THE MOST BASIC ROCK OF ALL

A lecture given on
7 August 1958

Hiya.

Thank you.

I got a couple of pieces of news for you.

This, of course, is the next to the last - two lectures, the last nearly being the final lecture of the course of the ACC. There's just this nineteenth and twentieth lectures.

You're coming down - you haven't realized that you're coming down on the fifth week. And next week I want you to get all the time you can get in on auditing. And I want to have some time to walk around and peek over your shoulders and give you a good swift kick if you haven't got your case up the line.

In order to do that of course, we don't have, we normally have four weeks of lecture in these ACCs, and this is it. They've gone awfully fast, but I would much rather do this next week, than that.

Thing is getting a hum. No, no, no, just turn it down.

Now the number of, of cases that we're ... - turn that down, don't like my voice bouncing back in my face. The number of lectures amount then actually, for this ACC, to twenty-two. Now this is the nineteenth lecture, but there was an extra lecture, if you remember. And then there is of course, the final lecture of the course. And that ends that.

Next week, as I said, I want to get in there and pitch, as far as your cases are concerned, look this over.

And I've got a bunch of Clear checkouts to do, I'm certain.

Now, we have just ordered your name on a bracelet. Your name has just been ordered on a bracelet.

And if you make it before the bracelet date, I'm making you a present of the bracelet. The bracelet date is Aug. 15. You make it before August the 15th or up to midnight as it says on all the contests ... Any later date than that, there'll be a bracelet sitting there for you, but it'll cost you the usual ACC price for a bracelet. Okay? Well, you can make it, I am sure, without much difficulty, particularly since I could probably clear any one of you now in about fifteen minutes; you've probably undoubtedly got the Rock in sight. No, that's straight. I mean, I'm not even kidding you. You guys monkey, monkey, monkey, you know? Got to have it all right; got to have the little finger up here properly while we hold the teacup - much more important than getting that guy Clear.

Okay, and so we begin the nineteenth lecture of the 2Oth ACC, August the 7th, 1958. And today we're going to talk about the basic Rock of all Rocks.

I've been talking a lot about the Rock but these - describes the Rock, gives you a command that run to the Rock - most of you're running on this command right now - and actually goes hand in glove with HCO Bulletin of August 5th, AD 8, Issue II, Revised.

Now, you must realize that it was inevitable that the conclusions be drawn that were drawn, and the further you are run and the further - the longer you run people on these particular techniques, the more you will recognize the inevitability of the conclusions and theory.

Now, Dianetics and Scientology didn't get born because some angel stood in the cloud and whispered sweet formulas in my ear.

This is the favorite method of new, hot dope here on Earth. You go up a mountain, meet a psychiatrist who gives you an electric shock, you come down and write the ten commandments and get everybody in trouble. Honor thy psychiatrist, and other such things get into vogue.

Essentially, any of this work came about through very careful observation. And once in a while somebody gets superstitious about this work. I don't blame them; so do I. How the devil... I vary - vacillate between two ideas concerning this work; there's two.

One is "Good heavens, how is it possible for man in all these millions of years never to have fallen across this material?" I vacillate between that one and "I'm not that bright!" You know? "That's not possible, and therefore man must be awful stupid." See? That's the other one then.

It's a matter - it's a matter of lookingness. And if I've ever done anything here, I merely looked and not been upset about what I looked at but looked at it to see what it was, don't you see? Possibly you could add it up to a simple matter of confrontingness.

Now, when we look over - when we look over past efforts, we find in all of the research, all the writing, all of the airy nothings and the whisperings of the angel from back of cloud nine, we find non-confrontingness.

Apparently everybody had a pitch. There was a big pitch here of some kind or another. They were trying to sell something, pie in the sky or something of this sort, and a lot of English on the curve, you know, and Irish too. Something - something else was in there.

Well, actually it looks quite vicious, but the truth of the matter is, I just think it was a matter of, I mean, incapable of confronting something. I think that was more the case than anything else.

Here you look at the common denominator of all past activities which sought to discipline, socialize or free man. Any activity under those three headings - discipline, socialize or free the individual man - had, each one of them, a dramatization of enforcement and inhibit of communication, reality and affinity.

You see, "Thou must not love thy mistress; thou must love thy wife." You get the idea, you know? "It's very, very bad for you not to..." See? "Thou must love thy wife; thou must not fail to include her mother," you know? That sort of thing.

What they were trying to do was heal up something. And even where a fellow had part of the truth - you know, they thought they had a social evil in view and that the way to handle this social evil was just some more enforcement and inhibition of affinity, reality and communication which they hadn't even isolated, you see? And when they sought to free him, why, they went out on another tack and made whole nations ill.

Karl, the black Marx - Mr. Marx told more lies per paragraph about what he had seen in the world than any man alive. Sometime you want to read Das Kapital if you want a good belly laugh. Of course it has been rewritten so often to follow party line that it's practically not recognizable from his original manuscript and I think it's now against the law. Supreme Court, I think, recently passed a decision that the original Karl Marx books would be banned and that it was only legal to read the party rewrite of them. Oh, I'm not saying the Supreme Court is totally communist; I think there are three judges left, or four, that aren't. Anyway.

Their last - their last psychological - they came afoul of us, by the way, not to get digressive at all, but they came afoul of us very thoroughly here in just the last couple of years. They took as legal fact psychological texts written by communists, and that is a matter of record in the integration laws.

And I refer you to Senator Eastland's speech in the United States Senate to further investigate the fact that the Supreme Court has used for its fact, for its legal opinion, the psychological textbooks written by people who uniformly had been up before the House and Senate un-American activities committees for subversion and desire to overthrow the United States by force. And he wanted to investigate this and he didn't get very far doing it.

Here was psychology. Now, does psychology have a pitch? You said it. It's the A=A=A pitch. You know, it's the "masses" idea. And you find in their textual material, accompanying observation... See, this is merely contemporary. I mention it simply because it's a matter of slight contempt as far as I'm concerned. I mention these boys in passing because you yourself can go right into the society at this moment and look at their textbooks, and you probably have never read one, and you should, you should.

And you say, "Well, I just thought Ron was kidding us and making jokes. It's not possible. What!" You know? You ought to, to find out how far we have come.

But the point is that they had a pitch, that's the only point I'm making. They're trying to sell the animalistic nature of man in order to make it more feasible to discipline him. They're trying to take conscience away from people who have to discipline people.

It's quite interesting. They say, "Well, he's just a brain and he's not a spirit, and you're not really destroying anything but some meat." You get the idea? And the reason the rulers of the world buy this so avidly is because they say, "Well, when we ordered that fellow to be executed, we were just sending a machine to the chair." You get the idea? And you ask the rulers of the world who have to punish people, they think... I found out it doesn't pay. In any nation's history, I found out that it failed, by punishment. It never won with it, never.

And you find out these people wouldn't buy something that said they were a bunch of dramatizing psychotics when they used electric shock and electric chairs and hangman's nooses in order to discipline the society. You see, they would rather buy something that sold them something which they hoped was an easy conscience. Get the idea? Now, the political philosophies which are extant today are indistinguishable between what they call democracy and what they call communism and boy, this is heresy. That's why the United States can make no forward progress against a communism at all, and why communism, by the way, will never make any real forward progress against democracy, because you can't tell the difference between them.

Now, that's a horrible thing! That's a horrible thing for anybody to say. But let's compare their basics. Let's go right down and compare their basics. Let's look them over very carefully and we find out that the champion of the common man who had to be like everybody else was the United States of America in the year 1776.

And the grammar and rhetoric surrounding the common man and how he should be permitted to get along, and how rich and powerful landlords ought to all be kicked in the teeth, is in the literature of the United States a hundred years before Karl Marx was telling any lies and is the woof and warp of this country's political philosophy.

Go up to the Capitol and look in the rotunda and you'll see the champion of the common man is not Russia but the United States. And Russia is going out along the line telling everybody that "The US are composed of a bunch of capitalists." The US listens to the propaganda and begins to believe it. In other words, they're making lies out of lies; you see why I've introduced this fact. You make lies out of lies out of lies.

Russia is saying, “We’re the only champions of the common man.” They got the Arab all sold on this fact now. They got him all sold on this. That’s a fabulous thing to have happen - that Russia is the champion of the common man? The laborer? Oh, never! Karl Marx told a whole string of lies which he probably copied. He came over here about 63 or some such - 1863 - and he saw young boys, “who when they died at their post on the mill, were thrown on the garbage dump.” Oh, this is corn, you know.

Now, what he actually did see in this country was the standard of the common man raised at last amongst the nations of the world. And he took it home - never realizing what he looked at and wrote a book about communism. Well, boy, people now look at communism and think they’re looking at something. Here’s a fantastic picture, don’t you see? Here are two great nations arguing about their “different political philosophies.” As a matter of fact, their basic aims and goals are almost identical. This comes from an inability on the part of either nation or its leaders to inspect anything. They believe and theorize without looking. From one milligram of fact they make a thousand tons of produce.

And then the scholars of our times and of earlier times thought it their job not to look at the world but to look at the thousand tons of produce already manufactured from the milligram of fact.

And so we get this enormous unwieldy structure that we call philosophy. We get this crazy, politically-pitched offshoot called psychology.

Christianity was something that first saluted the common man. And if we look at our immediate forebears that were busy putting their necks in a noose by signing the Declaration of Independence, and think of them as originators or authors, we had better look at the early Christian church when it first came in toward Rome. Boy, they were more commie than commies. There they believed in the common man. They overthrew a whole empire by simply saying - by simply saying that men had souls and should be treated something better than animals and that nobody should own them. They tried to free people.

And then they gave that a big pitch, particularly when Alexander the IV, Lucrezia Borgia’s, Cesare Borgia’s uncle, came in and made a big business out of the Roman Catholic Church. Wasn’t really a big business up to that time but he made a big business out of it; it’s been a big business ever since.

He enhanced his riches a great deal by the use... I don’t know what she used, it was arsenic or something of that sort, but they kept marrying Lucrezia off to some new millionaire and then bumping him off and inheriting his dough. That’s the sad and horrible story of it reduced to its most tabloid simplicity.

Here you have the United States going around today - my God, I don’t think the leaders of the government know whether they’re leading a fascism or an industrial clique or what they’re leading, or why they’re leading it or anything else - they’re lost. They never bothered to look; they aren’t bothering to look.

If anybody stood back from this row that’s going on right now with the Middle East and so forth, he’d laugh himself sick. What are we arguing about? Look at the history of Baghdad.

Baghdad’s history can be written with only one fact: the assassination of its kings. We’re excited about the history of a country that has always assassinated its kings. Well, if you just look at this, you say, “Why should we get excited in 1958 about the assassination of some new Arab ruler?” Well, let’s just look ten years earlier or ten years earlier or ten years earlier or ten years earli- clear on back to the time when Tamerlane came in and did some very broad assassinations.

And we find what? We find what? We find that man is apparently incapable of changing his conduct, which goes hand in glove with: he’s apparently incapable of observing fact! It’s very

easy for me to talk to you about the third dynamic and show you a first dynamic as a result, because a third dynamic is only a first dynamic plus one gone awry. And you get the same model - you get the same model on the broader scale of a nation as you do in an individual. And it's very easy, then, to apply these things to that area of a third dynamic.

Now, the Arab nations dramatize an engram which is an ARC break between the ruler and his people. And this culminates with an assassination. And then they get a new ruler and everything is going to be fine and then he decides to slip up on a few of the Prophet's best rules of conduct which he got from an angel back of cloud nine and he starts to get cruel to the people. And we eventually get an ARC break which adds up to the assassination of a ruler, which then succeeding, gets a popular ruler who adds up all of the things the people have done to him and finally dramatizes an ARC break and gets assassinated and we get a new ruler...

Now this begins to look like an engram chain, doesn't it? Hm? Begins to look like an engram chain. It's a dramatization of what? Well, the first thing we should know is there's only one thing ever dramatized. And the broad analysis of the bases of all dramatizations, which makes it the basis, is: ARC break. That is what is dramatized constantly and continually.

Now, the text of the drama is furnished by engrams and this makes the dramatizations particular. He has an engram by which he is going to leave his wife. Get the idea? Got an engram, but this is an ARC break. He has an ARC break with his wife and he's going to leave. He has an ARC break with his wife and he's going to leave. He has an ARC break with his wife and he's going to leave. That's textual but that is very close to ARC.

Now, exactly what he says as he decides to leave his wife and does so is furnished by a script known as an engram. In other words, when she doesn't serve hot coffee - see, he doesn't even know this - when she doesn't serve hot coffee that is his signal for him to get peeved about the fact she didn't wash his underwear. And the fact that she can then demonstrate to him that she has washed all of his underwear and it is now in a drawer, clean, is of course an invalidation of his statement which he then uses as the reason why he has to leave! Now, that's the text.

Now, don't you go ever confusing "text" with the fact of the ARC break dramatization. We have a picture that looks like this: Thetan: he getting along all right. Hasn't met anybody; hasn't seen anybody; hasn't heard from anybody; hasn't talked to anybody; has never thought particularly he'd like to! One day he gets the idea he'd like to talk to somebody. He's had it.

But the fact that he finds that it's fun obviously outweighs the travail of the consequences because he keeps on doing it! Well, now the communication itself per se, is not a dramatization.

This is what it takes to make the dramatization: communication requires a reality, by which we say an agreement. And it requires some small affinity, even if it's on "I'm on bad terms with him." See? You even have to be at least on bad terms with somebody to have an argument. Well, bad terms to a thetan are better than no terms, evidently.

So we get this cycle, and don't lose sight of this cycle because as you run a preclear, you see this cycle repeated over and over and over and over. And it runs like this: "Want to communicate. Gee! Here I am communicating. They - whoa, boy, man, this is wonderful! They're all communicating with me. Gee, life is terrific!" See? Some psychiatrist were to hear this, he would at once say, "Ah, we're describing manic-depressive." No, we're not describing manic-depressive, we're describing psychiatrists as well as other people. "Paranoia" is where it gets stuck with the communication inflow resisted. "Schizophrenia" is when the personality has to split and face in a couple or more different directions in order to communicate.

You see, all of these goofball manifestations are how you write the script. See, that's just the engram writing the script. And mental illness, neurosis, difficulties, boredom, having to listen to a presidential speech, anything else, could be a series of dramatizations. You got it? But that's the script.

Now, what I'm talking about is the fundamental that underlies the script. And we have eventually been able to pick up this script called an engram and say, "What's common to all these doggone scripts?" People act so differently person to person, yet they all to some degree must have some meeting ground because they can still talk.

So therefore there must be something that underlies these scripts. And that is essentially what I've just done; I've looked. Instead of looking at the masses of compiled data which were born in the first place out of a milligram of truth, I've gone back and found the milligram of truth and said, "Well, what do you know? Huh!" And that wasn't much of a trick. It required at once a contempt for a phony. People accuse me sometimes of having "something on" certain buttons. Yes, I have a button; I have a definite button: Something pretending to be what it is not. I have a button. Someday when you're feeling dangerous, you'll have the same button.

And when somebody is pretending to be what he is not or what she is not, and doesn't know it, you get a totally forgivable situation. But how about the fellow who is pretending to be something he is not and knows it all the time and goes on pretending to be it. Man, he has no responsibility at all for the rest of the human race, that's for sure. In other words, he's interjecting there an unknowing thing, as far as everybody else is concerned, so he is creating stupidity on earth. See, he's pretending to be what he is not. He's pretending that something is true which is not. Then, people who believe him do not know that it is not, see? So therefore they become stupid or they don't know, don't you see? So these are the stupidity breeders. I like bright people. That's a button. All right.

Now, when we look this over very carefully, we will see that this cycle is present amongst all the scripts. He wanted to communicate, he wanted to agree, he wanted to have, and he wanted to feel affinity for, and he went ahead and did it. And he got this tremendously successful circumstance of communication. And it was so good and he considered it (stupidly) so rare, that he wanted to hold on to it. So he protected it.

And boy, any time you protect a communication you're just drawing a little gauze shield down across the line, you see? And the next time you worry about it, you bring another little shield down the line. And what do you have? You have a communication barrier, not a communication line. See this? Every time you start worrying about, "Gosh, this is too good to go on forever," you know, this sort of thing? "It's too good to be true," and you start worrying about it, why, you've cut your own communication line.

So this fellow, he put out all his communication, everything was going along splendidly and then he got a fancied or real ... Real or fancied - you always find that with your pc. The communication break with the auditor is "imagined or real," but it's still a communication break, whether it's imagined or real, see? And somebody said, "Well, we don't have to pay any attention to that because he just imagined there was a communication break." No, you can't do that. You imagine it or it is real, it doesn't matter which it is, it's still a communication break. And it's the imagined ones that are the tough ones to get at because your own sense of justice is outraged.

He says, "Well, when you reached over and slapped me in the face, there, the last time I doped off, I felt bad every since." And you feel like saying, "Slapped you in the face! Who the hell slapped you in the face?" You know? And he says, "Well," he would say, "well, I remember it clearly and vividly. I woke up out of the boil-off with this stinging cheek, you know? You must have been the only one who could have done it." I'm afraid that you have to patch that up as a communication break. It's totally imagined and this is awfully hard on your auditor discipline sometimes. Has happened. I have patched up more communication breaks where I threatened to throw pcs out windows and set them on fire. And I still patched them up. So it was real or imagined. Well the funny part of it is, it had to be imagined in the first place before it could be real. So an imaginary communication break is usually much more fundamental than a real one.

Hence you get delusion having a superiority over truth. So people read stories like I used to write rather than good solid fact articles like some of the political experts write, you know? Oh

yes, yes, they turn away from the paper and say, “Well now, I’ll read something that’s a little bit better,” you know, and read a total delusion. Let’s not kid ourselves. Fiction is a delusion if you want to put it that way. It’s totally illusory. It never happened. And when you pretend that it did happen, it’s written so convincingly and so forth, people seem to think this is wonderful. It’s this fantastic thing. But it’s good communication and it’s safe communication because it isn’t real.

But this is primary. Thetans like to do this. They will discuss things that don’t exist. And out of that desire to, you get this later pyramiding of false facts. And they completely lose sight of what they are doing and after a while get lost and actually get physically upset and in pain and crazy and everything else just because they’ve lost what they were talking about in the first place.

What was the communication break? Well, they never - they know there was one but they start looking for the real ones and they miss a senior one, an “imaginary” break.

Guy got to worrying about what would happen if he lost his girl. Boy, you’d certainly rarely look for that one as a communication break. She didn’t say a thing to him. He just realized he spent a long time there with no girl and now he’s got a girl, and suddenly strikes him some night - not even as a restimulation. A thetan is capable of primary thought. Remember that. Don’t ever blame everything on everything else.

And he gets to thinking, he’s lying in bed, maybe - maybe - perfectly delightful evening, you know? And he comes home and he gets to lying in bed, and he’s lying there and he’s thinking about it and he says, “Gee, what if I lost her, you know?” He’s got a nice game going, nice drama now. And he thinks over, “Boy, that would be pretty tough. I wouldn’t have anybody to talk to, nobody to dance with and so on. Why, that’d be pretty bad, you know?” Whew! Never thought about it before; he thinks about it then. And he walks up her front steps the next time and he noticed a man’s hat on the swing on the porch, see? He doesn’t say anything about it. He has no evidence of any kind. There’s nothing to say about it at all. And he’s a little bit cool. She isn’t feeling too well so she chops him up. Now, we’ve got a good communication break going, haven’t we? It was the gardener’s hat that has been there since last fall, only he just now noticed it.

Now, he can do this all on his own behalf. He doesn’t have to have a machine to do it for him, but he apparently has manufactured machines to do it for him.

So you get this big communication, big agreement, you know, big affinity, everything going along fine and then you get an imagined or real communication break. And then the next thing you know it has dwindled on out to some shocking circumstance.

Now, some people get into a state of total bewilderment. They say, “What did I say that made me so totally ostracized by that family or that group? What did I say or do?” Well, you didn’t have to say or do very much, you know? It’s no sense in him trying to model his future conduct on it. That’s usually what he does. He analyzes things, gets an imaginary reason, models his future conduct on the thing that he must not have a circumstance of that character again, you know? Mustn’t do it twice because it’ll cause a communication break with the group.

I remember one time I came to a party and I’d had a - was very late - and I’d had couple too much to drink, at another house. And I came to a party, and it was a costume party, and this girl had a very fancy dress on and I lurched against her and spilled a cup of tea all over her lap, you know? And well, we cleaned her up and so forth, but the point is, is I was absolutely sure for the next thirty days or so, you see, that that group wouldn’t want to see me again, you know, or talk to me.

I met this girl on the street one day and she was upset. What was she upset about? Well, I hadn’t been around to see them. See, I’d - I had decided - I decided there must be a communication break there, you see, because I was guilty of an overt act, and then I made one

And I had to do some tall talking with those people the next time I saw them. No! I wasn't mad at them, and no, nothing had happened, and so forth. It was the weirdest thing you ever saw. They'd forgotten all about the cup of tea. It was an old dress that somebody had dragged out of the attic, you see? It didn't have anything to do with it. You get how a thetan works at these things, see? Well, unfortunately after he's had some tremendous experiences on this cycle: big ARC, imagined or real break with, then a real, actual break containing physical pain and unconsciousness and all the rest of it.

You walk up to a fellow, you say, "Hello, Joe." And he hauls off and he knocks every tooth you've got down your throat, breaks your jaw and puts you in the hospital. That is the sort of a communication break. Well, he runs into a few of these, you see, and he starts to get text for his script. And he buries these things out of sight. Every time he dies, he said, "I'm no longer responsible for any of those things," so they can really bite his head off.

There's the primary reason why you've got to pay attention to whole track, because that is what is occluded.

See, "You don't remember? What was your address in your last life? What! You don't know your own address? What's the matter?" Yet you can ask anybody this and they say, "Well, must be something wrong with him because - you know? I..."

See, this is crazy. There is a totally buried thing. And do you know the address thereafter has the potential of being aberrative? People who go in for numerology have simply forgotten their house numbers for too many lifetimes.

But underlying all of this, you've got big communication, big agreement, big reality, big affinity, dwindling, falling off for imagined reasons resulting in a real break which has the potential of causing pain.

Now, all pain is, is the suddenness of the comm break. That's all pain is, see? And all unconsciousness is, is the retreat from the comm break. "Unconscious" is a total nonconfront of the comm break, and the pain is the suddenness, the speed of the comm break. I say, "suddenness" incorrectly by the way. It's the suddenness or slowness of the comm break, either one. One, it stretches the lines and the other one condenses the lines. Pain and worry are actually versus each other.

A fellow doesn't hear and doesn't hear and doesn't hear and doesn't hear for a very, very, very long time and he's wanting to pull those lines tight and they remain stretched, see? Well, he wants the lines to remain stretched and they get awfully tight. Fellow comes up and hits him in the jaw, see, he wants those lines stretched. Well, those lines insist on tightening, see? So it's too stretched or too tight.

So, a miss - a pain, unconsciousness, worry, anxiety, all of these things are just maladjustments of communication lines and aberrations consequent to the mass and affinity. You see, the communication is what monitors the other two; communication is always senior.

So therefore - therefore, when we're auditing a case, we have a pattern process. Now this is - this is quite important to you. These conclusions became absolutely inevitable.

Up in the files I have a dozen profiles, and I don't even think I've talked this over with HGC auditors because each one of them audited one of these cases for a short time with this as an auditing command: destruction, auditing destruction on a preclear. And there are twelve profiles in which destruction was used as a process. "Get the idea," or "What part of that person wouldn't you mind destroying?" or "Get the idea of destruction." You get the idea? They were destruction processes. And all twelve of those profiles did a dive. You got that? Boy, that is something to look at. That tells you that you must be entering something new in on the case! You're making him worse by auditing a part of the physical universe cycle. Well now, some conclusion should be drawn from this.

Another inevitability is this technique - there's several techniques - but this technique gave us a real inevitability: "Recall a time you communicated." Now, you run that process and you'll run all sorts of things right in the case. But you run the process, "Recall a time you didn't communicate," doesn't work. Now, those are tests.

Now, why is it that every case is speeded up by "In front of that body mock up a person pleased with your condition?" Yeah, how come that's speeded up? Well, there's a bunch of rationales behind that, but it leaves us to the inevitable conclusion that the Rock, of all things - and sometime you ought to think this thought all the way through and see how those things did lead to such an inevitable conclusion - that the Rock must be the biggest communication area of the early track.

It's pretty wild. Another test that was run was every time you monkey with somebody's field, you make him worse. In other words, audit the field as a field; handle the field as a field. In other words, "Mock up a confusion. Mock up a confusion. Mock up a confusion. Mock up a confusion." And I've got more profiles that say every time you tell people to mock up confusions, you make them worse. Every time you try to open up somebody's field, just as a field without doing anything else about it, you upset them and make them worse. Now, that's something to remember, isn't it? So a field must be a secondary manifestation - to what? Must be a secondary manifestation to something. It's not primary because it doesn't surrender at all.

People - black curtains and things like that - you can audit this to some degree. You can gradually turn on somebody's mock-ups. But I don't know that it isn't just the auditor ARC that's turning them on. See? You make people worse when you audit their fields.

Out of these conclusions you must realize then, that if ARC is the primary aberration, then the break of the ARC is secondary. And so we get that thing which inhibited people as being secondary to that which pleased them. Now, inhibiting people would be fooling with fields. Inhibiting people would be running destruction. And these things don't run. Inhibiting people would be running cut communications. "Look around this room and find something you wouldn't mind going out of communication with." Boy, it sounds so reasonable! It's such a lovely process. Run it on somebody sometime if you don't believe what I say. They go wheeeew, thud. The agreeability with which they'll run it is always wonderful. They're absolutely sure it must be a process. They're sure it must be good.

Well now, if this secondary manifestation - uniformly and continually - if this secondary manifestation is the one that can't be hit; if every time you hit destruction, fields, disintegration, noncommunication, so forth, the case deteriorates, we're left with the inevitable conclusion that it must be communication that upset things! But that is unthinkable because that's a fellow's pay. So we decide that communication must be all so far as power is concerned.

"Communication" must be power, force, any other thing that you want; it must be contained in this thing called communication. Therefore, how do aberrations obtain force or power in the bank? Obviously from the evil things. I've gone into this before over the years. It's been fairly obvious that evil itself had no power. It was good that powered up things. Interesting fact. The chopped comm had no power except that imparted to it by the comm.

You can conduct an experiment sometime. You're putting out truth, decency. Watch somebody who tries to cut the line. Don't fight them, but just watch somebody who tries to cut the line. Watch him blow his silly head off. Do you know that's the rationale behind one of the clauses of the Code of a Scientologist? "Do not argue with the uninformed," you know? Some guy wants to raise the devil with you in somebody's front parlor because "You're one of those Scientologists," and he knows, he's studied psychology at the barber college, you know? And he's the hot boy as far as that's concerned. And he knows so-and-so, and he starts going on like this. The wrong thing for you to do really is shut up to the people you were talking to in the first place. You just go on talking and all of a sudden this fellow will get more - you see, the

condition is that you go on talking, see? You go on as though nothing had happened. You never pay any attention to him.

The next thing you know, not because of the attention factor, this guy will start to get more and more nervous and he'll blow right out of the room. He'll become very upset and his upset will be entirely out of proportion with what you did. His attempt to block your communication has in itself no power! Your ability to communicate is what has the power. And if you fix your communication on him and tangle with his argument one way or the other and get yourself mired down, you have no further power behind your communication because you're giving cognizance to a communication break! If you ignore the break and keep on communicating in spite of what the fellow is saying...

That's how you get into every argument you ever get into, by the way, is you give the validity to the comm break. You sometimes are startled into it or you're surprised. Somebody gives you a non sequitur to what you're trying to tell them, you know? You say, "Well, I made $100 this morning and so forth." And they say - she surprises you - the other person says, "Well, that's not enough to pay for the car I just wrecked, you know," something like that. And, "If you hadn't locked the steering wheel," or something of the sort, you know, "why, I wouldn't have wrecked it and..."

You're stupid when you say, "How did you wreck the car?" You should go and say, "Well, I made $100 this morning. I think things are going to run along pretty well." "Yeah, but the car ran over the side of the driveway and ran into the flower bed and picked up all of your beautiful new begonias.

"I made $100 this morning." And if you've got the ability to keep up putting out a comm line, the person who is doing this to you will absolutely blow a piece of their skull right up through the ceiling. Try it sometime, see? It's the communication which gives power! ARC in its totality - since communication actually cannot exist in the absence of "R" and "A," so we have to say ARC, but the major one is communication - now, ARC then, areas of, are what give all the power there is to the reactive mind, no matter how many witches are burned in it, no matter how many people are wiped out, no matter how many nations have failed diplomatically and therefore atomically. You see? To hell with the script! If you'll pardon my crudity.

A motion-picture film derives its ability to be shown on a screen by a clear light which burns behind it and the picture on the screen is shadow. You understand that? So you can just keep in mind when you're auditing people, or handling yourself socially, to stay in command of the situation, all you have to do is be the clear bright light and let their shadows fall where they may.

There's nothing more horrifying. It sounds - it sounds so impossible until you've tried it that a fellow would say, "What I - you mean this cop arrests me and I go on being cheery and bright and communicating? Ah-ha-ha-ha-ha-ha. That's a real life situation, you know. That's not a theoretical classroom situation. A warrant is a warrant. Heh-heh-heh-heh." Oh, brother, I pulled this once in Philadelphia. I think there are two or three here that were there at the time. Purcell wanted me as a witness in his stinking bankruptcy setup, so he had me arrested, you know? When you have - when you want a witness in a bankruptcy it's perfectly okay to arrest them. Now, maybe you didn't know that, but it's - is, you know? And I was dragged off a lecture platform by a bunch of Philadelphia cops. Dreadful mess - dreadful mess involved. But after I got over my startlement on the situation, I did the most horrible thing I could have done. I just went on being cheery. And I had three federal marshals practically mopping up the floor in case, when I walked over it, I might get my feet dirty before I got through.

And in court, the 1.5 federal judge - they always have 1.5s; when they drop to 1.1 they fire them; as long as they're 1.5 they can be federal judges - and this federal judge up there was 1.5ing around and he says... He'd evidently been slipped a little wad of dough back of the side, you know, to make this as embarrassing as he could, because it's very silly to arrest somebody to be a witness. You know, it's under "Holding person as a material witness," you know, and to get out they have to post bail and everything else, you know, the general illegal setup that they

call law? And anyhow, here this judge was saying, “Can’t I hold this man for anything else?” And the marshal, the United States marshal, United States attorney and the United States deputy marshal and Purcell’s own lawyer rushed up to the front of the bar and they says, “No! No, your Honor, you’ve got this whole thing wrong!” And they told me there must have been some dreadful mistake here. I’d never told them anything; I never testified to anything; I never said anything. You get the idea? All I went on - I went on not being upset. That is all! Because after I found out what it was all about, I wasn’t upset.

Now, this certainly doesn’t make me any nine feet tall, but it certainly blew them out of this firmament. People, when they are put into this kind of a pitch, when that much injustice, when somebody has been hired to embarrass somebody, are supposed to be upset, and it didn’t follow any part of the pattern. And I went on, horribly enough, communicating with them, not being reserved and worried and upset, but I went on talking! I went on being pleasant to them. I went on offering them cigarettes, hoping I hadn’t taken them too much out of their way. And these guys practically committed suicide.

I did it one other time and a guy did attempt suicide. They had him in the hospital for ten days.

Don’t think for a moment - don’t think for a moment that the ability to communicate does not have greater power than the ability to shoot and kill. You understand? A bullet’s final effect derives its total power from an earlier ability to communicate with high ARC. The bullet would disappear in force the moment the earlier ability to communicate vanished. Anything which can be killed must consent to be communicated with on that channel.

Boy, now you look at this. I’m not - I haven’t been giving you - these are rather wild adventures I’ve been talking to you about. It upsets some of you because you were there, you know, and - but you were probably much more worried about it than I was.

But the point is that no matter how worrisome a thing got, no matter how many bodies you lose, if there’s one lesson you had never learned - one lesson - you’d be OTs today. See, there’s one lesson you never should have learned and that is: stop communicating.

Yes, when you first start communicating into the teeth of some ravening, roaring beast, you say it’s much better when a rhinoceros goes by to get back over - back behind the tree, don’t go waving something at him. That’s just because you customarily don’t wave things at rhinoceri. Remember that. Remember that. You haven’t reacquired the aplomb necessary to do so and it takes a considerable aplomb to wave at a rhinoceri.

I used to get a big kick out of dogs - embarrassing dogs. A dog rushes off the front porch or something as you come up the steps you know, in a strange house, you know, and he rushes down the steps and he’s going all bay on the fire, you know, and he just going to tear you limb from limb and gnaw quietly on your bones and bury them in the garden. This is what he’s trying to tell you, see? You’re going to have it in just about a moment or two.

The most horrible thing to do with one is stand there and smile at him, not propitiatively but just stand there with a good, free heart and smile at him and say, “Hiya, Rover,” or something like that. And he gets so embarrassed and he gets so upset. Of course, you say, “Nice doggy, nice doggy, nice doggy,” why he’s - he’s going to chew you up. But if you never admit the fact that he can bite you, he never will. It sounds utterly peculiar. And experiments along this line are attended with some small risk, until you get your aplomb back.

But in auditing somebody then, the only incidents and the only parts of incidents you are actually interested in, is those moments of communication which have been so totally successful as to become a total solution for an entire series of lifetimes. And those ARC moments which are a total solution are clutched to the preclear’s bosom. And they’re what give power to the consequent and subsequent ARC breaks all the way up the track.

And so we have a technique: “How could you help a people pleaser?” as an item bracket. Now, you let this pc go over into too much entheta and you’ve had it. You’ve had it in its entirety. You keep him on the pleasing part of the people pleaser, not the rough part. Something for you to remember.

If you hit a late lock you, of course, are going to have pain in it; when you hit the earlier one, you’ll see the case fold up. You understand that? Every time he slides into a somatic, he’s slid late in the incident. Well, don’t necessarily check him when he slides late in the incident, but just know that he has.

So this big communication, imagined or real communication break, physical pain and unconsciousness; big communication, real or imagined comm break, physical pain and unconsciousness - you get that as the cycle? Well now, that is the milligram of truth behind the billion tons of doubtful fact. And once you see this running out, it is entirely too simple to be believed. So it probably, few thousands of years hence, will have to be rediscovered all over again. But the point of the matter is, is we know it now, so let’s use it.

Thank you.

[End of lecture.]