant walked away and got out in the hall and got onto the elevator and went downstairs and walked out of the pre-clear's sight. And this was a gradient, because before I permitted this preclear to examine the whereabouts of the elephant -- find out if it'd really been thrown away -- I had some more elephants mocked up right away. You see? I just said, „*All right, mock up another elephant.*“ Gave him no time to inspect whether or not it was gone. Let him cognite. I didn't tell him he'd gotten rid of it, you understand.

It's a very funny thing. They can throw things further and further away if you give them more and more things up close to have waiting there, pending throwing them away. You know? I mean, you form a goodly supply. Sometimes you have to mock up half-a- hundred things to get the preclear to get rid of one. This is quite a trick, quite a trick, the getting-rid-of step of Havingness, and is the more important -- is the more important of the steps of a Subjective Remedy of Havingness. Get him to mock up something and throw it away.

A failure to do this -- I hate to remark on this, but we have had very few casualties in Dianetics and Scientology; very, very few casualties. In fact, practically no casualties that I know of anywhere due to processing. But I do know of one case that could have been salvaged if the auditor, written to at some vast distance from the U.S., had actually completed a Remedy of Havingness. And the auditor somehow or another didn't have the wit or something to mock up enough things to throw them away, and so on. The case had had a slight case of cancer for many years, but the cancer was beginning to advance rather rapidly. And the result of the case was that eventually, why, the person died. The person is fairly well known to us, by the way.

But the make and break of the case was, is I told the auditor to remedy that person's havingness, in and out, on babies! Got that? Cancer is procreation gone mad -- that's evidently what cancer is -- and you have to take the various factors involved with the second dynamic and remedy havingness with them. And this has proven efficacious in several cases.

But many, many, many months after this, I was in that particular area and the case was brought to my attention as being much, much worse. I immediately went and saw the person, and so on, and picked up the auditing from that auditing command, you see, right from that session. And the auditor had never either understood himself, or had been unable to carry the session far enough forward to where he could waste one single item. In other words, no items of any kind had been thrown away. You see? Merely „*mock it up and shove it in, mock it up and shove it in*“ -- lots of that, you see? -- and then the auditor had not persisted to this degree of having the preclear mock it up and get rid of at least one.

Well, I completed at that time, as well as I could get in touch with the case (which was almost gone), this Remedy of Havingness. And it was just too late, that was all. It was gone. Made the case hang fire a little bit longer, but that's about all it did.

But there had been -- and I could see easily -- there had been a point there that had been missed. I'm not blaming the auditor. The auditor undoubtedly had his session difficulties there which I didn't appreciate particularly. I'm just talking about the make and break point of a preclear's life.

Now, we have not lost any preclears to amount to anything. And because this person was already sick and would have died anyhow, we cannot assign this death to Scientology. But we can assign the lack of salvage to Scientology. Do you get the slight difference there? We had a chance. There was a period when this could have been accomplished and it was not accomplished. Just why, and so on, I actually never inquired. I merely assumed the auditor had his difficulties controlling the session or had his difficulties in understanding it. But I did make sure that I got hold of this auditor and did get this auditor tremendously well briefed on a complete Subjective Remedy of Havingness, because it was evidently a missing block in his repertoire.

Now, it requires adroitness. It requires a gradient scale. It requires the idea of overcoming the idea of quantity. The preclear, maybe, can throw away one bicycle if he has a box full of a thousand bicycles. You see? One bicycle if he has a box full of a thousand bicycles. You don't even have to have a thousand bicycles mocked up, you see? You have to have a box full of a thousand bicycles, or you have to have a hundred boxes with ten bicycles each or any way you want to put it. You must get across the idea of quantity, and eventually he'll get enough so that he thinks to himself, „*Well, I can get rid of one of these.*“

Now, another method of doing it is to run invented ways of wasting something. And you'll find out after you've invented a great many ways to waste something, that they can then mock that same item up and throw it away.

There's more ways than one to get out of this interesting phenomenon of a caved-in bank, but that is the phenomena of a caved-in bank: The preclear has all of his engrams pulled in close, would not give you anything, wouldn't dismiss any slightest computation or thought. Everything he thinks, he thinks right now and goes on holding onto it. In other words, he's a black ball. And it's getting tighter and tighter around him, and he is more and more alarmed about it and, at the same time, is unable to do anything about it.

Well, the thing to do about it is to get him to get rid of something. And unfortunately, it is a Subjective Remedy of Havingness that is the most efficacious. And I say „*unfortunately*“ because the case is normally a black case. You follow that? It's sort of on the order, if you hit somebody long enough, he would start to pull in your blows. That's overcoming his resistances to things.

All right. The remedy of the state of the bank in such a wise there, the first and earliest remedy which we have, is a Subjective Remedy of Havingness whereby black masses are mocked up and shoved in. You don't have to mock up the black masses and throw them away, oddly enough, because blackness is not a thing, it is just a condition. And you have them mocked up and shoved in; regardless of how dopey he gets, go on. Make him make mock-ups, shove the mock-ups in, throw the mock-ups away, have him make up quantities of mock-ups, have him invent ways of wasting things if he can't throw them away easily. And work it up to a point -- and this is real skill on an auditor's part. He just has to be in there pitching every moment. It's the most intricate action in the entirety of auditing, is the handling of mock-ups and the Remedy of Havingness.

Now, I hate to have to give it that sort of a label, but you better know what you're looking at, and it's not an easy one. And I'm going to tell you something that someday may depress you terribly, because I'm going to tell you I don't know of any reason to fail at it. And one day you're liable to run into somebody and fail at it one way or the other.

But if you fail at it, it is because the preclear -- today -- because the preclear went out of session and went out of your auditing control rather than the preclear confronted something which he could not do. A preclear can do any of these things, providing the auditor's control is good. Procedure has to be very close to perfect to accomplish it easily and well.

All right. Now there, there is the bank. There is the target. There is the thing. The mind in its entirety, really, is at the auditor's control with these Creative Processes. And Creative Processes, of course, include as the most important single step the Remedy of Havingness, Subjective.

And that's all into a whole rack of processes known as Creative Processes. And in anything we do, don't lose sight of the thing that if your preclear did not have a mind and if he did not have engrams as part of that mind, if he didn't have locks, you understand, and he didn't have a whole bunch of „*it's bad over there*“ because he's never had that mass, and if these things were not there, your preclear would be having no difficulty at all.

I couldn't say that impressively enough. It is absolutely true.

It is the mind, it is the engram, the locks, the secondaries, the gathered experience summated, which gives the preclear his difficulties. It is not that a preclear kills somebody and then thinks, „*That's bad,*“ and suffers for it. Conscience, and so on, is a mechanism of the mind. The preclear kills somebody, gets a picture of it, and the picture collapses on all the other pictures of his killing people up and down the track and

he gets frantic. It adds the consequence; it adds the liability. It could almost be said that the consequence of living here on Earth is to have a mind.

Now, if you lose sight entirely of that particular mechanism, you're really going to lose sight of the entirety of your activities. It is the mind. The mind is not necessarily your target, but it is your opponent. A preclear can remember anything that ever happened to him without the assistance of a mind. He can do any action or any series of complex actions without the assistance of a mind. The mind makes it almost impossible for him to create. So don't fall for the psychoanalytic hogwash that it's his aberrations that make him artistic.

Now, it's true enough that it provides a rather amplex of game, a great amplitude of game, if a fellow is out of communication with other players. If he gets out of communication with other players, he's always got this game in the hole, you might say: a mind. You show him he can have other players and other games, and he gets less interested in this game called the mind. But the mind might not get less interested in knocking his teeth in. Get the idea?

So there is the body, and that's an interesting mechanism, since it is just a mock-up ambulant in a mocked-up universe. That's not even a problem. Scarcities and that sort of thing -- we seem to be able to remedy those in spite of the Atomic Energy Commission. We seem to be able to get along one way or the other with these bodies, and if they weren't around, why, we'd be getting ambitious as to how we mock some up. And probably we'd make it very complicated, so nobody could mock up as good bodies as we could mock up, or as sick bodies or something, and we'd eventually establish some rules and some government regulations: *„If you mock up a body which does not carry the government brand on its back, and so forth, why, you will be theta bopped,“* or something. You know?

But that, that isn't much of a problem. That isn't much of a problem. It's the thing that prevents mock-ups or which keeps a person convinced that he can't create that would be the problem. It wouldn't be the creation itself

All right, now let's look upstairs from that, and let's find a thetan sailing around, interested or not interested in things, and so on, and I assure you he can't get in trouble. It's just one of these things. He needs assistance. Unfortunately, there are all too many people and objects and things ready to assist him to get into trouble. But he himself really couldn't get into any trouble; he'd need help.

Well now, if he simply took over a body and started to run it, he would not be in trouble -- not really; not yet. He'd have to have some sort of an automaticity. He'd have to have some sort of a bridge between the body and himself in order to have any trouble. He does an action today, and next month some part of his being still thinks he's doing this action. That's battiness. That's real battiness. He does an action today, and a month from now he may be convinced that he's still doing the action. Now, that would really require some kind of a weird mechanism in order to make that come true.

Well, that weird mechanism we call, bluntly, the mind. It is the bridge mechanism between these two things. Therefore, it is always legitimately an auditor's target.

Why do you put a preclear into communication with other people or yourself? That's to show him that he's not impeded by his mind. Why do you make him mock something up and have him pull it in on himself? That's to show him that he can survive in spite of an action of a mind in making pictures and pulling them in.

Practically anything you're doing is motivated by this thing called the mind. He might have believed, when he was four years old, that he was a bad boy for an hour. The mind makes sure that he remembers it and believes it for forty years. Don't you see? It confirms the continuance. And in view of the fact that that which is confirmed is, originally, and has to be a conviction, you would say, then, the mind is a mechanism which confirms convictions -- which is pretty close to a technical definition. Continuance of conviction: That is what mind is really interested in.

So, what do we have? What do we have when we are actually confronting a preclear? We have a thetan, we have a body and we have a mind. What are you trying to solve? You're trying to solve the mind. You're not really trying to solve the body. You're not really trying to solve the thetan.

You could take a body, slam it up against the wall, and if nothing confirmed that state of existence or continued that conviction, it would snap back to battery. I had the pleasure of watching a little baby do this just yesterday. An hour after birth, baby's head all out of shape was still better than at the moment of birth. Six hours later -- head getting into very good condition. This morning -- no evidence, head in perfect shape, see?

Well now, if hot rodders could hot rod themselves through a brick wall and bounce off the windshield, assemble the parts, throw them back together again and so forth, and that evening be in perfectly good condition, if no reminder was present, they would go on and do it again. Well, why not do it again if the recovery rate is this fast? Well, they don't do it again because other people don't like hot rodders -- you get the idea? -- so that they tend to confirm the mechanism. They want the hot rodder to remember this.

A thetan is getting assistance. He's being assisted, and the recoverability of the body, then, lowers. You follow this? The body gets lower in its recoverability because its state of maladjustment is confirmed.

Now, that is all a psychosomatic illness is. It is a state of maladjustment thoroughly confirmed and continued by a mental conviction that it is. A spastic is one particular type of electronic-engram implant, just one particular type. They're interesting, these spastics, because they are totally in motion; there are no rest points anywhere.

Now, let's look this over with great care. What is a rest point? What is motion? First you have to know what a mind is. A mind is a mental image picture, series of, containing all perceptions. And those mental image pictures in which we're interested are, of course, those pictures which contain pain, unconsciousness and compulsive exteriorization.

If you were to take just those pictures out of the mind, it'd have to behave. Be very easy to do. Do you see that? The mind would have no glue to hold it together because what is confirmed there? Pain is confirmed, unconsciousness is confirmed and exteriorization is confirmed. And that's that. You see this?

Now, if I were to ask you suddenly what a mind was, you could tell me this tremendous number of words, descriptions and so forth, but if you said that it was a mechanism which confirmed experience and continued it, you would have an action definition which was usable in auditing: Confirmed and continued experience. Well, I wouldn't care what kind of a mechanism that was and you could probably go out from that definition and invent a new kind of mind. See? Some other way of doing it than suspending it in picture form or something, see? You got it?

Well, your action as an auditor -- in order to return somebody into a state of good ability -- your action as an auditor is simply to take the conviction out of those moments. You take the nowness, „*it is still happening*“ out of these moments and what do you have? You have what you had in the first place: nothing. But because somebody likes mass, you'd better give him some mass. So the action of auditing is not an annihilative action. That's a one-sided look. It's not totally annihilative. It's a substitutive action.

There are many ways you could go ahead and use auditing to annihilate. And in the final analysis there are certain things and types of things which themselves are annihilated. But what you annihilate is a significance. Well, don't annihilate terminals in order to annihilate a significance; annihilate the significance instead. You see?

So to do this, substitution is one of the more powerful techniques as well as the real definition of what you're up to. You're substituting a bank for a bank, an idea for an idea, a mass for a mass. And if you don't substitute, you get your preclear in trouble. He is a mechanism that for some reason or other believes that he has just so many ideas, just so many engrams, just so many this, just so many that, and he sort of feels that if he did an inventory and found himself one short, why, he'd be in a bad way. It's not true. He has a quantitative look at these things, you see?

But here he is, incapable really of discarding something without having some thing. Now, just why that is, is basically a consideration. If you could break that consideration, why, you'd have it made. But unfortunately, the consideration evidently doesn't easily break. But you do substitution for a little while and he finds out a change is going on in the mind; he becomes convinced of something new: that he can change and that he is not his mind and that he can change and after that he finds it easier to do.

You never saw such stuckedness in your life as when you first start to process somebody who is having a rough time in life, and you ask him overtly to change. You ask him to change something in his makeup. You ask him to alter some part of his mental makeup. What are you going to do? Well, you're going to alter some part of his mental makeup. Well, he knows that better not happen. But there are some things he wishes he had some other things instead of, there are some things that he would just as soon substitute some other things for.

And I'll give you an idea: Just take John Jones. He has a car which is a 1947 and it's sort of falling apart. In 1947 the world was still kind of falling apart. And in addition to the car being old, they didn't make very good cars in 1947. The chrome was rather thin, and they were still convinced that they were in the war, you see; the national mind was at work. They were just beginning to break away from their 1940 styles. This '47 car -- he's got a lot of things wrong with that car.

Well now, to take his 1947 car away from him would cause him a great deal of upset. It's a lot of grief, but it's still a car. Even if it didn't run and it was just sitting in his backyard, he would be a little bit upset if somebody stole it. So what can you do? Well, you can substitute a new car for it, of course.

Well now, significance says that a new car would be more acceptable, but the funny part of it is, is any interesting car would be acceptable. Now get that: Any interesting car would be acceptable. He'd just as soon swap it for a 1922 Buick if the 1922 Buick was sufficiently interesting.

People would stand around and give him attention for it, say, „*What on earth is that?*“

He'd say, „*Oh, that's a 1922 Buick.*“

And they'd say, „*1922! Well, how do you ever get any tires for it?*“

„*Oh, I manage. I run it without them.*“

You get the idea?

Now, the funny part of it is, you don't have to substitute that dramatically. You substitute any car there that he would substitute it for. I mean, that's the limiting factor: any car he'd substitute it for you can substitute for it.

All right. This is the way it works in the mind. He has certain hates. Obviously, a well-balanced, mentally-alert, well-off person has to have 2n [nth power] hates. See, obviously. At least there's something that makes him believe this. So, if you want to take a hate away from him, you better give him a good one.

Now, you can do this very covertly. You can do this very covertly. You can simply ask him to look around and find something he could hate. And the next thing you know he will tell you that there are certain things which he does hate. You get the substitutive mechanism? You give him a 1922 Buick and he all of a sudden tells you he has a 1947 Chevy, which he had just as soon throw away. He never thought of getting rid of it before. You got this? You see how this works?

I don't say this is the total mechanism of all auditing everywhere, but I merely tell you that when you're dealing with the mind this is a good, adequate, safe mechanism, and if you stayed only within that realm of understanding you'd be very successful. Don't take away his chopsticks without giving him a spoon. If you want to take away his spoon, give him some chopsticks. He maybe won't even know how to use them.

But it's very funny; a thetan is very agreeable. He really is. He doesn't realize how agreeable he is. He's sitting there agreeing to be in this universe. He must agree to do that all the time, every ticking moment of the day and night. No matter how he cries

what's happening to him is detrimental, he's still in this universe. He says he can't get out of it, he says all sorts of things, but he's still there. Now, he agreed and he must be agreeing; and he must be, at every tick of the clock, agreeing to time; and he must be agreeing to anything and everything you can look at or he wouldn't be alive. It's almost impossible for a thetan while he's still alive to disagree. That's the trick. That's the real trick: to disagree.

Girls find this out rather early in their lives, see? They're told and told and told that they must disagree to certain approaches made in their direction; they must disagree and they must reject these things and so forth. But they have a hard time with this. They have a difficult time with this because, gee whiz, the next thing you know, why, somebody is rolling up the bonbons and the corsages and so on and they say, „*Now, let's see, who's paying me to disagree? Nobody!*“ Of course, somebody tells them the horrible consequences of certain activities and actions and puts this into a continuing confirmation of conviction. And if they do this enough, however, they cave them in on the second dynamic and the girl gets sick, and she doesn't quite know why she's ill. She's ill; she's unhappy. Well, she needs a certain amount of inhibition, she feels, and she needs a certain amount of freedom, and she gets some kind of a ratio between freedom and inhibition. And if she could just get somebody to agree, then, that that's moral, she'd be all set.

Now, if you recognize our old friend randomness in this, you see (freedom, restriction, plus-and-minus motion... Got the idea? Just so much in the way of barriers, so much in the way of space), you've got what the individual considers to be a proper balance for life. Well, that's his consideration. It isn't even necessarily a proper balance; it isn't even necessarily workable; it's not even necessarily sensible, but it's what he thinks is necessary.

Now, it isn't even that he's found he was safe with that proper balance. Don't buy that one, because he has a certain ratio between security and insecurity. He requires a certain amount of insecurity. He must take certain risks. But you have a ratio between these two things, and that ratio we would consider his accepted randomness, plus-and-minus motion. He's got to have just so much motion, you might say. He has to have so much agreement. He has to have so much livingness. He has to have so much this and that. And he rather tends to fix himself in this line.

And we're looking at something which, mechanically, could be summed up to be the governor in a phonograph. You see, a phonograph record has to run at a certain speed to make music: If it runs too fast, why, it Donald-Ducks on you, and if it runs too slow, why, it sounds like Paul Robeson in a grief charge. Well now, his agreeableness even extends over just to that one point. His agreeableness means that he has to play music at a certain speed. The music called life he does go on and play at this certain speed, you might say. He's in just so much trouble.

Now, just how he learns that this is agreeable is easy for an auditor to trace in any preclear. His parents accepted a sick child. Their acceptance level of a well child was exactly zero. The only time he ever heard from his parents is when he was sick and they: „*Oh, my poor, dear little boy. There you are, pale and wan.*“ Or he found out, quite re-

versely -- some other preclear found out -- that the only acceptable child was a furiously screaming, combative child: Then his parents would sort of agree that that was all right. In the final analysis, he could get these various agreement-points on various subjects sort of worked out and he'd know what they were and this would give him a certain amount of music. And he would play, then, a record called John Jones. He would go on playing that for seventy years and then someday somebody would break the record.

Now, to alter any of this, it's interesting that you, without his consent at all, can go ahead and change the music. It's fantastic. But unless you are there, you have great difficulty doing so. You got the idea?

In other words, he'll change the music for you. But he always changes it for somebody; therefore self-auditing is a lost art. I say it's a lost art not because it ever existed -- because everybody that does it gets lost! There's nobody with which or whom to agree.

So when you ask somebody, „*What is your definition of life?*“ or something like this, he'd probably flounder. When you ask somebody, however, how sick he ought to be to get along, he's liable to look at you rather slyly. There is definitely some point in any action, plus or minus, where the preclear knows the action is get-along-withable. See, it's agreeable; this action is accomplishable. And he says, „*Well, you've got to be just so weak.*“

Southern girl says, „*You have to be just so helpless in order to get along*“ It's quite amazing, quite amazing. Now, you come along and you try to break that agreement with her. You know, you try to bust up this idea that she has to be helpless in order to get along. No matter how unsuccessful she's being in getting along, she will still be that helpless.

You take an English girl: She's being helpful -- not helpless; helpful. And no matter how unsuccessful she's being in being helpful, she won't take a look at it; she'll just go on and be helpful.

It's auditing that changes these things. Get the idea? It takes a highly specialized know-how about existence to get an alteration of any of these agreements. They're that strong. They're that strong, so don't ever disrespect them. Don't ever respect them either. Just know that they seem to hang together regardless of how much hot water you put on the glue. Unless you apply good, sound, practical Scientology to the thing, it's gone. Dianetics and Scientology were able to crack through this cordon.

Now, everybody that ever observed the mind before us, everybody had concluded -- had concluded positively -- that there was no way you could artificially change behavior or IQ. This had become one of the solid agreements about the mind. And when you look over the number of therapies and duresses, drills and exercises, recommendations and diets which have been recommended to man in an effort to change his behavior and his intelligence, and when you realize that none of them ever worked, you see at once (1) it is a tough problem, and (2) with Dianetics and Scientology, you're really working with a diamond drill. Zamity-bam! Well, you get too far off the

beam with Dianetics and Scientology, and they don't function; you don't get these agreements changed. See, something wrong goes wrong, and so on.

Just how you do this is really very simple. It's too simple for anybody to grasp. That's why it has always been obscure. Now, to change the body all you really have to do is to change the considerations that went into the mocking up of the body. That's all you really have to do, basically. To change a thetan all you have to do is to get him to change his mind. But you don't get him to change his mind, because he hasn't got a mind. So you'd have to characterize that as saying you change a thetan by making him alter a postulate. That's the way you change a thetan.

Now, this whole interim span between the body and the thetan, all this gimcrackery, machinery, mental image picturey, anything and everything you've studied in Dianetics (really, the entirety of Dianetics) is, for our purposes, a mind. It's an interesting thing. I mean, it's the most complex thing that anybody ever decided to become complex about. And it sets up and functions on certain specific agreements in certain specific fields, and to alter those requires certain technologies which require an understanding of the mind itself.

Mind is made out of mental image pictures which associate. Why do they associate? Well, because they do. That's a consideration. Well, why are there mental image pictures there? Well, they're there. Well, how do you know they're there? Well, there's chunks of energy lying there that look like pictures. Well, you alter the whole being of a person. If it is being modified by the mind, all you have to do is modify the mind and you modify what the mind is modifying, don't you see? If anything is going via the mind, you change that via called the mind and you change the direction of the communication. In a totality of communication the mind would go hhowh! So you don't audit miscommunication, you audit communication.

Now, the funny part of it is, is that people collect minds. Just as though we didn't have enough trouble, people collect them! Some people collect stamps and some people collect minds.

Any process you've had for a couple of years is intensely workable. Just relax about it; they're all workable. Very often your procedure has to be so close to perfect to make one of them work, that it looks like an unworkable process. But these are all workable. Now, we take somebody whose mind is already in horrible shape, which contains this additional postulate: that it collects and synthesizes and re-erects anyone else's mind it sees. You see what randomness we get here! Wow! And yet that is one of the common mechanisms in a mind.

You get this chameleonesque thing called a mind? Collects mental image pictures, association and so on. But if you realize that you can always substitute something for something, you realize then you can look around the room and have the person find something he can have. He finds some old tin can he can have and he gives up a couple of Rolls Royces in the bank. He finally finds there's a Rolls Royce he can have and he gives up some old, crooked hatpin in the bank. I mean, there's really no good level of exchange: It's what his idea of the barter is. It's completely nonsensical, maybe, to you. Person looks around and finds something entirely disproportionate that you con-

sider illogical. Well, that's what's wrong with his mind: It's illogical. That's what's wrong with that point and why it needs straightening out: It's an illogical point.

All right. Now, this substitution brings us into a whole class of processes known as Substitution Processes. It's a huge array of processes. Any moment of pain, unconsciousness and compulsive exteriorization is composed essentially of two things: confusions and rest points. Just those two things. You have to get a substitution for the rest point, otherwise he's thrown out into the confusion and we get into a very mechanical thing here. So we find a substitution for the rest point and another substitution for the rest point, we as-is the confusion. After a while we bankrupt him on the subject of confusion, we have to get him to mock up some.

But we tell somebody that we want to separate a valence from „*Look around and find a substitute for Mother.*“ He finds an old tin can, a light switch... oh, some of the weirdest things. They're perfectly good substitutes for Mother. Find a substitute for any given confusion or any given situation just on an objective basis, and the individual becomes quite happy and quite calm. Now, this is one of the fastest processes there is because it's right dead center on what you're doing. You're substituting, so you ask for a substitute. That's all there is to it; it's terribly direct. It is one of the best assists there is.

But even above this idea of substitutes, there is the idea of knownness. That's all a thetan does is know and unknow. And so the whole sphere of processing is found to be most effective where it addresses an unknownness. You follow me? It addresses an unknownness. Got it? It is the unknown incident which is the aberrative incident. If the preclear knows about it, it isn't aberrative. Got it? It's something unknown about it that is aberrative. So we have the whole process of „*Look around and find something that you could forget,*“ „*Find something you could not- know,*“ and so on, as being a killer as a process, because it just picks up these unknowns and it goes flick-flick-flick-flick-flick; in other words, it puts them in communication.

Now, all unknown is, is out of communication. All known is, is in communication. You get that? So if you ask a person for unknowns you get, at once, him into communication with something he hasn't been in communication with. You improve his communication, and that's why cases have a startling rebound and resurgence when you penetrate and knock out these unknowns.

Psuckoanalism knew all about this, knew all about it; they left nothing to the imagination at all. They knew that if a person could be made to recall his childhood sexual misadventures, that he would become totally well if you could give him enough psychoanalysis -- twenty, thirty, forty years worth. Well actually, the entire efficacy of the subject simply depends not on the second dynamic, not on childhood or anything, because they're picking an obvious unknown target.

Now, you can ask somebody -- you could say to somebody (you want to fix up somebody with as much gain as he'd get in a couple of years of psychoanalysis), „*Now, tell me something you wouldn't mind forgetting about your childhood.*“ That's all; just put him into connection with forgottennesses of one kind or another.

But make sure that he's forgetting things he knows, and you take under control the automaticity of making unknown -- which of course puts him into communication with unknowns. And it's as simple as that. And you could do that for an hour and you'd get two years of psychoanalytic gain. That's for sure. You see that?

Substitutes: You substitute the known for the unknown. You substitute the rest point for the rest point. You substitute a rest point for a confusion. You can substitute a confusion for a rest point; that becomes bad auditing. You can substitute an unknown for a known; that becomes bad auditing. You see that? You have to substitute the known for the unknown, you have to substitute the rest point for the confusion to really get things smoothed out satisfactorily. Do you see that? Hm?

All right. Now, wherever we look in auditing we find some part of these problems leaping at us. And I didn't have very much to talk to you about so I just thought I'd talk about the whole subject.

Thank you.

Thank you.

[End of Lecture]