

CASE ANALYSIS - ROCK HUNTING - QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD

A lecture given on
4 August 1958

All right. This is the question period of the sixteenth lecture of the 20th ACC, August the 4th, 1958.

Now, you've had a lot of time to run Rocks. You haven't, unfortunately, had too much experience here in Rock hunting, just as itself, and therefore I'm going to ask you to do something, and that is to turn me in a list of all the Rocks you have found or are running on every case. Every Rock that you know anything about, even if it's on somebody else's case, or your own, you turn me off a complete list of Rocks, huh? And then I can go over this complete Rock - a list of found Rocks - and we can get a little bit smoother common denominator on this thing, huh?

Audience: Mm-hm.

I want to tell you right away I ran into a freak case that is a nonstick case - a case that doesn't stick but surges. The case was here a little earlier so I didn't mention it. It's a freak case. I'm sure I can get this needle to stick sometime or another but I worked at it for three hours. Unfortunately I processed this case before, and the case is capable of blowing full computations that would have been a talisman at one time or another, see? And as these things blow off I'm blowing down to machinery with a case with no reality on machinery! Now this is interesting. The case is obviously operating on machinery, and there's no reality there on production machinery. There's only reality on one thing and that is: anything that stops you is no good. Anything that stops you is no good.

Now, "stop" and "stopped" blew off as stops. I did get the needle to halt on "stopped." The consumption machine, then, is a machine simply that stops everything, being fought by a production machine. No reality on the production machine, which is earlier, but lots of reality on anything that stops anything - and that is bad. Definition of something that stops: bad.

The behavior of the needle, I must tell you about. I'm sure I can stop this needle on such a question of a stop remover or something like this, and a stop remover will get over into some reality. But I must tell you that I haven't stopped it; I hadn't asked the question of stop remover yet.

I've exhausted the case of practically everything that we could think of, you know, practically everything we've run into. Whenever I say "Stopped," the needle does a half-a-dial surge and then slows its surge down. In other words, the common surge and rise of the needle, you see, is just about so much. Well, all you have to do is say "Stopped," and it goes - get the idea? Just the statement, "Stopped" causes the production machine to go into furious activity; and trying to look at this case, because it's so solidly in an unreal, totally delusory production machine, is something like trying to look at somebody while he's got a hose on your face. You're trying to see the nozzle to the hose and all you get is water in the face, you see? And there's that tremendous uprise, this terrific surge every time you say, "Stop." "Stop" at first, mind you, slowed the needle down and occasionally stopped it for a moment, you see? But then stops blew off of it, just in case analysis, you see? And finally, "Stopped" no longer stops the needle. What we're doing is, just with scouting, coming in toward the production machine.

Now, a machine that produces things of some kind or another does not yet stop the needle! See? No reality - going through tremendous delusion. Now, perhaps just an additional scout would bring us down to the standard case but so far it has not. And I do have this freak case now, that every time you say the key word, you don't get a stuck needle, you get a tremendous surge. Yes. I just wanted to mention this case because this is the one case that so far is an exception to all other rules.

Yes?

Male voice: What would happen if you said, "Start" to that case, then?

Nothing happens. There's a total unreality of mental machinery.

Another thing, this case was asked to run a mental machine on another preclear, as an auditor, and just cut and ran. Just went. Wouldn't audit it, monkeyed, continued to scout and continued to fool around - needle just as stuck as though it was jabbed into a Rock, you know? And auditor would not run it, wouldn't have anything to do with it until practically a whip was used. (This was on another case, not myself.) It was fascinating. The case was just getting out from under anything that was a production machine but was not getting a needle reaction on a production machine and kept saying didn't know anything about a production machine.

That suggestion, "Start" might work at this time, and I've kept a very good list of everything that has been asked on the case. And the case unfortunately is in sufficiently good condition that it is blowing computations that would ordinarily stick a needle; and all that happens is the needle sticks and, boy, there it stuck, see? You say something: "talisman" - on any kind of a talisman, you know, like a heathen idol or a priestess or something of the sort, you know - and that needle just comes up there and sticks, see, but good! And you say, "Huhhhhhhh," you know?

And then you say, "How about this priestess?" Psheww - two-dial blowdown - the liabilities of auditing a Scientologist that's already in pretty good shape.

Okay.

Yes?

Male voice: Well now, wouldn't that case you just mentioned be practically a perfect target for this, "Mock up a person who would be pleased with your stupidity."

Oh, yes. Perfect target. You'd blow through the delusion. You're right, and that's really what I would have done with the case if I wasn't trying to find the case - trying to find the case out, just on a routine scout. It was my amusement. I spent three hours on it.

Yes?

Female voice: Ron, could you have a Rock which is a consumer and then have a machine which is a producer holding the Rock that is the consumer in place...

Yes.

Female voice: ... and then you blow the Rock that is the consumer, but the machine that is the producer sort of holding that pattern there, still remains.

Oh, yes.

Female voice:... for a while?

It would.

Female voice: Oh, okay.

It would.

Female voice: Yes, okay. I got it.

That's when your consumer goes blahh. That's when the consumer goes up the spout and out the window, you see, and you've got another wild needle. Now, the reason I mention this freak case to you is that I've blown the consumer off of the case, don't you see? It's "stopped," see, anything that stops anything, you see? And that consumer's now gone off the case and all we're getting is tremendous surges just at the thought of anything stopping it. Only it isn't totally gone.

Female voice: But now you'll easily blow the machine producer?

Well, I think with another hour or so of scout, we'll get a machine into view because two hours deep in the scouting - this is an awful long time for me to scout anything - as I say, the case was making a session out of it. I'd tell the case every half an hour, or something like that, "You know, I'm not auditing you." It didn't matter. The case was right in there in-session, blowing things left and right.

I noticed that at the end of about two hours the case was starting to get a reality on machinery, and all of a sudden... I'd described machinery to the case. The case was just duhhh, you know. No help. Wouldn't assist anybody to do anything, you know, just duhhh. At the end of about two hours, case suddenly sat up and said, "You mean a mental machine that produces something? Is that what you mean? Or that does something?" And I said, "That's right." And the case was getting an increasing reality on machinery just as we did a scout.

Female voice: How about a machine that produces stoppers? Would that be a machine that this person would understand?

Well, that's probably the first machine this person will understand and that may get a stick. That's why I say a stop remover would be the production machine. I'm going to try that one and then I'm going to try a barrier production machine and I'll get there with this case.

Yes, Miriam?

Female voice: Well, my Dianetics 1950 auditor's ear says you've got something that says, "Got to keep going. Never quit. Nothing stops me."

How do you mean, now?

Female voice: My 1950 Dianetics auditor's ear. That would be the kind of thing I'd be hearing.

Yeah? Mm-hm. Those phrases, by the way, are simply lodged on top of the basic postulate that created the machine, which gave them their force.

Female voice: So this one would have to keep going and couldn't stop.

That's right.

Female voice: You'd find that kind of thing.

Must not be stopped!

Female voice: That's old-fashioned 1950 demon circuits.

That's right-that is-it's a...

Female voice: So maybe that's what you're going to have to find.

That's probably-probably there. Undoubtedly. Yes.

But it's funny - funny, scouting in this fashion and actually getting a needle stopped but thoroughly, and only keeping it stopped for maybe sixty seconds, tells me that you could scout with a considerable degree of gain on a case, you know; that there is some therapeutic value to scouting.

We ran into one of the nastiest computations on this case, you know, the most debased beingness. The person was practically throwing up on the floor over the thought of it, and the needle stayed stuck on this one for about two minutes and then it all blew. The whole works blew.

Well, so what! So you didn't have to run Help on it.

By the way, this case had an analysis run on it in another fashion and there was something this case couldn't do: the case could not not-know anything. The case objects only to one thing and that is survival and continuance of anything and can't not-know anything and actually had to be kicked around in a session for about an hour trying to get not-know running, on getting the idea of - just the idea - of not-knowing, let us say, this microphone, so that it would seem to disappear. Just getting the idea - not getting the microphone to disappear - but just getting the idea of having any object disappear so you could see through it.

And I put the case through a drill and I said, "Now, look at it. Now close your eyes," and I'd remove the object and I'd say, "Now look in that direction. Do you see the object?" Case would say, "No." I'd put the thing back up here - this was just research auditing, see - put the thing up here and say, "All right. Now open your eyes and look at the object. Now, can you get the idea of the object ceasing to be there?" And the case would say, "No."

Male voice: No, no, no.

Oh, yes. Oh, yes. This case is an obsessive survival case - just absolutely obsessive to the point where there's no slightest thing anyplace that is not going to survive right where it is, just as it is surviving at this instant. All things must! And the case at the same time answers all auditing questions, "Now, invent a bad situation," you know? "Well, somebody coming in and saying to me every day - and never fail, every day - coming in and saying to me... And the next day coming in and saying to me something..." And a case doing any kind of a repetitive duplication in other words, but the case would never explain this, see? All these answers of something bad is something happening again. Repetitive. Repetitive.

In other words the case is saying on one side, "Everything must survive." And on the other side of it, is saying, "The most horrible thing in the world is for something to survive."

Audience. Wow! Oh!

Get this? And the reaction of this case on the needle was finally stopped and then we've got stops out of the road and now we're getting nothing but this fire hose surge. Get the idea? Okay. I'll get this one tamed down, but there's a three-hour scout. Some of you who feel bad sometime that you haven't located a Rock in three hours can remember this one.

Any other question?

Yes?

Male voice: Ron, I'd be interested in knowing if this "Mock up a person who would be pleased with your condition" could be used in a group or would it be recommended?

I've never tried it. It's pretty hard to control a group into mock-ups. Takes an awful lot of good auditing to do that. You'd have to groove the whole group down into an auditor's control over several sessions before you'd dare tackle it.

Male voice: It would have to be very expertly done.

Yes. Your group auditing - you couldn't take a group that was being attended by new people all the time. That's why, by the way, when you're operating in an area, you should not run a casual group as the group which you group process. You actually should go about it with a different procedure entirely. It's very successful in London.

Run a PE and anybody can walk into the PE or walk out of it, except you try to enroll them for a week, you see? And the excellence of your PE is determined by how many people are there Friday compared to how many people were there Monday night. And if you find that number dwindling too fast, I can tell you there's something wrong with your PE because all we have to do is change the PE Instructor and we can alter the situation.

Now, out of this group and from this group we gradually pick up candidates for a group intensive, like a weekend intensive. And what they do over in London is run a weekend intensive. And this weekend intensive is quite interesting in that it starts out at exact hours and goes through to exact hours, you see, and it's given over a weekend, and we run that group over the weekend. Now, you can run a group intensive over two or three weekends if you want to.

Now, it's possible to take a group, then, start them all at once, groove them down, get them under control, and then you can run practically anything. The best producing group auditing sessions, however, are in that old PAB - I think it's PAB 114, isn't it, or some such PAB - the Tone 40 Group Intensive. And I've gotten several - I have many, many profiles on this now and they are better by far than random processes.

And we even ran a test on it and had two or three group intensives run, using old-time Group Auditor's Handbook processes and so forth, and got before and after processes. Ran them quite well, you know, thinkingness processes and that sort of thing. And they didn't compare in results to that PAB 114 set of processes - Tone 40.

But this one, of course, could definitely be attempted but only on some group that was all of a piece and was under the auditor's control. Okay?

Male voice: Thank you.

You bet.

Any other questions here? Yes?

Female voice: In looking at the pc and trying to figure out what to run on him, what Rock, some of these things that we're running, isn't that service facsimile?

No. The service facsimile is generally the glib explanation of the Rock and it is part of it, but it is that part of it which is used on the surface. And you can't necessarily diagnose a Rock from a look of the service facsimile, but the service facsimile will come off while you're running a Rock, quite unexpectedly. That's about all I know about it. Now I probably haven't answered your question. Ask it again.

Female voice: Well, I'm thinking that if we run something that has to do with the service facsimile first, then it would expose the Rock to some degree?

That is a good thought. It has not to this time been done because... We have one case, the service facsimile of which has been tackled from every known angle, and carefully has been kept off of the Rock for a great many sessions, and the case has gotten nowhere. So at a whole series of one, I would say that the tackling - this indicates that the tackling of the service facsimile as itself, in lieu of the Rock, is unsuccessful - at least has been in this case.

Now that the Rock has been isolated and tackled with this case, and so on, the case is now making progress for the first time, service facsimile ignored. We've had an awfully hard time keeping HGC auditors off of some people's service facsimiles and getting them onto a Rock, because service facsimiles are so logical, they're so reasonable, and they are so obviously the thing that is wrong. And then the Rock turns out to be something that the devil himself couldn't have computed. You know, it obviously led into the service facsimile but you - all you needed - a six-foot rearview mirror to see how it did. Yeah, it's very devious.

Female voice: But when we are finding something with which that pc could reach or withdraw...

Mm-hm.

Female voice: ... that is the service facsimile.

Yes. That is so correct and you want the underpinning of it. And the pc, however, will give you failed reaches and failed withdraws if you keep at him long enough.

By the way, do you recognize that in scouting there is a repetitive command that you use that is quite therapeutic? Is: "With what could you reach people?" Do you know that? But notice it's being run subjectively and it tends to as-is the standard reach pattern of the pc. It's a sort of a repetitive as-ising process and, if run for a while, runs him out of and causes him to as-is his standard mechanisms, which are the service facsimile.

Now that he exhausts the service facsimile responses, why, you'll run into the Rock much more easily and you'll bypass a service facsimile, so the process of scouting does account for what you're talking about there, looking it over roughly.

I'm quite interested in questions which lead into the Rock but none of them are more fruitful just than the auditor's imagination. He just sizes it up and pays his money and takes his chance and see if the needle sticks. That answer your question?

Female voice: Well, not quite, because I thought that's what we were doing with - now like...

You thought you were...

Female voice: ... the attention machine or a heat machine and it has to do with the service facsimile, and we're running it.

Well, then I don't - I don't... Ask your question again.

Female voice: Ways of reaching...

Hm?

Female voice: Ways of reaching or withdrawing from people. We're running some of those...

Mm-hm.

Female voice: It seems to me they have to do with the service facsimile.

I just said they do have. But to take the service facsimile...

Female voice: Are you saying we shouldn't?

..as it exhibits ...

I see. You don't know enough about the service facsimile. It's an exhibition that the person makes in life and he exhibits this as a methodology. He exhibits it all the time, except just how it reaches people is quite weird because it usually doesn't.

Now, the thing that produces the service facsimile is what we are running. This not only produces a service facsimile but the remainder of aberration.

Now, to take the service facsimile, which is the obvious visible manifestation of a case's attempts to reach things, and to run back to the Rock, is often a horrible failure. It can be successful. But your service facsimile will be run if you run the Rock.

Now, let's take it from a diagnostic standpoint. The service facsimile is as often as not, of no use to you at all in diagnosis. But in running the Rock you'll run back into the service facsimile. Now, you are running the service facsimile when you are running the Rock, but you are not just running the service facsimile, fortunately.

Service facsimile is just the last decayed bits that are still exhibited of the Rock. See? That's just the last bric-a-brac and what this bric-a-brac adds up to is something like taking a half a dozen Chinese puzzles and kicking them all together, then selecting out at random half a dozen pieces and trying to make something out of it. It's a mess. Got it now?

Female voice: Thanks.

All right.

Yes, Bob?

Male voice: Ron, in running my particular case and trying to put it on all eight dynamics, I have a horrible time when I get to the eighth dynamic. I cannot conceive of it without flipping back to the first. So I'm wondering what is the eighth dynamic?

Yeah, well that's - I've told you many times that when you get the first clean and clear, you can certainly see the eighth. You get the rest of them clean and clear, you can see the eighth and all of the explanation in the world does not enter in as any substitute for it. In other words, that's an unexplainable phenomenon. That's another isness for which we don't have adequate language.

Male voice: Do you mean that we can't see it as a Scientologist?

It's pretty hard to do. It's pretty - pretty doggone hard to do. I could go as far as to give you some kind of a jackleg trumped-up explanation of the thing and generally don't deal in such things. They're just suppositions as far as I'm concerned.

See, the whole thing hinges on the fact of: are we all one or are we individuals? Now, to do that with any subjective reality is the only way you can do that; you can't take it as an intellectual dose. This is one of the things that a person solves for himself.

The Buddhists have tried to hand it out as an intellectual dose and wherever Buddhism has failed, it's because that dose has failed, see? Now, the next thing that we run into with regard to a computation between the two is rivalry - jealousy. The individual that conceived of another individual being God in a particular universe, he became very jealous of the other individual, you see? And we get a lock on the God computation. We normally run into the lock of jealousy, and you can possibly even remember in this lifetime when you heard about God creating everything and you said, "Well, I - I - doesn't seem very real to me. I - I had a hand in this," you said, even if you were a little kid.

Audience: Yes.

And so there's that jealousy computation. Then we run into something else. What universe are we talking about? If you're talking about the thetan's own universe, of course he's always been God in that, but is the thetan's own universe the MEST universe, you see? And if this is the case, why, all right and if it isn't the case, all wrong, see? Now, a fellow has to become subjectively reconciled to the idea that this is or is not his universe. So that's another question that has to be answered and that is answered with its greatest reality, not as a string of words, but as a fellow taking a look at it, see? Now, a Scientologist can know vividly what he is trying to answer, and that is a long way along the line. But for somebody to come along and announce an answer to this particular little conundrum, overriding anybody else's reality on the situation and the back reverses and so forth.

You'll find out there's only one thing I get criticized for. Once in a while I get criticized because I won't let people help me while I'm demanding that they help me. That's very funny. I get a letter every once in a while, "You won't let me help and that makes me very mad at you," and so forth, "because you won't let me help." And you look back in the files - you've actually asked the guy to do something, you know, and this wasn't evidently real as help.

So you get this other one. Periodically, I'd say once every six months, I receive a resounding upbraiding of magnitude on the subject of refusing to let people believe in their own gods - tampering with other people's gods and that sort of thing - running down Yahweh and so forth. The people that write these things - they don't know what god they're talking about. They don't know anything about it at all. Is it Vishnu they're talking about? Is it Yahweh? Is it Christian church Jehovah or the three gods of the Catholic church, or what is it? What are they talking about? They just say, "God!" Well, this is wholly uninformative and we're off to the races at once.

Now, I think that almost any Christian will agree with you when you say, "Christian practice has left something wanting in an optimum picture - the practice of Christianity as it has been practiced." That's a good thing or a bad thing in the final aggregate - simply depends on this thing that every cure eventually becomes a disease.

Along about the fourteen hundred and ninety, something like that, about the time that people came over to discover America for Spain (its already having been discovered several times - like Lindbergh, the sixty-fourth man to fly the Atlantic but now he's the first man that flew the Atlantic, you know?), why, Ferdinand pulled into Spain, as a method of taxation, because he was always broke and he was pretty chichi anyhow - he was a very little man and Isabella was quite a girl, from the history books - and Ferdinand, to get going on his always depleted purse, instituted the Inquisition.

And a very sincere fellow named Torquemada was appointed by him - over Isabella's dead body, practically - to become the total head of the Inquisition of the Catholic church in Spain. And Torquemada took his job very much to heart! Nobody doubts his sincerity or his service facsimile.

Male voice: Oh, boy.

But here this fellow Torquemada was in actuality only serving Ferdinand's exchequer, because everybody who was found to be an heretic, of course, had to surrender all of his lands and goods to the Crown - first to the church and then to the Crown - and the Crown really got them, but the church got a large whack out of them before the Crown did. And so anybody who was rich could be communized - I mean excommunicated.

Very, very little difference between basic Christianity and basic communism, by the way. That's why they don't fight. You wonder why the churches don't clean up on communism. They have no interest in cleaning up on communism. They themselves have been communistic too long. And you don't even find them getting angry, really - which they should.

But here you had an argument there which put the final stain on Christianity. In England all you've got to do is talk about churches and so forth - almost anybody in any shop or the street and they spit! You know, they'd say, "Dah - church," you know? But, you see, it became the disease. But remember it was a tremendous cure for about fifteen hundred years. It was a big cure. Cured the world of the Roman Empire. That was its basic purpose. It cured the world of independent gods and spirits. Practically nobody here that didn't get hit in the head somewhere along the track - as you'll find out in running it - by the ingress of Christianity into your area.

People got too many engrams on the subject, that's all; and you start explaining religion and you've had it. Religion is a subjective affair. About the only thing you can do is point out the errors of past religions, and you can point out some of them and people feel a little easier about it occasionally. They say, "Yeah, well, that's true." But as far as telling the man exactly how he got at cross-purposes with what he once considered God, is a highly individual activity. You know, they got at odds in various ways.

Yes?

Male voice: I'd like to hear your explanation of how you started on all this in the first place.

Started on what?

Male voice: Scientology. Dianetics. How you sort of independent - became independent again now, or - how did all this really come about?

Oh! Nothing-very, very simple.

Male voice: I mean, maybe a lot of people have heard it but I haven't heard it.

I just died about three times in this lifetime and got used to being outside. Really, that's factual, and because I was already moved out of the groove, don't you see, in teachings. My family, many members of my family that I was raised with were devout Christians, and my grandfather was a devout atheist. And there were conflicts involved in the subject, and like a kid normally will, where there's an area of argument, he just moves out of it and he says, "Well, I don't know anything about it," you know? And I got over to Asia and India and I found out there were a terrific number of things that were - evidently people knew, and then I found out to my horror that they didn't know what they knew about! I eventually realized that - that they didn't know what they knew about. And they didn't know how they were doing, what they were doing, and in the midst of all of this knowledge, I found the direst of poverty and a totally caved-in civilization. So that knowledge couldn't have been any good for anybody but it still was a route, you know? They didn't have it.

And I came over and took science over here at GW down at 22nd and G Street. After I'd been there for a little while, I found out they sure didn't have much of a route in science - they were gibbering! Yeah. They didn't explain very much of anything.

I got so I could pass a 100 percent examination on physics any day - I just - snap of the fingers, run it all off just like a machine, you know? Nothing to it. But didn't get us anywhere. Didn't explain matter. Didn't explain the universe - why it was here.

Used to listen to biologists gibbering around about how we were all mud, and so forth, and I already knew that they were quoting a heathen religion over in India. And I tried to tell them this and they'd say, "Oh! No, no, no. This is the latest biological founding," and so forth. Bah! And they were dramatizing Adam and the rib and so forth and so I figured these guys were kind of dead-ended. And then, I got interested in the arts and I said, "Well, the devil with all of it." I got interested in the arts and was fooling around in the arts and all of a sudden wondered why all poetry in all languages sounded like poetry! And decided there must be some missing branch of aesthetics called rhythm or something. And I couldn't - found out nobody had adequately described the stuff, so I set up some scientific apparatus to test some Japanese poetry.

And then I wondered why various syllables - why should various syllables mean sadness? I eventually got the picture of sad syllables, you see? I spoke two or three languages without too much difficulty, you know, heathen languages, and so forth. And I'd take poems from these languages and I'd read them and I'd get a picture on a little tape on a Koenig photometer. And I'd look at this and they looked the same, but these syllables were a common denominator of sadness, you see, or a common denominator of joy. And you'd get a certain wave picture that's joy, and a certain wave picture that's sadness, you know? And yet, each race seemed to agree on this, and I'd found the first thing that man could agree on, of being sad and being happy and that that had something to do with certain syllables.

And boy! This was quite a revelation to me, but I said, "Well, if people know all about this..." and I went over to the psychology department. You wonder why I'm bitter about psychology. And I found a fellow over there named Dr. Fred Moss and he was a fine guy. He'd been called in by President Hoover many times for consultations. He was one of the better psychologists in the country - he wrote a book or two on the subject - and not a bad old joe himself at all.

But I found out they couldn't answer a single question I asked them about behavior or the mind. And I found out psychology was a study of a thing called a brain and it had no relationship to the thing called a mind. And the more I stressed this fact and the more I asked questions concerning it, the more I found that the mind was a totally neglected subject in modern times.

So I busted out James and an encyclopedia and Locke and Hume and Descartes and all the rest of it and, boy, I read those guys down to the bone - and they all disagreed to some degree or another.

But the odd part of it is that the older editions of the Encyclopaedia Britannica - I realize now at this line - does carry a list of terms that we use right now in Scientology. It's by accident, see? Our concentration on these terms and subjects was once concentrated on back in the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth century, see? Man was thinking fairly straight along this line and then he went nuts, went crazy, you see? And I found these fellows were simply being pompous. And you only find me getting real cross about one thing. This is a common denominator of what I get cross about, I get real mad about. It's not any individual penchant, I don't think, because I've looked for it in vain. But when something is pretending to be something else than it is, when it is knowingly pretending and when it is knowingly a fraud, I cannot restrain my teeth from meeting. That one drives me nuts, see? Why? Here are a bunch of people who want to know - civilization which is dying for the lack of a knowledge - and here and there in the society we find some men who know positively that they don't know and who are saying to everybody else that they know.

Now, these men are the principal third dynamic engrams; and those are the engrams of the third dynamic. Here we have Dull Foster, see? Dull Foster himself knows and states to his friends that he knows nothing about international relations and the only reason he wants to be secretary of state was because his grandfather's great-grandfather was. He knows that he has no business opening his fat mouth! And here he's got this country so involved it doesn't know whether it's coming or going. The man is not honest, and when a man is knowingly dishonest I like to break out my quiver of arrows, even if they are only verbal.

Now, as far as knowledge of the subject concerned, I proceeded from the fact the psychology department didn't know what I was talking about. I said "Man, whatever his race, apparently has something in common emotionally. Now, what is emotion?" Duhh. Anytime we talked about something besides a part of the brain they weren't with us.

Well, the Christian Scientist had already talked about mind. You look in Christian Science and, although there's some pretty wild ones in there, they must have been on the groove somehow or another; they at least admitted there is something called "mind." And to find oneself existing in a society with the knowledge that there was a hole in that society, needed for the enhancement

of its culture, which wasn't filled, plugged or cared for, and so on, was challenge enough. That was challenge enough and I fooled along with that for some time, just monkeying around, trying to find a few common denominators. I applied mathematics and what I knew of the physical sciences and what I knew of spiritualism, hypnotism and the rest of it. I was not without some background on the subject. But here you had a broad span, and I wasn't dedicated to any of these any more than I am dedicated to a symbol today. It's just the truth and what is it all about; that's the dedication.

And I found that there was some advance - one could make an advance along these lines and one could understand more about it and I was quite pleased to go ahead with it. And then one day I kicked the bucket and that upset everything. And I found myself about a hundred and fifty yards outside the head, with the heart stopped, and I said, "Wait a minute! What am I doing here?" You know? "What's this all about?" You know? I kind of dimly remember that this was the way it was supposed to be anyhow, and then it was kind of, "What was I doing in there?" See? And found out vaguely that I had a full command of my faculties. And people that have been exteriorized by auditors very often can't see the environment or see a false environment. I never had that difficulty - the environment that was there. The cars were cars, the body was the body, the operating table was the operating table and all the rest of it, see? I saw the body was going to kick the bucket and suddenly realized that was going to do me out of things. Now, here I'd been working for years trying to build a name and I'd been - had a few MEST possessions and I had things wheeling. And I just reached over and grabbed the body by the head and smacked it back to life again, see? Bang! And it gave me pause for thought.

Oddly enough, I reverted from a spiritual explanation and explained everything electronically, or tried to. But I was merely interested in what was making the body function because I was trying to hook it up again.

Well, a couple of times in the war - various things - 1938 I wrote the first book on this subject: common denominator of existence is survival, and that is for true. It still is. We're still solving things on the basis of survive: the first command. It took - '38 to '58 - it took nineteenth years, that is, 1957 I found "help." It took nineteen years to find a word that exactly ran and described survival so that it would run on cases, and it was the via that was the acceptable via that took apart the conglomeration of this and that, see? But during the war, why, I already knew enough about my subject. I had run into people who were interested in the mind, Freudian analysis, other things, when I was a kid. I used to be able to take Freudian analysis and things like that and patch up guys who were going off their rockers.

Last year of the war I spent getting patched up in a naval hospital. And I used to drift over and bother the psychiatrists and I didn't belong in that ward, and so they got upset with me. And I found out I could do things with troops that were in Jap camps and so forth, nobody else could do.

And thought of myself as - the first time as somebody who actually had some business in the field of practice as well as research. First time - because it didn't matter how many hours they saw psychiatrists or psychoanalysts, you see, they didn't get well. And I could patch them up sometimes fairly adequately.

And then, 1947, I received all of my back pay from the war in one lump sum and although I was going along pretty good as a writer, I had to write the whole thing into solvency, which left very little time for research. I set up a practice in Hollywood with this lump sum and all of a sudden had a singing, humming practice. Every once in a while somebody writes me from 1947. I didn't charge people anything unless it was part of their case that I had to, and started making Clears.

I heard from one of those Clears the other day, by the way. A girl wrote me - and she had no word for anything, you know - thanking me for all the confidence I had given her, and she'd been very successful since. These people evidently were still pretty stable up the line.

And then by 1950, wrote a book on the subject but I, meantime, had tried to teach some people how to do it; and the book was devoted to teaching them how to do it. It came close in some places but it didn't give, oddly enough, the first clearing method. I myself didn't understand it and I carried on since that time merely developing a surer lineup.

And what drove me from 1947 on was this one fact: I realized that a subject of the mind in the world had no slightest business existing unless it cured itself; and that acted as a terrific catalyst. You could release things into the world, then, which were unsolvable and which merely became new evils, and anybody who has done that in the field of the mind, you see, has gummed the race up something fierce.

So, not wanting to gum the race up just one more time - as one more guy gumming the race up - I have been surging forward towards a subject which also solved itself. And you have processes today, old processes, which run out auditors, pcs, run me out, run all the books out, you know? And I wouldn't be proceeding with any aplomb unless - unless that were the case, you know? We don't want a new cult - as the newspapers insist on calling us - which is going forward, unable to cure itself, which in another century would become one of the greatest ills the race has, like Christianity did.

Christianity to me is the great example of this. For a while it was terribly successful and then it just caved in on itself and it became - oh, whole nations have been slaughtered in the name of peace and Christ, for heaven's sakes. And I never wanted to get into this category, that's for sure. That's what's been keeping us going.

But a bomb landed in front of me one time and blew me appetite over tin cup, and so forth, and I found myself out of my head again, only I was used to it by this time - pick the mock-up up and keep it going - pretty weird, pretty weird.

Any one of you might have started on the same route - any one of you. It's just a cross-up of training more than anything else, and a stick-to-ivity on the subject, which was actually taught to me in several fields. But nothing very odd about it except that it...

The oddest thing about it to me is why man never made a breakthrough on this! That I have never been able to get through my head, you know? And I read these wise men, these men with facilities of language and thought and so forth which I never on earth possessed, and these guys were walking around in circles? Schopenhauer, for instance. This man's ability to write and to think, and so forth, and he got right on down to the death engram - Will and the Idea - he got right on down. And then he simply dramatized: he didn't do anything more than dramatize.

And that man has been staggered by this for some time has made me suspicious! Maybe it wasn't supposed to be solved, you know? And I had that suspicion with me right up till 1950 and I then began to realize that that was not the case! That it couldn't be solved - that was factual from the standard reference points he uses. That it was not meant to be solved was a dramatization.

One of the biggest dramatizations you'll find in a case is the case mustn't know anything about its own case. As a matter of fact, that dramatization, I'll confess to you, carries on to this moment in Scientology - that you mustn't know much about your own case; you must audit somebody else and understand his case.

Now, with this ACC we have made a breakthrough in that, all by itself, and I can conceive the possibility now of a man being able to confront his own bank well enough to solve his own case. I can confront this. Self-auditing, as long as you stay on "Mock up somebody who would like your own condition," something like that (don't go off into a figure-figure and so on) is productive of results. I've been keeping two cases on self-audit and taking tests on them, and they are gaining - they are gaining about - with half the speed they would have gotten from an auditor, see? But of course they do have an auditor sort of on an oblique angle. But this we're

solving; we're getting it even on down past the universal "There must be two," don't you see? And that's passing to some degree.

But that doesn't invalidate your training because as I look at the people who are around in this world at this time and imagine them being able to confront their own minds, when they don't even know such a thing exists, there's lots of room for you.

Well, that's the long and arduous story of it, stripped of all of its romantic elements.

Okay.

Yes?

Male voice: I've heard a lot of fabulous stories about the book "Excalibur." Could you tell us a little about that?

It still - it still exists. I got a carbon copy of it. The original's been stolen.

Male voice: Will you ever put it in print, Ron?

The original... No. The original was stolen by the Russians a long time ago. They offered me a hundred thousand dollars to go to Russia and work exclusively in Russia - all laboratory facilities - and actually offered me any facility and pay and equipment that Pavlov had ever had and they almost had me on the boat, you know? That was back with Amtorg [Amerikanskaya Torgovlya - A Russian - American trading company]. And a few years later, why, my apartment was raided, doors smashed in and so forth, and the only thing missing in the whole place - papers were all thrown about and so forth - and the only thing missing (there were very many valuables there) and the only thing missing was the original copy of the book "Excalibur." Still gone. I do have a carbon of it, however. I didn't know I had the carbon. The carbon is the first writing. The book that was stolen had been rewritten somewhat. That answer it?

Male voice: Well, I was wondering if it would be something that you might ever put in print or.

Highly doubtful.

Male voice: Was it dangerous to read, I mean, the subject.

Very, very.

Male voice: How about Scientology?

Terrifically introverting.

No. Scientology offers some hope. "Excalibur" simply was nothing on worlds, Earth - without any understanding at all on the subject of why. Or it simply said exactly what he was looking at and it evidently produced the mechanism, making him confront immediately and intimately all of the brain mechanisms. And, "Excalibur" is actually devoted to brain mechanisms as well as many of the principles which led to the research line. But it described brain mechanisms, and so forth, and guys read those things and they actually were sitting there just looking at them and they go up the spout.

Now, in Scientology you ask a man to confront why, you ask him to confront thinkingness, you ask him to confront reason and supposition. You don't give him the hard rock-bound object, you know? And he gets along all right. You can write too brutally on the subject evidently.

Scientology - I've never known anybody to do anything with Dianetics and Scientology or any book thereof, but after reading in one, to feel better, even though they were sometimes worried,

or something of the sort. And I have had instances of people just reading the first article and stepping out of a hospital bed, and so forth.

So this is not true of "Excalibur" and "Excalibur" comes under the heading of a dangerous weapon.

Male voice: Would it still be dangerous for a Scientologist to read it?

Oh no, no. Matter of fact from that aspect I wouldn't publish it for another reason and that is that a modern Scientologist would laugh at it. It's the only book, too, by the way, that contains any nomenclature straight off my case. Many of the descriptive words in it are straight out of my own engrams. I'd had no auditing at the time; I'd had no broad look at the track, or anything of the sort; and I just picked up the handiest stuck phrase on the bank. Right.

Okay. Well, now, are you doing at all well, do you think?

Audience: Yes. Yes.

Is there any hope at all?

Audience: Yes. There is some.

Is there anybody who has no hope at all? Now, you'd be afraid to raise your hand in this company, so go ahead and raise it if you have no hope at all - you just don't think it's anywhere from nothing. All right.

Okay.

There's a high probability in these cases that a look at them will discover them running an associated Rock of some sort. And I've already seen this mechanism of something associated with the Rock being run with great avidness, and so forth, and it simply runs up and down a bit and then it sort of knocks off. Well, there was a fault in the analysis of the case to some degree, which is of course very easy to make. Yes?

Male voice: I wanted to ask a question about that because you mentioned this in the lecture, that after you'd run the thing a while maybe the actual Rock, which was something pretty close.

Uh-huh.

Male voice:... will show up.

Yeah.

Male voice: Now, this seems to have been the case here. You know, you assigned a space jockey...

Mm-hm.

Male voice: ... only this sort of - well, it ran and things happened and then it flattened out. And so Saturday I got a - I got a little bit better look at this and decided it wasn't the jockey itself it was the ship. And this stuck, incidentally. We were just.

Yeah?

Male voice:... running around.

Yeah.

Male voice: Now, what would you do in a case like that? Would you discontinue running the command and let the...

Jockey didn't stick anymore and ship did? You've got to shift - that's all there is to that. We'll have to go into this a little bit further...

Remember something. We are talking about a chain which begins with basic-basic, goes up through engrams, secondaries and lock chains. It's a wholly totally identified mess - you understand - and trying to find one's way through this requires you to know certain laws concerning Dianetics and that was: When it doesn't erase you went earlier. Remember that? Hm?

Male voice: Right.

You can't do anything else with the Rock than this and you're more or less being held on this, as auditors, to stick to it, which is a little bit of a criticism of you. People are afraid you'll bolt, you know, and use the look-around as just a method of bolting. So once you have audited out and have stuck to a Rock for a while, which had as a subsidiary Rock...

I gave you an example of it this morning. You find arm. Arm sticks. Doesn't seem to have any sense. It doesn't select out one way or the other. Next thing you know we're really talking about an arm - meaning a weapon. Now, that is the arm that's stuck, and a plain arm just goes through hell while that is being broken out and then continues to have somatics on it as the rest of it is run. But the arm itself would probably not resolve if it was a human arm that we were auditing. You got the idea? Now, you just picked the wrong chain, that's all. The right chain was a gun! And yet at first it'll be armor, swords, spears, you know? All kinds of things will stick equally with this. As it differentiates, somewhere there's a main chain. Somewhere there's a main chain; you'll find the other chains will fall off of it.

Now, there's something I said I'd give you in the lecture and I didn't give you, and that's how to prove one up. Is you merely add - I've mentioned it many times - that you add to it and subtract from it. Well, now, when some synonym for which you are running adds to it, that isn't it. The thing itself will go on sticking, but other things associated with it will add to it and subtract from it, you see? So if something starts to become subtractive and if something starts to become additive, and some close synonym to this is the better one, why, that's the one that should be run.

But there's another error. You can come off of the main Rock and start running some associated Rock which doesn't stick as well and just gum the case up gorgeously. You get both of them? Now, one of the rules is that all those things which are late have less validity than those things that are early; and you find yourself running anything late, like the Catholic church for the love of Pete, let's go south! See? Otherwise it'll hang up. Got it? You find yourself running items which all of a sudden run into machines. I'll give you a clue. Run the machine out and then come back and find out about the item. You got the idea?

Female voice: Yeah.

So part of your running should consist of occasional testing, occasional scouting and occasional lookovers to redefine this thing and to find that part of it that sticks best, and then you run that segment of it. You understand? As you run it you're getting rid of generalizations and associated things. You got it? So theoretically you can move over center to one that just sticks with deadly glue. And that was what you should have been running all the time, but the devil himself couldn't have piloted his way into it. You got it? Now you can move over as long as it's earlier and sticks better.

Yes?

Male voice: How about going from factories to consumers and vice versa?

Yep.

Male voice: That's legit too?

Yes. That's all a part of it. You shift over from a consumer to a producer, from a producer to a consumer, you can shift back and forth. The rule is simply: what sticks best now. You understand?

Male voice: Right.

It's what sticks best now.

Male voice: You're going to have to have something with a free needle, though, to make that check. Right?

No. Not necessarily. Your needle is going to get wobbly on one part of it. Just do another little scout on it, see, remembering vividly what you were running, because you might not find anything else and then you'd just better come back to what you were running. You get the idea?

[End of lecture.]