

# THE CREATION OF HUMAN ABILITY

**Transcripts and Glossary**  
**Part I**

# **IMPORTANT NOTE**

In studying these lectures, be very certain you never go past a word you do not fully understand.

*The only reason a person gives up a study or becomes confused or unable to learn is because he or she has gone past a word that was not understood.*

The confusion or inability to grasp or learn comes AFTER a word that the person did not have defined and understood.

Have you ever had the experience of coming to the end of a page and realizing you didn't know what you had read? Well, somewhere earlier on that page you went past a word that you had no definition for or an incorrect definition for.

Here's an example. "It was found that when the crepuscule arrived the children were quieter and when it was not present, they were much livelier." You see what happens. You think you don't understand the whole idea, but the inability to understand came entirely from the one word you could not define, *crepuscule*, which means twilight or darkness.

It may not only be the new and unusual words that you will have to look up. Some commonly used words can often be misdefined and so cause confusion.

Therefore, in studying these lectures be very, very certain you never go past a word you do not fully understand. If the material becomes confusing or you can't seem to grasp it, there will be a word just earlier that you have not understood. Don't go any further, but go back to BEFORE you got into trouble, find the misunderstood word and get it defined.

This datum about not going past an undefined word is the most important fact in the whole subject of study. Every subject you have taken up and abandoned had its words which you failed to get defined.

## **Definitions**

As an aid to the reader, words most likely to be misunderstood have been defined in the glossary included in this volume. Words often have several meanings. The definitions used in this glossary only give the meaning that the word has as it is used in the lecture. This glossary is not meant as a substitute for a dictionary.

The *Dianetics and Scientology Technical Dictionary* and *Modern Management Technology Defined* are both invaluable tools for the student. They are available from your nearest Scientology church or mission, or direct from the publisher.

# INTRODUCTION

This series of thirty-eight remarkable lectures was given by L. Ron Hubbard between 4 October and 12 November 1954, to the students of the 8th Advanced Clinical Course.

They outline the processes which make it possible to restore to the individual the power of his own postulates over the mechanics of the physical universe.

The progression of world events in 1954, outside of Scientology, was such that L. Ron Hubbard's development of the technology to free mankind spiritually became more vital daily. In this year of 1954, the various national governments of Earth were working diligently to turn the planet into a series of armed camps, ready to enter a final rush toward extinction for the race of man. The United States and Canada activated a plan to place radar stations across the far north of the continent to warn of enemy aircraft or missiles crossing the arctic; French forces were defeated in Vietnam, paving the way for the communist take-over of the northern portion of the country and the later Vietnam War; Colonel Abdul Nasser seized power in Egypt; the first nuclear submarine, *Nautilus*, was launched; and a small island in the South Pacific was the site of the test of the first hydrogen bomb, demonstrating the ultimate of man's destructive technology.

As mankind worked to develop more ways and means to destruction and annihilation, Ron worked ceaselessly to develop the technology of sanity and freedom and to create the future which man had become convinced would never exist.

In these lectures, Ron discusses the extensive theory behind the processes described in his brilliant book, *The Creation of Human Ability*, and brings this theory to life with scores of examples of the application of these principles to everyday livingness. Here is truly basic data that every individual needs to understand his full abilities as a spiritual being, the rehabilitation of these abilities, and the means to operate at cause over the agreements and considerations which formed this universe.

These talks by Ron were given in an intimate and informal setting on the premises of the Church of Scientology in Phoenix, Arizona. They were taped on a set of old-style Concertone recorders, long since obsolete.

During the lectures, the recording equipment and the sound recordist were located in another room. Ron's voice was transmitted to the recorder by means of a phone-line hookup. This arrangement, set up by the sound technician at that time, was far from optimum and was not a technically correct method of recording a lecture, and it resulted in a serious degrade in the quality of the original recordings. It was only through the very exact and precise application of Ron's Clearsound™ state-of-the-art sound technology that these lectures and the vital technology they contain were salvaged at all.

It is our great pleasure to be able to present to you now *The Creation of Human Ability Lectures*.

**The Editors, 1989**

# CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION TO THE EIGHTH UNIT.....	1
BASIC ELEMENTS OF PROCESSING.....	9
TWO-WAY COMMUNICATION.....	24
ELEMENTARY STRAIGHTWIRE.....	39
OPENING PROCEDURE OF 8-C.....	54
OPENING PROCEDURE BY DUPLICATION.....	69
REMEDY OF HAVINGNESS.....	84
SPOTTING SPOTS.....	99
AXIOMS OF DIANETICS.....	115
THE PARTS OF MAN OVERT ACTS AND MOTIVATORS.....	130
R2-61: GOOD AND EVIL; R2-62: OVERT-ACT- MOTIVATOR SEQUENCE.....	144
SECOND LECTURE ON TWO-WAY COMMUNICATION.....	158
COMMUNICATION AND STRAIGHTWIRE.....	173
SURVIVE.....	187
HYPNOTISM.....	201
WHAT WOULD YOU DO IF... ?.....	215
ABOUT THE AUTHOR.....	232
GLOSSARY.....	234

## **STUDENT USE OF TRANSCRIPTS**

The tape transcripts in this volume serve a vital purpose for students. With a written text of the tape in hand, students can follow the tape rapidly and spot their misunderstandings.

Such transcripts do NOT supplant the tapes, as *how* the words were said and *how* preclears in auditing demonstrations actually responded are quite important.

L. Ron Hubbard



# INTRODUCTION TO THE EIGHTH UNIT

*A lecture given on  
4 October 1954*

Okay. Now, I want to tell you about the Advanced Clinical Course that is going to happen to you. Understand that there's going to be no effort here to teach a course. We are going to make this course happen.

And the production of an effect is always the favorite indoor sport of a thetan, and as a net result, of course, you will have to allow me the liberty of making you an effect slightly as we go along here in the interests of you making a great many people into an effect. You get the idea?

And this is all in the experience that I had in ten months of teaching Advanced Clinical Courses. And believe me, I learned a lot about this. I learned quite a bit. I learned much more than the students, I guarantee you that.

In the first place, I was trying desperately to find processes which could be taught – not processes which work, you see. That was 1953, I was doing that – processes that work – but now, processes that could be taught which would work for an auditor. Because as soon as we did that then we were on our way. You see why we would be, because then an auditor could take a case by the scruff of the neck and all of a sudden, why, a big change would have taken place in the case.

But it wouldn't have mattered how smart, how clever, how far-reaching, how infinitely, particularly penetrating an understanding – it wouldn't have mattered one single bit how hot a process was if it couldn't be taught to an auditor so that he would then use it. Now, you see that?

It would have meant that I could have gone on processing people and clearing people, and this had ceased to be a problem. This ceased to be a problem in 1952. Now, that's a long time ago.

As an example of that, I went over to England and started reaching out and picking up people and processing them myself. And I was banging people out of their heads so fast that they thought the Germans had started raiding again. I mean, their buildings were creaking.

It was "nothing to it." All you had to do was do the right thing at the right instant and *bang!* you had a thetan exterior. And then you did the right thing again, again, again that had to be done – mostly because you just looked at them and knew what had to be done – and you had somebody exterior, stabilized.

Give you an example of this. This is 1952 I'm talking about, October. Give you an example of this: I took the students who were in the 1st Unit there in London, and I took one afternoon and evening and exteriorized the whole class.

But what do you know? I had people there who exteriorized, you see, and didn't

stabilize or anything of the sort. I'd just bang them out of their heads, you see, to show them that this is kind of how you went about it, and went on to the next one, taking ten or fifteen minutes per student.

And what do you know? I audited them thirty days later after a great deal of class auditing, and found them *exactly* the same state they were in the day I had processed them.

Sixty days after that I ran a check on this whole class, one after the other, and found them in the same state that I had left them in the second period of auditing.

Now, what had happened? This, by the way, is disheartening. This taught us that I could exteriorize and process people, but that I wasn't teaching other people to do it very well. That's a very, very critical sort of an observation. But the person being criticized was myself, very definitely. This information was not sufficiently codified. The essential elements were not being relayed in such a way as to make the processes workable for an auditor.

And therefore, you saw Scientology – and Dianetics – dragging their heels throughout this country, dragging their heels badly, dragging their heels in England.

Well, I thought I had it for a while, to an extent. In 1954, early 1954, I opened up a clinic in London. And some of the best auditors over there were in that clinic. And what happened? Oh, a tremendously interesting thing happened. They solved all the easy cases. And all the tough ones complained.

And so, we closed the London clinic – *bang!* We sent somebody who had been in here through the most trying times of these clinical courses, and who knew his business, and we sent him over to teach an Advanced Clinical Course exactly along the lines that the 7th Unit was taught here.

And he taught that course in London, and at the end of two weeks, by co-auditing, he had everybody in the unit exteriorized. This wasn't him auditing them, you see. This was just everybody in the unit, by co-auditing, exteriorized.

As a matter of fact, I have a bulletin from him right now. I asked him, "What in the name of common sense did this?" This would be of interest to you. Now, it says, "Dear Ron, the processes which exteriorized the class were 1-1," (he meant R1-1) "R1-2, R1-3, R2-16 to 22. The holdouts," he says, "were run and exteriorized on the specific technique 'Give me something which could occupy the same space as you're occupying.' "

Now, to do this was a triumph, very definitely. And I just sent up a boy for your benefit (and he didn't know this – that it was for the clinical course benefits) to the center of the Bible Belt of the United States, which is the Middle West, to process somebody who has had some of the more interesting ideas, and to train them.

By the way, the only reason this person was trained outside the precincts of the HASI to the level of D. Scn is because this person had registered in and had partially completed an early Advanced Clinical Course, which made it possible for us to complete the training of this individual.

But this individual was a fairly rough case – a fairly rough case – and had not done too well with processing. And at the end of three weeks this person was doing wonders. And we were satisfied to hand over a D. Scn to this person.

Now, all due respect to the fact that there might have been other factors which occasioned this – such as the factors of affection and wanting to be of help, and so forth – I specifically wanted to know whether or not we could send somebody out, of here to some vast distance, and not have him even conduct a clinical course, and still bring somebody up to a point where we would not even vaguely be ashamed to certify this



person. And we can do that now.

Well now, you're not going to get the benefit of all this. You're going to get the brunt of all this. That's a big difference. I'll give you the exact outline of this course: In two weeks we are going to teach you a two months' HCA Course. We're going to do that in two weeks, taking you through the primary processes.

Now you say, "Well, we know all about these primary processes. We know all about this, and huh-huh, *pfif-pfaf*, I mean..."

Oh, do you? Let's just make awfully sure in these first two weeks that you do know these primary processes. This is no insult to your processing, you understand. This is no insult to your certificate, since everybody here has a certificate.

But it definitely says this: In the old days they used to learn how to fly airplanes by walking out to the field, and if its motor was running ... And they often even went so far as to check the flying wires and to see whether or not the gas petcock was turned on so that the motor would continue to operate after the plane came off the ground. But of course, that was only advanced students that did that.

And the fellow got into the plane and went racing down the field. One of the early birdmen told me one time that whenever they flew any of the early Wright planes, and so on, they had an ambulance run along below them. Those planes stayed in the air for a minute and a half. But they learned how to fly in this fashion. There was no such thing as dual control.

And a lot of these boys later on could be found in the army and in the airmail, and other places. And you could always somehow or other tell that this person had learned in that fashion – he flew with his left wing slightly low. He skidded slightly on his banks. When he was landing, why, he would often come in with a rush which avowed his intention to attack all the telegraph poles at the edge of the field. Even today, the definition of a flying field, you know, is an area of land surrounded completely by high-tension wires.

And these boys would become fascinated with these things and twirl their wheels on them. And they would not do a completely smooth job of flying. Why?

They had learned with an error. And, because planes would fly, they had gotten by time after time with this little error. See? I mean, just – it wasn't much. It was enough to throw them into the power lines once in a while and do things like that. But it wasn't completely detectable.

So that's why we're taking these first two weeks and doing what we're going to do with these first two weeks. You see that? We're just going to make sure that you've got all these basic applications down absolutely smooth; just completely smooth. Because, oddly enough, there's a precision way to do them.

All right. We're going to take a two months' course in the first two weeks of this course. If anybody cares to faint, go ahead. But the boys feel a little bit rushed in this two months' course that we are teaching here at HCA level. They feel a little bit rushed. So, if they feel a little bit rushed covering this same material in two months, why, please feel at liberty to feel rushed by covering it in two weeks.

Now, what we expect from an HCA (or an HDA) is simply this: We expect this person to be able to conduct a two-way communication, to use the most basic Straightwire there is – "Something you wouldn't mind remembering; something you wouldn't mind forgetting" – that is, to use it smoothly so that the preclear knows he's being processed.

Sounds awfully elementary, but you would be surprised how many auditors omit these two steps – a two-way communication with the preclear, and how to administer

Straightwire. Just make sure that he knows to do those things, and then he knows precisely how to do Opening Procedure of 8-C, which is R2-16.

He should be able to know, also, Opening Procedure by Duplication. He should be able to know how to spot spots in space and remedy havingness. That's all we expect an HCA to know. I've given it to you.

Do we expect to know any theory? No. That's too much to hope for. All due respect to these people, it's just too much to hope for. That's our experience talking. That's my experience talking.

Well, somebody's got to know theory around here. Somebody's got to know the various ins and outs and wide applications of Scientology. And that's you! So we're going to take up four weeks of that.

But more precisely than that, let's divide those four weeks. The first two weeks we're going to get these basic processes down so we're completely smooth with these processes and so there's no question in our minds, whatsoever, about these processes. You see that?

Then, all during this time as we move forward, we're going to take a review of basic theory in addition to getting through these processes. And we're just taking a review of basic theory for these first two weeks, too, just in case you haven't got enough to do. And we also expect in these first two weeks to get your cases all up top.

And then we're going to take one week, after these two are over, of highly specialized, concentrated, individual review and inspection of what you know on the subject of Scientology and Dianetics (you better know both, by the way) and just make absolutely sure on a highly personalized basis that you know exactly where you're going.

You know, there's one thing that a lot of auditors have never learned. Psychology is a speculative science. So is nuclear physics a speculative science. So is chemistry. But chemistry and nuclear physics are less a speculative science than psychology. Psychology has this enormous tradition of speculation.

The only reason I would ever stoop to the field of investigation at all is because there's a job to be done and we needed the processes.

Dianetics was never a speculative science. It did exactly what it said it was doing, and it had very specific Axioms. And a great many people in the field of Dianetics don't know that.

The Axioms are inside the cover of Book One. And when they are used, and very nicely applied and so forth, you can achieve some very, very astonishing results. It is a mental therapy. It's the field of the human mind.

Scientology is not the field of the human mind. Scientology is the overall science which also includes the human mind. See that? Dianetics is a mental therapy which specializes in the human mind. It even means *through mind*.

But if you will read page 401 of *Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health*, you will discover on that page Plan A, Plan B, and Plan C. And Plan C is Scientology. I invite you to look at that page, by the way. You'll be surprised because so much looks so random, and it's not very random. Page 401, *Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health* tells you all about Scientology. And Chapter 2 of *Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health* describes only one thing: A thetan exterior, stable. And that's a Clear, in Book One.

So, let's not feel that we have wandered too far afield. I learned early that people could not face no-havingness. People as individuals could not face no-havingness, which is to say, to be exteriorized.

You give most people the idea of being out there, a nothing in nothingness, and they

say, "Erk." You know? They just fight right off from it. They'll try to put God out there or they'll try to put something out there, but not themselves, certainly. Because it would mean too great a loss of havingness, wouldn't it?

We're trying to reach man. Well, man eats very readily from the vines of Dianetics because it simply says you've got a mind. You know, that's a somethingness. And it has engrams in it. Those are somethingnesses, aren't they? And it does this and it does that and it behaves in this fashion, all beautiful somethingnesses.

And if you can get a guy to run engrams, it'll pull havingness in on him. Makes him feel good – more somethingness. Get the idea? So, of course, it's a mental therapy.

Therefore, you have to be prepared as a Doctor of Scientology to adequately bridge this gap between the avidity of people for having something and the truth of the matter. And the truth of the matter is nothing. You can't make the world at large look at nothing. But they'll look at something, and they'll be happy to do so. So you see where we've been going?

Now, we look at Scientology as the overall science and modus operandi of life, and we don't care whether that life is a thetan running a robot on Planet 62 of Universe 81X, see; the principles of Scientology will work. The principles of Dianetics do not necessarily work. But they work here on earth amongst men. You see that?

So there's the essential difference between these two things. So, if you're going to study to be a D. Scn, you'll be expected to know the modus operandi of life itself in any planet, in any universe, in any life form and in any activity of life. Dianetics is the subject of how to make people better off and how to make them well. And it has certain very definite goals which are very acceptable to man. And Scientology, if you please, could vanish a universe. So, it's the overall science from which we could take all other sciences. The first science, by the way, 1932, was Scientology, and it was Scientology still in 1938 when it was first really named. And then it was Scientology some more in 1947. And then all of a sudden it became Dianetics.

Why did it become Dianetics? I had to write on the subject for the American Medical Association and the American Psychiatric Association, and I was foolish enough to write for them because I thought they could read.

And I wrote a little booklet which you can have a copy of, and which in your book kit you will find a copy of, which is *Scientology: A New Science*. Actually, when it was released generally and so forth, it was called *Abnormal Dianetics*. And that is the first copyright on the word *Dianetics*, all other arguments to the contrary.

It went through and became intensely popular. Well, why hadn't it become popular earlier? Well, in the first place, I was not talking very much. I was writing fiction and doing my researches, paid for by that fiction. I was not publishing to any great extent. But I had already learned that when I told people that life was a unit which created things, but which itself did not have any mass or existence (I hadn't stated it adequately at that time), they just sort of got awfully disinterested somehow or other, if not actually ill.

Now, where does that leave us? That leaves us with the necessity of having, not only a command of life itself, but what life is interested in. We must have a command of that. And if we're going to process men, then we have to be able to talk to men about their minds. We also have to be able to talk to men about their souls, since this again is a somethingness. Most people's idea of a soul is – I don't know, some kind of a ghost or a mass of something or other. There's been no comprehension of this.

So in this course we have to master this bridge, the reason for this bridge, and so on. And we have to know all of the rationale and reasons why, and demonstrate it. So this

third week we're simply going to take a good solid review of Dianetics, theory of; Scientology, theory of. You understand? I'm going to give you that myself, real heavy. But then we're going to get into the third week. Now, I have so arranged it that we may be able to get some preclears in here by simply staggering Advanced Clinical Course enrollments – may get some preclears for you. If we don't get them in that way, we'll get them in some other way.

But you have a project to carry out in those remaining three weeks which will teach you the rest of what you have to know, I am sure. And this project is called research auditing. Because I found out the very best auditors, and the very best auditing discipline there is, is research auditing. You simply use a process. And whatever happens, you go on using the process. And you notice what happens.

*The Auditor's Handbook* – not to be confused with *The Auditor's Manual*, which is a book of Dianetics – *The Auditor's Handbook* (Scientology, *The Auditor's Handbook with Intensive Procedure*) happens to be the mimeo copy. Well, the other copy is the printed copy. And it has over three times, if not four times or five times, as much material in it as the little mimeo edition. Now, I am sure you have the mimeo edition in your books that have been handed to you, or you will have.

The printed edition of this is your meat. This printed edition is quite important. It has sixty processes in it. And in the period of three weeks I will expect each one of you to test and know each one of these processes.

Now, that's all you've got to learn. I've given you an outline; I've tried to take it easy on you and not impress you too much or make you feel tired with it. I don't want to discourage you because the fact of the matter is that you can get discouraged enough about other things. But the most discouraged you will ever get is sitting over a preclear's red-hot brain and not getting any result. And that's the worse thing that could happen to any auditor.

Once an auditor recognizes that he has authority and control over the minds of his preclears and human beings, he doesn't even vaguely think in terms of restimulation or needing processing. That I guarantee. You see that?

If you know absolutely, by your own experience, that you can change the mental outlook of human beings, you're not going to worry about them restimulating you. The answer to this is under a process known as authority, pan-determinism, other such factors as that.

But an auditor only gets restimulated when he himself cannot get results. So, it's our job to demonstrate to you that you can get results.

But you, at some time or another, will find it absolutely necessary to take some preclear some HCA has had hung up on him – the preclear hung up, not because Opening Procedure of 8-C doesn't work, not because Opening Procedure by Duplication doesn't, work, not because these other processes don't work. It's hung up because he ran them in some peculiar fashion which didn't pay any attention to it. The fellow got divorce papers served on him that morning, and so the auditor audited the fellow at eleven o'clock that night. And the fellow said, "You know, I feel awfully sad, and I'm somewhat tired now. Can't we do something or other, and ..."

"No, no. We've got to go on with this session."

And "Well, you know, I had some bad luck today."

"Well, we're not going to pay any attention to that. Find a spot on that wall."

Well, you'll be called on to straighten this person out, and also to explain to this HCA why and what for, and the ins and outs of the business.

Now, I want to give you just a little rundown on what you're walking into. It's too late for you to leave. I mean, you're enrolled. You know, it is quite customary for somebody to say, "Well, if you don't like this – you're here on your self-determinism, and all that sort of thing – if you don't like this, why, it's volunteer, you know, and you can leave, and so forth." We don't do that around here. You're in; you're done.

So we just close the gates right at that point, because I'll expect each one of you to qualify to train in Dianetics or Scientology to any level. Expect each one of you to do that.

Expect you to be able to run, in another area than Phoenix, a mock-up similar to – be the workable form of – the mock-up which is now going forward with the Church of Scientology in Phoenix. Expect each one of you to be able to run, independently and all by yourself, such a mock-up.

It is quite a mock-up, by the way. It takes into consideration the fact that a fellow has to have money to eat in this society if he expects a body to keep running, that an organization itself has to carry forward along a very agreeable line in an area, that preclears have to be procured, and that HCAs have to be made in order to carry the progress into the society. You'll have to know something about the Church, in other words; you'll have to know something about this whole mock-up.

Well, this class will see this mock-up in operation, and will see it in the process of variation, and so forth, as we experiment with it to get it into its optimum state – you will see that happening.

I will expect you to be able to run one of these things.

Now, this is only going to require of you twenty-eight hours a day. And I think that's reasonable, isn't it? Perfectly reasonable. It's only going to require twenty-eight hours a day.

The first two weeks you've got to get down all your basic processes; you've got to review – and unfortunately, although in Advanced Clinical Courses we have long had the rule of no tapes, there happens to be, for this unit only, a new set of tapes in existence which have just been codified, and you will have to hear them, otherwise you're going to be adrift. Because you will be teaching from these tapes. So you'd better see how they are taught over a period of two months in two weeks. See that? So you'll have to give a listen at these tapes. That's unfortunate, but that merely applies to this unit.

All right. The main stress with you right now is nothing but this: It is simply to take up, rapid-fire, six days a week, for these two weeks, the material necessary to bring you completely up to date on the basic processes in the field of HCA, and iron out any possible quirk or misunderstanding you have of these; review at the same time all of the basic theory of Scientology. And the third week – you haven't got to worry about that now, have you? – I'm going to give you a basic review of all this and straighten you out individually.

I won't see an awful lot of this unit until we enter that third week, and then I'm going to see an awful lot of this unit. And then for the remaining three weeks, as I said, we are simply going to go right down the list and learn all there is to know about sixty processes. That's a lot of processes, isn't it? But you've already learned a lot of those already. You know a great deal about it.

We're going to do some research auditing, because you are going to codify an evaluation of these processes as to which ones you consider work best. And we will print that in *The Journal* as a codification by this class as to which were the most workable processes in this rack-up. That means an awful lot of hours of auditing, doesn't it? Terrible.

Well, I really feel for you. And I am sure that there will be very few surviving this particular sprint, because it's utterly impossible for anybody to assimilate and know by heart, fifty Axioms in three weeks. It's utterly impossible for *anything* like that to occur, but it's going to occur. And now that we have all agreed that it's going to occur, I wish to thank you very much for coming over here this afternoon.

# BASIC ELEMENTS OF PROCESSING

*A lecture given on  
5 October 1954*

I want to give you here the basic organization of any course.

By this I mean that in Scientology or Dianetics, I don't care which subject, there is a basic course from which we take off. And until we have that basic course in very, very, very good shape – I'm not now saying that the basic course is now a professional course. This is actually the HCA-level information which has to be known, and thoroughly. And unless we have this particular set of basics thoroughly known, we just go on drifting and floundering and stumbling around from there on out.

Now, I can tell you this, that I'm talking from experience on this particular line in training auditors. Heretofore, there weren't processes which could be easily done, precisely stated, and which got good results that we could do this with. So you see, the advance of the subject itself took care of the training.

Now, there are certain very, very definite basic things that we have to have, that we must know, that we must know very, very thoroughly, and that somehow or another we must accomplish before we can go on into anything like theory. And therefore, these first days of this course we're going to stress these things very heavily. I'm going to expect each one of you to become very expert in these things.

Now, the items which an auditor must know if he's going to get anything done in any preclear anywhere – which he must know today – are only seven in number. There are only seven of them.

And they're in this order, by the way-the order is quite important. Number one is a two-way communication. He has to know two-way communication. He has to have the basic idea about it, the basic material behind it. More important than that, he has to understand two-way communication and how it fits in an auditing session. If he doesn't understand two-way communication, believe me, he's never going to be able to audit.

Now, right under two-way communication comes comm lag. When you study two-way communication, you study comm lag also. These two subjects are inextricable, and as they exist, so you audit.

Now, if you just knew this, if you just knew two-way communication and comm lag and you didn't know anything else, you would still make some progress with cases. But more important, you would be able to understand every preclear you confronted; you'd be able to understand what they were all about. It would be on this adjudication: on a two-way communication basis, and the comm lag which they demonstrated. And you could – as you walked down the street, as you looked at people around, as you tried to live with people and so forth – you would understand what they were all about. See that?

If we understood this and nothing else but this, we could look at a group of people

and we could know who in that ... Let's just apply it on a beautifully broad business basis: We could look at this group of people and we would know who in that organization was gumming the wheels of that organization. If we just knew this: two-way communication and comm lag. If we knew nothing else but this, we could walk into an organization and we would appear to a business executive to be an absolute magician.

We could talk with this one and that one, and circulate amongst the groups and ask a few questions, and the next thing you know, you could say, "Well, your business volume would increase in your sales department if you would fire Jones, Smith and Spiegel; and if you would put Mr. Dameron in charge of sales."

"No! How did you know this? Jones, Smith and Spiegel have the most horrible sales record; they have lost more equipment and lost more orders. How did you know this?"

Now, here then is a terribly important subject all by itself. So this one we just have to have nailed down, I mean, with spikes, as an auditor. He's got to know this. He knows that a communication lag is what it is, and it operates as it operates.

There are two ways that communication lags can operate, and one is an outflow and the other is by no response. A communication lag is the length of time between the question and the exact answer to that question; see, that's the lag. Now, it doesn't matter what happens in between; it's all lag. Whether the fellow is talking like mad, raving, screaming, crying or is silent, see, the lag between the question and the answer – whatever happens in between – is the communication lag of the person.

And some of the worst cases you're ever going to process are people who evidently have no communication lag. Well, they talk all the time, don't they? And yet they never answer the question that you ask them. And you walk around though life, and you'll find people do this. They don't answer the question you ask them.

Once in a while somebody does this for a gag – he teases people. On a line, they ask him some question. He believes this is kind of a foolish question, so he gives them some razzle-dazzle. This comes under the heading of a sense of humor, not a communication lag.

But in the normal course of human existence, you'll find out that the communication lag is the easiest index by which to recognize people. But more important, if you don't flatten a communication lag, or if you don't flatten the lag on a process that you start to audit on a preclear, your preclear isn't going to recover – he's just going to bog, bog, bog, bog – until *you've* dropped him in innumerable communication lags, and never got your *question* answered. You always want to get your question answered. That is the subject of communication lag.

A lot more to this, particularly there in practice; it's a terrifically important subject. But here we have it as number one – not because it's the most important subject – because it's the first thing we have to know. All right.

Let's get the second one number two of this list of seven things. Number two is Elementary Straightwire. The most elementary Straightwire there is, is "Something you wouldn't mind remembering; something you wouldn't mind forgetting." That's the most elementary there is.

But the idea of sitting down and asking somebody questions, of course, brings up the idea of a two-way communication. So you have to know about two-way communication before you know about Elementary Straightwire.

You're asking somebody to research his past, and if you don't know about communication lag, and if you don't use communication lag in researching his past, if you don't keep asking the question until the lag is flat – you know, "Something you wouldn't



mind remembering. Something you wouldn't mind remembering. Something you wouldn't mind remembering." You keep getting the answer to this, no matter what distances there are between the answer, and you'll find out at first it takes him ten seconds to answer, then five seconds, then fifteen seconds, then three minutes, then two seconds, then forty-five minutes, you know, on one of these questions.

Well, you don't change the question as long as you've got a communication lag. As soon as you've got a nice flat lag and he's answering it at a routinely regular spacing, and so forth, you leave it alone. You go on to the other question – "Something you wouldn't mind forgetting" – and you ask him this.

It's not uncommon with this Straightwire question to run head on into a communication lag of an hour or two. In fact, I've run into one – we have one on record – of twelve hours on "Something you wouldn't mind forgetting." But it was communication lag.

We didn't go off to some other subjects, you see, or some other process simply because this was boiling this long. As an auditor, the person was foolish enough to ask this question of the preclear, see – just foolish enough to ask this question of the preclear. So the second he asked it, the auditor was stuck with it. He had to get that question answered. And day after day he was still expecting an answer to that question – mostly because he had an Instructor riding the back of his neck, making sure that he carried that communication lag through. And when the preclear finally answered that question, he heaved the most enormous sigh of relief you ever saw heaved. Oh, it was tremendous, see. The fellow had been obsessively remembering everything his whole life, and this was really what was wrong with him – obsessive memory. "Something you wouldn't mind forgetting" – there *was* no such thing. Well, here was a question of communication lag and two-way communication. That's Elementary Straightwire.

Why do we have to know Elementary Straightwire and why is it such a big subject? Elementary Straightwire is *a big* subject. It's because if you know Elementary Straightwire – the general form of Elementary Straightwire – a thousand codified processes fall into place. But if the auditor has not crossed this one bridge right away, if he doesn't know how to administer Straightwire, he'll fail with these processes. He'll fail with every darned one of them.

It just won't matter. It won't matter at all how clever the process is, how clever the auditor is, what tremendous insight he has into the length of the ingrown toenails of the preclear. If he does not know how to administer – you see, the mechanics of *administering* Straightwire – if he doesn't know this perfectly (and of course, then, if he doesn't know two-way communication perfectly), and if he isn't at ease in administering Straightwire, then the brilliance of these processes mean nothing. And in that alone is the failure of an auditor, and was the failure of any auditor who did fail on a case in all of Dianetics.

A good auditor can simply administer ... This is also included in Elementary Straightwire, which is called ARC Straightwire. Well, "Recall something that's really real to you" is the first of it; it's in the back of *Self Analysis*. You know that they've had that tool since 1950? And if you just went on using that – you just went on using it – people get well.

In fact, a psychotic will break through to neurotic, or a neurotic will break out into sane on just that Straightwire. But these boys did not know how to administer Elementary Straightwire, and their failure to administer it properly caused the process to fail!

See, it's all very well to have this list of questions and ask them, but believe me, that's

not Straightwire. Straightwire is an art. Because you've got to hold that preclear in two-way communication with you, you've got to measure that communication lag and you've got to flatten that communication lag with every question you ask; you don't go onto the next question. You get a flat lag, completely flat, so that you get an even spacing of reply from a preclear, and when you've got that, you're all set. That person will feel much more at ease.

Elementary Straightwire even remedies havingness. It's a very interesting process. I had a test auditor, by the way, audit "Something you wouldn't mind remembering; something you wouldn't mind forgetting" on a preclear until the guy was Clear. He was a rough case. He was a Black Five. Took him eighty-three hours. The fellow finally realized that he could remember everything back to his entrance in the MEST universe. So what? You do much Elementary Straightwire and the fellow starts to fall through into earlier lives anyhow. You can't help but stir up material.

It's all right for the society at large to agree that we only live once, but then they didn't have a process that they had to make work. The second you try to make a process work, the fellow falls through this flimsy agreement that we only live once and starts going off in other directions to a conclusion that he is immortal – God help him! All right.

Now if we have those two things down, we have then developed the poise – that's part of Straightwire and part of two-way communication – an ability to keep a preclear in communication with us. There's all kinds of ways to keep a person in communication with you, you know. There's a present time problem; there's all kinds of ways. Keep up that two-way communication, keep that preclear fairly well at ease, keep him from getting upset unduly in the session because of the immediate environment, know how to flatten his communication lags. There is auditing poise right in there. There is the aplomb of the auditor.

Of course, a lot of the aplomb of the auditor is developed by the fact that he gets cocky after a while if he's really good and well-trained. If he's really good he gets cocky; he looks at people, he knows he could do things for them or to them, and then he stops worrying about them. So his poise around people is rather tremendous. He even sometimes gets a little haughty. But that doesn't matter a bit. If he can handle them, why, they know it too.

But there is a mechanic in handling people and that's this Straightwire problem.

Now, number three is Opening Procedure of 8-C. Why do we call it by this horrible title? It has a shorter title: R2-16 is the name of this. You won't find people calling it, however, by R2-16; you'll find them calling it Opening Procedure 8-C.

Well, it is the basic material – the basic material – in the whole process, Standard Operating Procedure 8-C. It is the Opening Procedure *of* 8-C. So when they say Opening Procedure 8-C, they mean Opening Procedure *of* 8-C.

And it's a very complicated thing. It's a *very* complicated thing. Now, it looks so simple, mostly because its execution depends upon a thorough knowledge of a two-way communication and Elementary Straightwire. And if you know those things, you can do 8-C; but if you don't know those things, you're not going to be able to do 8-C. If you know those two things, 8-C is a very simple process. If you don't know two-way communication and Elementary Straightwire, it becomes a very complex process and the darnedest things happen.

Its basic operation is simply to ask the preclear to walk over in his physical body and touch a wall. Now, in Dianetics, we used to say to them "Come up to present time. Come up to present time. Come up. ..." Remember? You can walk through a sanitarium and

simply tell people, one after the other, "Come up to present time," and you'll get a few impossible cases to suddenly turn completely, impossibly sane – just by telling people, one after the other, "Come up to present time."

Yeah, but what's "present time"? This stuff: walls, spaces, objects, forms. This is present time. There's a little more to this – a little more to this. A bunch of sneaky stuff underlies a lot of this stuff. 8-C has tremendous workability because it tells somebody to come up to present time.

Next, it has tremendous workability because to the thetan nothing really operates as an adequate defense. A thetan can go through walls, ceilings and floors. He can sail straight through a planet and come out on the other side. He does not have mass. Furthermore, his perception can be very, very weird. He can make his perception almost anything he wants to make it; he has highly fluid perception. That's because he actually, in good shape, doesn't need defenses.

Now, seeing is actually stopping your sight. You have to stop your sight on that wall to see that wall; so seeing is stopping. If a thetan saw perfectly, he would be completely stopped, wouldn't he? So let's not worry about how well a thetan sees or doesn't see. He can see outside; don't worry about this. But he can also see at will and at choice on various wave bands, all depending on what he's willing to stop.

Well, that's the thetan. How about the body?

The body is the stuff that sees this stuff clearly. The body is what wants this stuff. Why? Because the body needs a defense and if it can have defenses, it's happy; and if it can't have defenses, it can't.

There is a state known as paranoia which, we learned in Dianetics a long time ago, was simply a phrase-type thing; "They're all against me," you know. But actually, paranoia is no – defenses. That is basically what it is; it's no defenses at all. And if you think this is peculiar or that there is one kind of insanity known as paranoia and another of that kind of insanity known as of and another kind of insanity known as "psychiatric," you are very, very much mistaken. It happens to be a gradient scale of how closed in your boy is; that's about it. And what effort he is making to get out, and that's about it. So he goes clear back into the past to try to get out that way – crawl out the bottom, so to speak.

And he'll go into the future too. Don't think that people aren't stuck in the future. I ran across a guy one time who was almost going mad – he was three hours in the future, always. Stuck! He would know all the dialogue of a movie before he saw it run off. It was worrying him. They had given him some electric shocks for it too, and hadn't helped a bit.

Now all of these conditions of "stuck in the past" "stuck in the future" and "no defenses" (for the body) that one, very interestingly – are remedied in Opening Procedure 8-C so it becomes a tremendously powerful process.

Opening procedure 8-C. How is it done? You ask him to go over and feel walls and make various postulates about it. You just ask him to walk around and touch walls and hold on to them and let go of them and pick out spots and touch them.

Why this "touch them"? You know, people think in group processing they are running 8-C if they ask somebody to spot some spots on the front wall. They're not; that's not 8-C. It is a sort of a group procedure, which comes out of 8-C, but it's not 8-C. 8-C is walking your preclear around – that's the first thing it is – and having him touch things. And those two things qualify it, and these teach him that he has defenses – his body has defenses.

As a thetan, you see ... He's maybe educated in the field of "all is illusion," which is simply saying "You haven't got any defenses at all, fellow. Ha-ha. It's all illusion. Those walls are thin, they won't stop anything. Ha! Of course, we're good, benign people; we're

thinking the right thoughts. But we don't tell you that the right thoughts are the thoughts necessary to make you completely crazy and blow your brains out.

And that sort of lineup – as well as many types of mysticism – convince people that it's all illusion. Sure, that's right. It's perfectly true; it's all illusion. Fortunately it's illusion to people firing guns too, and the gun is also an illusion and so is the bullet, but fortunately the bullet knows it's real – the bullet knows armor plate is real. They don't tell you that, you see. It doesn't matter if it's all illusion, bullets still get stopped by walls.

If you were a thousand miles away from the cops who were after you, you're not going to get caught – space. If you're ten years after the debt, statute of limitations have kept you from being a debtor. You get the idea?

There *are* defenses, see. It's all an illusion to the thetan, but, boy, is it real to a body! And if it's not real to a body, the body then has no defenses.

So, here's this body, able to be shot, with the illusion of walls around which won't stop bullets. And we get this weird idea, you see, on the part of a person: as a thetan it's all thin and he can go through it; so therefore everything is thin and can go through everything; so therefore a body, you see, therefore is completely naked to the winds of the world. Only this isn't true.

Well, a fellow goes around, you see, and as the body he finds out the walls are solid. He says, "Look, they stop bullets." "Look, this is present time." See, he's saying all kinds of things.

This is one of the most involved and complicated processes that ever went on and yet it is very simply done. But if an auditor doesn't know all the things it's doing, why, he'll probably cheer the fellow u in the wrong fort.

The fellow says "You know I can look straight through that wall now with my physical eyes." And the auditor says, "Ah, well, I'm doing. all god job." Like hell he is! This fellow's body has to be reassured that walls are solid, that you can walk on earth and not fall through, that distance is adequate protection and that a length in time is adequate protection, because body is a very difficult thing to protect. "No defenses" is the motto of any preclear you'll ever process.

So we get to the next one. Four: Opening Procedure by Duplication. Duplication is the primary thing in communication. Cause-distance-effect with a duplication at effect of anything that emanates at cause, and you have a communication.

Now, we could go into this a long way. We'd explain how the telegram leaves New York and it says, "I love you," and it arrives in San Francisco and says, "I loathe you." And this would not be good, would it?

Well, the body's effort to get forward in time and so get protected, using time as a barrier and defense, brings it to the conclusion that "things mustn't happen again, they mustn't happen again, they mustn't happen again, they mustn't happen again." In other words, "no duplication, no duplication, no duplication," and the fellow goes further and further and further out of communication. And this is the anatomy of communication – duplication is. All right.

And Opening Procedure by Duplication is simply making him do the same thing over and over and over and over in the most duplicative manner possible: Book A, Book B, Book A, Book B. And the whole essence of it is to make that boy duplicate.

And a case that's bad off, if just started on this all by itself, would practically die in his tracks. It is a terrible process on somebody who has not had enough Opening Procedure 8-C.

He is not yet convinced, you see, that there are defenses. And you ask him to start

duplicating, and you're telling him all the time "Hey, look, things can communicate to you; things can communicate to you."

"Oh, no, they mustn't." Germs, disease, bullets, blasts, bombs, government-income-tax forms – they can communicate, they can communicate. He doesn't want anything to communicate. If there are no defenses, then the answer of course is "nothing must communicate," which is what he is dramatizing.

And the oddest thing is that this Opening Procedure by Duplication step one of "Dirty 30" – is so damned, *is so furiously* screamed at by every goof and nut and squirrel that runs across it, that you would think they had been personally wounded in the abdomen with a double-barreled shotgun. That's how hot the process is; you simply *describe* it to somebody who is "they mustn't communicate; they mustn't communicate" you know, and these people go "*Nyaaaaaaa!*" and practically spin in on you. Well, you have to know that about that process too. You bring a person out of that state with Opening Procedure of 8-C.

The odd part of the process is, there are many, many people in the London clinic, for instance, who had hung up. There are many people that auditors had processed for a long time who had hung up in processing. Auditors got them again, they ran some Opening Procedure of 8-C and then they ran some Opening Procedure of Duplication on them, and what do you know, their bodies became alive and they came right on out of it and they improved and they squared around and that's that.

Of course, they feel very hypnotic when they first start running this. If you only run it for a half an hour on somebody, he's liable to get almost completely hypnotized. But are you hypnotizing him? No, you're not. All you're doing is running out hypnotism. And if you just do it a little longer, you'll run out the rest of the hypnotism, you see. So people get the idea it's a hypnotic technique and all sorts of things.

Well, we don't care what idea they get, we merely care that it's the workability, it's the basic anatomy, of communication.

This is a terrific process. It is very, *very* hard on an auditor who himself has not had it run on him, but it is therapeutic even then. The idea of giving that command over and over and over and watching that guy do the same thing over and over and over and over – an auditor who hasn't had enough 8-C run on him just absolutely gets utterly groggy; he just almost goes mad at doing this.

And that's why auditors can't flatten communication lags. See, they ask this question – you just watch an auditor who's real poor, case in bum shape badly trained; you watch this boy work, and this is the way he'll work: preclear changes, the auditor promptly changes. That's the first thing he does. He asks a question, "Something you wouldn't mind remembering."

"Well, *er-ah-um-ummm-mm* ... What was the question again? *Ah-umm-mmnmz-mhrnm-mmmmm-mmmmm*. I don't know. I don't know. I'm having difficulty with that."

Well, the auditor will say, "Well, then something you wouldn't mind forgetting." Nothing wrong with the auditor, is there? He just can't stand to duplicate, that's all. That's the first thing wrong with him. You'd say it's he can't stand to wait that long. No, that really isn't what's wrong with him; he just can't stand to duplicate, because the preclear could answer that question immediately, you know, with no communication lag, and the auditor would still change it to the other question. The auditor can't duplicate.

An auditor has to be in good enough shape so that he can sit there and say, "Give me something else your mother wouldn't mind remembering. Give me something else your mother wouldn't mind remembering. And something else your mother wouldn't mind

remembering. Give me something else your mother wouldn't mind remembering. Something else your mother wouldn't mind remembering. Something else your mother wouldn't mind remembering. Something else your..." for five or six hours without a single break.

You say, this guy – you must get an auditor into a state then where he's completely insensible. No, it's only when an auditor is very sensitive and alert to his entire environment that he's actually well enough off to do duplication. So this is a very important thing, this Opening Procedure by Duplication, isn't it?

Now, we have item five. And item five is a companion to item six, but you can't do item six without knowing how to do item five. And item five is Remedy of Havingness, and you can't spot spots in space with a preclear on any but one process, R2-60 – that I know of – without ruining the preclear, unless you remedy his havingness.

In other words, he starts to spot spots – go through this process of spotting spots, looking out there and finding a spot ... And by the way, I don't mean putting his finger on it. You have him *look* out there, you see, and spot a spot; then look someplace else and spot a spot; then spot a spot in the middle of the room.

You have him do that very long, and any person who is having any difficulty at all will start to get sick at his stomach. Sometimes it takes an hour to get them to a point of where they get sick at their stomach. Sometimes you could run them maybe fifteen minutes without getting them sick to their stomach. But a case that's real bad off, you will just suggest that *they* nauseated look at a spot in space in the middle of the room and they will promptly feel nauseated.

In other words, their havingness is so slight that spotting spots blows it up, throws it away. Looking at a spot in space is as bad as taking his hat or his wallet. Get the idea? The second you have him spot spots in space, he is immediately robbed of some havingness, because all havingness is, is condensed space. And so you start to have him look at spots in space and he's uncondensing his havingness, isn't he? And of course he loses.

Well, he's lost too much in life and that's the reason ... In the first place, he believed he had to have something, you see – that's the first thing that's wrong with him. And then he lost too much of that, so he feels he can't get along without remedying havingness.

By the way, it's the body that gets sick. Well, remedying havingness can be done in many ways, but the most elementary way to do it is have him mock up something. Even if it's an idea or an invisibility or a piece of blackness, it doesn't matter what you have, he can always mock up something. He can always get some kind of an idea of this, and have him pull it in on his body. Mock up something and pull it in on his body.

[Please note: At this point in the lecture a gap exists in the original master recording. We now return to the class where the recording resumed.]

Okay. Now, we've brought you up here and we're still talking about the Remedy of Havingness. The most elementary form of the Remedy of Havingness, of course, is what it is, which is "Pull in any kind of a mock-up."

Now, the whole subject of havingness is a big subject. Oh, this is real, real, real big stuff! Actually, the whole subject of havingness is the subject of engrams, and there is a Loss-Substitute Scale which would stagger you – in I think it's R2-59 [R2-58]. The fellow loses the object, he substitutes "object, others." "Object, others" tend to disappear, and he'll substitute a mock-up.

You get somebody low on havingness and you run too many engrams out of him, and you ... You get somebody real low on havingness, and you try to run one lock out of him and, oh, he's got to pull in about five or six more locks to remedy that havingness. This fellow isn't creating energy anymore. He's taking already-created energy and he's pulling it in on himself. And so you'll run preclears who just have the darnedest appetite for electronic engrams. They will pull in some of the darnedest things you ever heard of, and in they'll come – swish-swish-swish-swish-swish.

And every time you try to erase something, they'll eat that energy up – that's the only reason they want to erase it in such cases – and they want to eat that energy. And then they'll – in will pop some more engrams, and you'll just stack, stack, stack, stack, stack. And after a while, you'll wonder what's wrong with this guy. Well, the trouble is he's reduced his havingness.

And if you simply sat him down and remedied havingness – properly – why, you would have a case that wasn't doing this with engrams. Ah-ha, Remedy of Havingness solves engrams. How very important.

Now, actually, the whole operation of remedying havingness – although that's its most elementary form, and that one you are expected to know, right on up to pulling in eight anchor points on a thetan, you know ... You should know more than this. A fellow ought to be able to throw things away.

The only thing really wrong with a psychotic is he can't throw anything away, you see; his havingness is reduced.

Now, every time a thetan wants to acquire something, he degrades himself slightly. This makes a little vacuum, so in it comes, and pretty soon he's a negative vacuum. You get the idea? All the space he was occupying is full, and so he becomes a body. Now, there's much more to this; there's other types of manifestations. But if you just pulled in things on him, he would feel much better.

Now, actually, at this level of training, we have to know how to pull something in and throw something away. – which tells us that we have to know also Expanded GITA, Standard Operating Procedure 8. As old as that. We have to know Expanded GITA, because you find many of these people can't *have*. So they have to waste, waste, waste, waste, waste some object until they can have it. They have to waste it so they can have it.

Now, that's real weird, isn't it? They have to waste it. And then sometimes, after you have made them waste it, you'll have to have them stack up eighty blocks, eighty square blocks of warehouses full of it, before they can pull in one of it.

Well, you needn't get so specific as Expanded GITA. The only trouble with Expanded GITA: It was too specific. It added too many significances.

*"Any* havingness is better than *no* havingness. That is the motto of a thetan. Any havingness is better than no havingness when he gets into this state.

So the basics of Remedy of Havingness that you are expected to know is the various ways and means that you would go about having somebody mock up something and pull it in. And if he couldn't do that at all, to waste some energy or objects and then mock some more up over alongside of him until he could pull some in.

So you'd have to know, really, how to get down there and make that guy actually remedy some havingness. See, that's a little art itself. It's very simple, it's just as simple as I have stated.

If he can't mock something up and pull it in easily ... Anything, you know – you don't care what it is. Now, the mass is the thing. The specific *identity* of the mass is relatively unimportant; the mass is the thing. You have him waste it and waste it and waste it, and

then see if he can accept one. And then after you have him accept it and accept it and accept it, he'll be able to get up to a point where he can accept it or throw it away, and that's the state you want him in.

The only quirk in that is you have him stack a lot of extras over here before he pulls one in. But you, actually – if you have to do that – haven't really wasted enough.

So it's a simple subject, the remedy of havingness, but it is done very exactly.

You have the fellow mock up something and pull it in. And if he can't do that you have him waste it and waste it and waste it and then mock up one and pull it in, and then waste it and waste it and waste it and waste it and waste it, and then finally pull one in.

Well, you'll find some people are obsessive on this so that they will mock up something and in it comes and *bing! bing!* Well, you'll start such a thing as an avalanche, and you can have planets, suns moons and stars. We've had an avalanche running on a preclear for as long as three days. That's perfectly all right. Let it run. It'll blow engrams – boom! *boom! boom!* This is the easiest way in the world to blow engrams. Solve the problem of energy masses you solve the problem of the engram.

Now, this fellow may be hepped on havingness to such a point that he has to have before he can do, and all that; but space is quite important. A thetan who doesn't have space won't exteriorize. He hasn't got any space to exteriorize into. He won't exteriorize because there'll be no place to go. And these fellows who have this idea there's no place to go, and they sit home all the time, just haven't any space, that's all. And they won't exteriorize either.

All right. So we have to spot spots in space and that comes up as the sixth one that we have to know: the proper way of spotting spots in space. Now, actually, the way you do this is you spot spots in space and remedy havingness, and spot spots in space and remedy havingness, and spot spots in space and remedy havingness. If you don't do one against the other, sooner or later your preclear is going to bog.

You might be able to spot spots in space for an hour without caving him in, and you may not notice it and he may not notice it, but all of a sudden he's having a lot of difficulty spotting spots in space.

A huge black mass has now appeared all around him at a distance of four feet that was never there before. And you say, "Well, the thing to do is just to spot some more spots in space." And now it's three feet. And so he spots some more spots in space, and now it's two feet from him.

And he's saying, "Oh! Oh! Wait a minute. I – I ... You know, I ..."

You say, "What distance do you actually think Chicago is now? What distance is Chicago?"

"Oh, I think it's *ssh-shu*" – *computational*, see, "Oh, it's two thousand miles."

"Point two thousand miles worth."

"Well, as a matter of fact, Chicago is right here, sitting in front of my right eye, see."

Here he is with everything caved in on him, and Chicago is there too. He's gotten a terminal collapse. See, he's one terminal, Chicago is another terminal, and he's got *them – bong!*

Well, there is another way to go about this same process, is: "What wouldn't you mind occupying the same space as you're occupying?" That's the basic thing of a universe. A universe cannot be built that has space and energy in it, unless you must first assume that two things cannot occupy the same space.

And then, if you were to study Alfred Lord Korzybski for any length of time, he would convince you that two things couldn't occupy the same space, and by convincing



you, would make this universe one of the most solid traps anybody ever got into. All you've got to do is get the impossibility of two things occupying the same space and you're going to have a universe of one kind or another, see.

So, "What wouldn't you mind occupying the same space with you?" comes right along with five and six, which is Remedy of Havingness and Spotting Spots in Space. And that is a killer; that is really a killer as a process. It's a murderous process, because it's directly in the teeth of a general semanticist. You'll get into an argument...

By the way, before you got to this with a general semanticist, you will have gotten into an argument already on whether you meant "fear" or whether – did you really mean "remember." "Now, let's see, by 'remember' you meant ... Ah, let's see now. Remember . . ." Because they know very well that nobody knows what anybody else says, you know – that words all mean different things to different people. That's the premise on which they go. That is taught in the American universities today, so expect it to be found in any educated preclear that you run into – just that one little foible that people really don't know what other people are saying because words have different values to each of us.

And when you say "coffee," well, "coffee" is one thing to somebody and it's something else to someone ... Apathy, apathy, apathy! "Can't communicate," that's all they are dramatizing.

Actually, coffee is coffee. And if you have a lot of associated ideas to the subject of coffee – if you're bad enough off so that all your ideas are in association with all of your ideas (see First Book, A=A=A=A); everything is identified – why, then, of course, "coffee" is liable to mean "horse" to you.

But if you can communicate even vaguely, you know what you're talking about and you know what he is talking about when you say "coffee." You also know what he's talking about when he said it was "real bright red." See? Actually, you couldn't express it as a painting formula without the most fantastic color denominations – you know? – all kinds of codifications, so forth, to say exactly what red this was, its *spectrometer* reading, and so forth. But you say, "It was very bright red." And the other fellow says, "You know, it was very bright red." Well, that's good enough, you see, and that's a communication.

Look-a-here, that remark in the field of the general semanticist tells you that we can't duplicate. See, nobody knows what everybody else is saying because when somebody says "coffee" then that means something else to somebody *else* – in other words, can't duplicate, can't communicate. And we're back to Opening Procedure by Duplication.

But it just so happens that a universe will only hang apart – not hang *together*; universes have to hang apart – as long as you do not believe that two things occupy the same space or that this is possible.

You, say, take a physicist, and he's batty on the subject of "conservation of energy" and "two things can't occupy the same space." See, these are the two batty things in physics; they're very batty, too. And they account for the physiognomies of the people you saw in *Look* magazine many issues ago; many, many issues ago on the articles of the nuclear physicists of America.

And I found out I was out of communication with these people when I was studying nuclear physics, so I went and browsed around and gnawed on a few books on some other subjects. These people believed utterly that you could not create energy. Their motto is "It's all been done before, it's all been done before." Tell them a story plot – "Oh, well, that's been done before. There's really nothing new in this universe anyplace." Well, that's just a dramatization on the thought level of the "conservation of energy."

So if you can't create energy, what must their havingness be? And if two things can't

occupy the same space, what must their havingness be? They would get so desperate that the only thing they could think of is "Let's blow it all up. Let's waste everything." They'd have to waste the whole universe, wouldn't they?

And you'll find out that Waste and Remedy of Havingness – the state of the person's Remedy of Havingness, he is dramatizing on his immediate environment. If he'd have to waste a lot before he could have, you'll find him chewing up his car. You will find him inventing atom bombs. You'll find him doing all kinds of things – you know, appropriating money to the "I Will Arise Burial Society" at Fort Knox – doing anything. The U.S. government can't have gold, obviously, because they've got it all buried. That isn't their gold; it doesn't belong to them at all. They just say it does, and they got more bayonets than anybody else. So they're going to waste that gold. Fantastic, isn't it?

By the way, a good auditor can do this trick – knowing Expanded GITA and knowing Remedy of Havingness and knowing how much space the fellow could have by how much he could spot in space: He could actually watch a fellow working and know exactly what the man was wasting. He'd know what the man couldn't have, then. Watch a fellow working, look at his possessions, and he would know immediately what the fellow couldn't have, because with all the things he couldn't have would be the things he couldn't do, you see. The "do" scale comes right in there.

We see somebody looking through a card file, and he's looking through this card file endlessly. And he goes and he looks through it endlessly again, and he's looking for "Jones, R.G." And you go over and you look in the card file and it's right there – right there – right after "Isaacs"; immediately after "Isaacs" is "Jones." And you say "Well, there it is."

And he says, "Well, I'll be darned. I've been over it a dozen times."

He's just trying to waste names. Now, if you talked to him, you'd find out that he didn't have many friends, or if he did have, he kind of gave them a kick in the teeth. And also this peculiar thing would take place: you'd find out that he occasionally had moments when he couldn't remember his own name. You know, somebody asked him suddenly, "What is your name?" He'd say, "Uh ... uh ... uh ... uh ... uh ... uh ..." He'd run a comm lag.

And that's all a comm lag is. It's all into the subject of havingness, see. If a fellow has to waste it first, he'll comm lag on it, and that's with Remedy of Havingness, and so forth, on a thought level. This is very elementary, the way it ties all together.

Now, he can have space to the degree that he believes he can have things. See, if he can have lots of havingness, then he can have space too.

The truth of the matter is, though, that space cuts down knowingness and so does havingness. The motto of all MEST is "stupidity." The floor, the ceiling – these things are stupid; they don't know. If they were to know anything it would be because you pushed them into a form which they could then telegraph as a form.

Look at a cannon sometime. It knows it's a cannon. That's all it knows; that's all it tells you. "I'm a cannon," see. Look at Mr. Smythe of General Motors – he knows he is Mr. Smythe. And by golly, he'll act remarkably like a piece of MEST. You see this?

When a fellow can only be one identity, he's really drifting down toward a piece of MEST, see. The whole subject of identity is wrapped up, then, in havingness. A cannon can have no other form than a cannon, unless *you* come along and melt it up and make an iron deer out of it – see, and then it's an iron deer. But it got the identity from somebody else.

Well, get this custom of naming babies. The Indians were a little higher toned when they let the baby choose his own name, huh?

All right. A man is as fixed as he has an identity – all this under Remedy of Havingness.

So in these two categories we do a lot of work. But how in the world could an auditor work with these people if he didn't have (1) a two-way communication; (2) a good command of Elementary Straightwire; (3) if he couldn't do Opening Procedure of 8-C; (4) if he couldn't do Opening Procedure by Duplication. I mean, if he didn't know these things it would do him no good at all to know about havingness, Remedy of Havingness, as far as a preclear is concerned. He could go around and give lectures on it or talk about it or argue about, it or write some other version of it. He could do all kinds of things like this, but as far as sitting down and running it on a preclear so as to produce a benefit in that case, he wouldn't be able to do it because the first four steps leading up to it would be missing.

All right. There are some other things which are absolutely essential but these are part of the others. Here we have Elementary Straightwire – at the same time we have to teach the Auditor's Code, don't we? And if we're teaching the Auditor's Code we should also mention the two other codes of Scientology.

And as far as Opening Procedure of 8-C is concerned, we would have to teach something about orders and commands and authority or pan-determinism. We would have to teach something about pan-determinism. Pan-determinism – you have to be willing to determine more than the course of your own body in order to determine anything. If you can't determine more than the course of your own body, you can't determine the sanity of a preclear, can you?

In all past "ologies" men studied the mind, and in that, all by itself, lay the reason for their complete failure. And it was a complete failure, I'm sorry to say. Twenty-two percent got well, but then the 22 percent would have gotten well if somebody had given them a new dress or a birthday cake. Do you see that? I mean, the obvious people that would recover anyhow, recovered. And the real reason was they stood back and studied the mind.

And we run immediately into the reason why Dianetics is Dianetics and psychology is psychology. Psychology is the *study of* "Let's observe. Let's observe. Let's observe. Let's be spectators. Let's go to the fights and watch the wrestling. Let's go to the football game and sit in the stands" (That would be high level.) "Let's observe. Let's observe. Let's not act. Let's not do. Let's not be. Let's not control anything else but us. And everything else we will make automatic." And it will all become automatic.

In Dianetics we have a precision science of a certain number of common denominators to existence; in Scientology we have a precision study of life, and a certain number of phenomena have been demonstrated, and these phenomena are workable in the broad application of life, and it's not a speculation.

And psychology is a speculation. And psychology doesn't have any axioms of any kind; it's just "Let's all get together and speculate." And they've speculated now since almost the middle of the nineteenth century. And we're one hundred years, almost, after the origin of psychology, and they have yet to hit upon a principle on which all psychologists will agree, except one, and that is "We all ought to study." They've got that in common.

Well, therefore, you're not there to study this preclear, and this is the central difference between what you're doing and what's been done before. You're not there to study what this preclear is doing. You're there to determine the future course of his existence in terms of a betterment of action and performance. And if you're unwilling to

do that as an auditor, he's not going to get very much better. He's going to slop off and dog off and make mistakes and do this and that, and you'll let him get away with it because you're letting him be self-determined.

Now, we didn't understand this entirely in Dianetics. But when we said self-determinism ... Two or three times I wrote essays on the subject – which I don't think are around particularly – and these essays all boil down to the fact that if we really say "self-determinism" we must be talking about the eight dynamics, you see. So in order to shake out this error, let's introduce this word *pan-determinism*. That doesn't mean that you're here to control others: it means that you're here to be willing to. And if you're not willing to, you won't ever control yourself, because life is composed of eight dynamics.

Now, pan-determinism therefore enters into Opening Procedure of 8-C because it is the auditor giving orders to the preclear. One of the reasons a preclear gets well is he thinks he'd be killed if he accepted an order and, by golly, here he is accepting orders and executing them and nothing happens bad to him; he gets better, he ... so on. What do you know, he can obey an order.

Now, if he can't obey orders and you try to run Opening Procedure by Duplication on him, you're going to have a horrible time.

Now, on Elementary Straightwire you'll very often ask a fellow one question and he answers another one to himself but answers yours to you. And there's where 8-C licks that difficult case. See, you'd run into a bug there if all you knew was really Elementary Straightwire. Every once in a while you'd run into a bug. And that bug would be a very, very prominent bug, and it would be the preclear who sits there and apparently runs all the auditing commands and isn't running a single one of them.

You go around to people who don't get well easily and check them off and each one of them will tell you, "No, I don't run the auditor's commands." You could really get them down and put them on the E-Meter, say, "Let's take our hair down here, fellow."

"Well, yeah, I've been run all week by that fellow. No, I didn't run any engrams."

"Did you tell him that you were?"

"Well, yes." You get the idea? He wasn't following orders.

Now, there's number seven which we have to mention. As I say, there is extra material goes along with those things; but you have to know those six very well and this seventh one. Seven is entirely wrapped up with *Science of Survival* and is *Science of Survival*, and in particular, the Chart of Human Evaluation in *Science of Survival*. I find out that all too few auditors know this material – the Chart of Human Evaluation and the basic stuff, the real basic stuff, of ARC. And that's in *Science of Survival*. The best way to go about that is simply read and study *Science of Survival* and look over the chart very well.

Now, for reasons of your explanation to the public at large, there is a little pamphlet on the Axioms of Dianetics which you should also look over, because these are fast communication – very fast communication. And you should know these yourself. That's the most elementary. That's just for communication to the general public, you should know these things. That goes along with, of course, *Science of Survival*, because these things are more or less treated in *Science of Survival*.

Now, it's a requisite, before you study all of this, that you should have read Book One, naturally. But we're not teaching Book One. There is too much in it to teach. It is probably the most complicated, diverse text you'll ever want to run into. People read it today and they say, "Well, you said all that in Book One." Yeah, well where were the people in 1950? I had to find out what they thought I was saying, not what I was saying.

All right. So a normal course then could be lined up on this basis, which would simply run week after week after week with tremendous benefit.

On Mondays you would teach 2-way Comm and comm lag.

On Tuesday you'd teach Elementary Straightwire, the Auditor's Code and the other codes of Scientology

On Wednesday you would teach Opening Procedure of 8-C

On Thursday you would teach Opening Procedure by Duplication.

On Friday you would teach the Remedy of havingness

On Saturday you would teach the Spotting Spots in Space, and on Sunday you would have the students study the Chart of Human Evaluation and read *Science of Survival*.

And on Monday the same student would get two-way communication with a communication lag. On Tuesday he would get Elementary Straightwire. On Wednesday he would get Opening Procedure of 8-C. And after he went through that week he'd hit Monday – two-way communication.

The Southern Methodists made a study one time as to how many times you had to utter a datum before students got it – nine times. Nine times, and they would normally as a group have it perfectly.

Okay. Now this is the spot we are jumping off from, the knowledge of these procedures – seven of them. All right, now then, it's up to this unit to swallow them all quick because we haven't got time to say them nine times, You have just about thirteen more days to get all of them. And therefore I'm instructing your Instructor to push on them real heavy, one right after the other, good and hard and heavy, until we've all got them down pat.

And then we can get down to what you should be studying, which is the Axioms of Scientology and the sixty processes contained therein; every one of the sixty, however, each one of them, is based only and totally upon these processes.

There is one other process you could teach, which is Significances, but it's relatively unimportant. Compared to these, it's relatively unimportant. Significances are less important than the Remedy of Havingness any day of the week.

But a knowledge of these seven gives you a knowledge of life, a good, solid working knowledge of life, and gives you the wherewithal to break cases, and gives you all the information you need to use *The Auditor's Handbook*, including Intensive Procedure, printed edition.

And so we'd better get good on these.

Okay.

# TWO-WAY COMMUNICATION

*A lecture given on  
6 October 1954*

This is a lecture on two-way communication. Two-way communication is the most important step we have. Just because it is very simple, just because it can be easily stated, just because it is easily done, is no reason why it's not important. Now, a great many things that make an auditing session halt, and so forth, are attributed simply to two-way communication. I want you to get this idea very thoroughly – that once you see an auditing session bogging down, the first thing you consult is two-way communication.

Now, the formula of communication is cause, distance, effect – that's the formula of it – with an intention to communicate at cause with attention toward the effect, and with attention from effect to cause, and with a duplication at effect of what emanates from cause. See that? If only attention is used, if there's only attention used, you will find the particle flow developing, heavy. You will find attention giving a heavy particle flow – get the idea? – if only attention is there. Because attention is not close enough to consideration. Attention belongs in the field of mechanics. It is the field of mechanics.

We have to go, if we go into considerations, a little closer up to the thetan, and that is accomplished by interest. Do you see that the bridge between consideration and mechanics is interest? And when we are into attention, we are into mechanics.

Now, that is an interesting thing there because it means that a communication line can be pepped up, speeded up and everything else, simply by injecting interest. But if you're only going to inject attention into it, nothing but attention, this is going to be a little bit difficult in the auditing session.

So an auditor had better get out of the field of sitting there with rather solid, but nevertheless alert, you know, attention – looking at the preclear; he's listening to him – and get up into the field of interest if he expects that communication line to flow. See that?

See, there's a difference between these two things, and the difference is simply that: it's particles, particle flow. Attention is much more solid and much less fluid than interest.

You can do anything with interest. You can look at something and sit back, and you're still interested in it. You see? You can communicate much more broadly about it because you're closer to consideration, you see, and less out of.

This is so much the case that a process which processes interest, and called "Disinterest Processing" (as included in Intensive Procedure), is one of the most savage processes that we have. It's a terrifically savage process. you merely ask the preclear to sit out in the park or something like that, and you have him place or spot or assume disinterest in everyone and everything he sees, one right after the other, you see? And it practically tears him to pieces because you're making him give attention without interest, and even worse than that, you're actually discharging all the accumulated attention particles which have been given without interest. If the interest is missing, an impaction or a ridge will result.

Now, you want to know how to get out of this universe? You better get out of this universe by being interested in the smallest particle in the universe – the whole universe simultaneously. Interested in it – not give attention to all the particles. Get the difference? See, you don't have to give attention to every individual particle in the universe, but you certainly have to be in a frame of mind which permits you to be interested in every part of the universe.

Now, let's take another little factor in this and discover the dilettante. You know what a dilettante is: He's somebody who starts in – oh, he gives a savage run at this thing, you know, very enthusiastic at first, and he's going to learn how to be a jet pilot. You know, "Oh-oo, hmm!" Great enthusiasm. Of course, dilettante's an item that comes into the field of the arts mainly, but we will just extend it to all of man's activities, and we will discover that he goes, oh, boy, is he going to be a jet pilot! Oh man, is he going to be a jet pilot! Yeah, and dhuh-dhuh-dhuh. And then the instructor says, "Ah, well, us boys here, we have to learn to do this and do that. And you have to learn how to ... the army regulations. And you have to learn how to make a bed." And this fellow – he's not quite as enthusiastic as he was before. And he gets a lesson or two. And then the next thing you know, why, he's out there at the commandant's office asking to resign.

Why is he asking to resign? What is the highest denominator – common denominator – to his activity or to the activities which cause these withdrawals from life, activities, goals and enthusiasms? He has as-ised all the interest in the whole subject of jet pilots. See, he didn't have very much interest. He couldn't mock it up. He suddenly had come on to a deposit of interest – he got sold by a poster or something of the sort, you see – and this interest was very slight. And he himself cannot create interest. And so, he simply goes into something and he as-ises – in other words, erases – all the interest he has on the subject, which leaves him with nothing but some attention which he had given to it before. He's kind of stuck with it and he feels rather soggy about the whole thing. But he's not interested in it anymore.

All right. Well, he gets out of that. And he decides he's going to be a piano player. That's the thing to be – be a piano player. Oh yeah, he's very interested in being a piano player. And he takes one lesson, two lessons, three lessons, and he meets a couple of other piano players. And the next thing you know, he's not even interested in the piano anymore. He quits; he's through. He doesn't take up any further ... Well, he decides, well, he's not so successful in that particular field. The best thing for him to do is to become something completely out of this world, something he's tremendously enthusiastic about – he's going to be a painter

And he gets to the point where he learns how to clean a brush and he quits. What's he quit for? Now, that's a very important thin to an auditor, because every preclear that's sitting there in the chair or in the group, and so forth, has quit just like this in various parts of life. He's quit time after time. And he's only sitting there because he's quit.

He is just as good, actually, as he ever was in seventy-four trillion years, and yet his considerations have turned over so that he quits. The consideration is this: he can no longer create interest; he no longer runs on the interest which he himself generates.

You see that? He just takes somebody else's interest or a little bit of interest and he as-ises it or erases it before he gets into anything like hard work.

Well, believe me, it takes a lot of interest to get you through the task of digging half a mountain away to find some gold, or sawing down a redwood tree. And they didn't used to have saws when they first cut those things down, you know; they had very bad axes. And it takes a lot of interest to keep a fellow at a job all the way through.

Interest is not at fault. It isn't because you have become interested in things and then have been disabused and betrayed so you had to withdraw from them. That is *not* what is wrong with the preclear. It is simply that he failed to keep on generating interest in what he was doing. There's an awful lot of people out here that tell you they're looking for happiness. And a lot of your preclears are going to sit there, and they're going to sit there, and they're going to be still looking for happiness. And they'll ransack their whole banks looking for happiness.

Well, the clue to happiness is being interested in life. And their happiness is as great as they can create it. And they will not experience happiness from any other quarter than their own generation. That's all. They'll get the amount of happiness that they can generate. But this happiness is not itself an emotion. It is a word which states a condition and the anatomy of that condition is interest. Happiness, you could say, is the overcoming of not unknowable obstacles toward a known goal. (Dianetics Book One; definition of happiness.)

The anatomy back of it is simply this (no more, no less than this): It's how much interest can he generate, and can he generate enough interest to get him over all those heavy-energy particles which have to be invested along the line. It's how much interest can he generate himself, how much can he himself keep interested in, in life, that makes him happy. Because happiness is application of self to existence. And that's all there is to happiness.

So what happens to this dilettante? He doesn't create interest anymore, and you will find this individual looking for happiness. Oh, no! He's *looking* for happiness. Nobody else's happiness is going to be of any use to him whatsoever. The only happiness he will ever get is from being able to create his own interest in things. See that?

Now, a thetan who is in good shape and who's exteriorized can get some of the darnedest levels of interest. Did you ever have anybody exteriorize and then go prowling around the beach, or something like that, and find a grain of sand and just sit there and look at it? Just as interested! And you say, "What's this fellow doing? Here he is, a half an hour in this chair and he hasn't said a thing. And I thought I was working with a comm lag here or something. But I'm not working with a comm lag, something else has occurred here." And you kind of quietly ask him, "What are you doing?"

"Oh," he says, "that's the most interesting thing!"

"What's the most int ..."

"All of these little electrons, you know, they keep going around in this grain of sand and it's... Oh, it's fascinating. It's very, very interesting." There's nothing wrong with him. That's the natural state of affairs. An individual should be able to get interested in anything.

Little boy is a kick. My little girl requires interest to be kind of generated by the vicinity. You know? It's got to be heavy matter and that sort of thing. She'd get interested. Yes, she's very alert and very interested. But this little boy, her brother, is practically an operating Thetan. And he is a fabulous little character – not just because he's my son, of course – but he's a fabulous character in that he's always exteriorized. You walk past his room, his door is closed, you see – in the middle of the night and he'll do a flip-flop on his bunk, *bang!* and he'll be right up there scratching on the door saying, "Hey, say hello," you know, that sort of thing. You open the door and say, "Hello, Quentin," and he's real happy.

He'll go around, he'll crawl around, and he'll find a scrap of wool on the floor, you know, from the dust sweepings or something. "Hey, what do you know about that," you



know? He isn't just grabbing pieces of heavy MEST, and scrambling this and tearing up this. He'll just look at this piece of wool, and he'll turn it over and look at it and feel it. And you come in; he's perfectly willing to break it off. He's not fixated in his attention. He is simply interested in everything you can think of, which is an interesting state of affairs, isn't it – such a high level of interest.

Well, it's almost impossible to make him unhappy. Little girl – it's rather easy to make her unhappy. She doesn't have this same level of interest in the environment. He can get sick because his body kicks back on him. He tries to make it do everything, you see, and it won't do everything it's supposed to do. Right now it wouldn't fly a plane or anything – he's still crawling.

But get the difference here. Nobody can make him unhappy; he has tremendous interest. Those are just a couple of kids that I see every day. But I see a lot of preclears, an awful lot of preclears. And interest is a beautiful index, beautiful index. In the first place, they are *interested* and *interesting*. Get the difference? *Interested*, *interesting*.

A fellow who is interesting is pulling everything in on him. He's trying to get interest from other people. He never will, really, to a satisfactory amount. His only salvation is to be *interested*. And he's as alive as he is *interested*. And if you'd processed as many movie stars as I've processed, you would get the idea after a while that people who are walking around trying to be *interesting* get into a remarkable state of nervous breakdown. They are expecting everybody to be *interested* in them and they themselves forget how to be *interested*, and they can only be *interesting*. And this is the most ghastly state of affairs you ever saw. So they're unhappy, so they don't know what they're doing, and so on.

What's this got to do with two-way communication? Well, a two-way communication is between the auditor, who should be *interested* (and it's a very interesting thing to watch the workings of a mind believe me) – he should be *interested*; not just sitting there doing a job, giving attention to something, but he should be *interested* in what is happening – and a preclear, who is being *interesting*. And the way the preclear is being *interesting* is to dream up more problems than the auditor can ever solve.

Now, a real two-way communication is where people are alternately *interested* and *interesting* – fellows can swap, you see. Here a fellow is at cause on the communication line – cause, distance, effect – cause on a communication line. He's being *interested*. And the effect is over here, you see. And the effect is momentarily *interesting*, see, to the person who is *interested*.

Now, when we get a reply on this communication line it swaps. And the person who was *interesting* is now *interested* and is now cause. And it goes back across the distance to "E," and the person who is there at "E" is now momentarily being *interesting*.

The two-way communication goes sort of like this: The fellow who is at cause is being cause then effect, cause then effect, cause and effect, cause and effect. See? He's being *interested*, *interesting*, *interested*, *interesting*. Cause is *interested*. Effect is *interesting*. So he's perfectly able to shift between being *interested* and *interesting*, *interested*, *interesting*.

And if he's unable to shift, if he's not unable to change his gears on this, he can't go into an adequate two-way communication. And there sits your preclear only being *interesting*. Well, does *interesting* ever assume cause? No, it's effect. It's trying to be the effect of interest. There he sits.

Why is he sitting there? It's because he's lost his interest in life. Oh, but he's being *interesting*, isn't he? He's trying to get some interest from life instead of trying to generate some interest. You want to know what's wrong with the preclear? Just sum it up in that

category and you've got it.

He's going to be an effect as long as he's being interesting. And believe me, more preclears can dream up more things to become interesting than any auditor has ever been able to log. You can cure their sinus itch, you can cure their ingrown toenails, and all you've done is take something away from them which made them less interesting. Because they know how to be interesting. Their mothers and their father taught them how to be interesting: Be sick! That's the way to be interesting. Everybody comes running around saying, "Dear, what can we do for you now?" See, they've learned a good, heavy lesson. The thing to be is unhealthy, kind of nutty.

They got attention from the. .. "Attention" is a misnomer here. They got interest from the teacher, you see, by being stupid, see. "I don't know how to do this arithmetic problem." And the teacher said, "Well now, dear, it's very simple. You do it this way and do it that way." What's he doing being this stupid on this subject of arithmetic? What's he doing in school for anyhow? He had a full college, Oxford – ending education in his last life. Where's it gone? Well, it's gone right where he means it to go, out and away, because he wants it all to be fresh and interesting again. So, you see, he wouldn't be able to do it twice, so he doesn't remember. He is as-ising interest when he begins to lose all of his past experience and so forth.

Well now, if you just take interested and realize that that's cause, and interesting and you realize that's effect, you have, actually, the theta-MEST theory.

What is this theta-MEST theory? What are we doing throwing that at you all of a sudden? Well, it was a theory generated by myself in the fall of 1950 as an effort to explain – it was just a theory, you understand; it wasn't anything else; it was just thrown in there to fill some holes – to explain this phenomena which had been observed of an analyzer working in one direction and a reactive mind working in quite another: the reactive mind being desperately interesting, we can say now, and the analyzer being interested.

Theta-MEST theory: Theta is a static. A thetan is a static. The definition of a static would be the definition of a true zero. A spot out here in space is not a true zero. See, there's still space. A true zero, an absolute zero, can be stated in this fashion. This is one of the things the world at large did not have as part of its technology. It did not have a definition of true zero.

A zero is a variable. You would have to have qualified every zero in a mathematical formula perfectly before you could have used zero as a constant. And yet mathematics use zero as a variable. See? All right. If it were used as a constant and it was a variable, why, they would have had a picnic.

Anytime they reached up into upper ranges, such as quantum mechanics and that sort of thing, they would have come a cropper, wouldn't they. And so they did, because they had zeros in the line, and these zeros do not happen to be absolutes at all. They are qualified zeros. They're a zero *of* something in the first place, *at* a position, in a time. And that's what mathematics has never done with a zero, and why mathematics has never really advanced beyond a kindergarten stage on this planet. They just don't have a definition of zero. Well, they do now.

All right. There's zero. And the definition of a static runs just this way: A static is not something in an equilibrium of forces, the way you were taught in your high-school text or your college text. It is not something in an equilibrium of forces, by its own definition. Because something cannot be in an equilibrium of forces in this

universe and still exist. An engineer is liable to point out to you when you're trying to explain things to him – he's liable to point out to you, "Now, look, if you put a brick right there on that flat surface it is being held up by Earth, you see, on the flat surface, and is being pulled down by gravity, and it's therefore in an equilibrium of forces."

"Oh, no," you say, "didn't you ever study astronomy?"

And the fellow says, "What's astronomy got to do with it?"

"Well, nothing, except that brick that is sitting there on the table is moving in eight different directions at enormous velocities."

Any object on the face of Earth is moving in eight separate, different directions to make the main vectors of motion of this planet. The precession of the planet, its orbital course and its turnaround every day so the sun can come up and go down – that's the main one. And just with that one, this brick that he said was a static is traveling at a thousand miles an hour. Well, that doesn't look very static to me or thee, does it?

So what is a static? A static is something without mass ... Boy, you know this definition, will you? It will really help you sometime when you exteriorize somebody, and you don't know quite what's happening. Just think of this definition. Remember he is a static and a static is something without mass, without wavelength, without time and actually without position. That's a static. And that is the definition of zero.

An absolute zero would be something which would fulfill all these categories: have a mass, no static, wavelength, no time, no position. Let's just wipe that out, and we have a static.

So if you find somebody having an awfully hard time, and he keeps exteriorizing into 1812, don't be too upset. If he were a true static, he wouldn't be here either. But he'd still be able to communicate with his body and do other things. Because the static which we call thetan and call life is something which can make considerations and generate a sufficient quantity of energy just by changing its mind.

How far off physics was. It thought that there was such a thing as a conservation of energy, that you couldn't create new energy; it was all old energy. I don't know where they got this idea that it was all old energy, but they've had this idea. By changing its mind, it can create energy – and this being a physical impossibility by the current textbooks, it has a tendency to be completely overlooked and was never viewed even vaguely.

A thetan can create energy. He can create energy so markedly and so definitely that you can test it on a meter as good as a spectrometer, as good as butcher scales. It's a meter in here that has a "bop" characteristic. And wherever a person has a sensitive place on his body – a pain or a razor nick or an old break on his arm or something like that – you can put this electrode. You put this electrode down on that break or that abrasion and it will howl. See, it won't howl over the rest of the face, but you put it on that abrasion and it goes "beep" every time it touches any sensitive spot on the body.

What is the characteristic of this? There's enough energy being generated by that sensitive spot on the body – enough energy being generated, zoom-zoom-zoom-to cause a current to go through the meter and measure. Well, that's curious, isn't it? It requires current. There actually is current because of the pain. The cells are producing or converting enough energy in that particular area to cause a current to circulate through the meter. All right.

We take some individual and we put it on a dead spot. We have this individual here as the monitor and we have the patient, and we put it on the patient's dead spots. You know, it never howls. This meter just never howls when put on various areas of this fellow's face. And the monitor over there looks clear across the room and sort of gets the idea of

connecting the meter electrode with the individual. And the meter will go "beep." Oh, now, wait a minute! There's no electrical lines or anything else going between these two people.

In other words, we have somebody set up there, and simply determine that there's going to be a connection, now, between the electrode and the person. And he will sort of get a vision. He gets a sort of a little picture of the electrode. And a meter (as good a meter as is used in anything; a butcher scales or so forth; it's that accurate; it's just a meter; it reads on dials, and so forth; a physicist's dream) all of a sudden says, "This individual has thrown some energy over there and made it light up."

Now, the difference between a good healer and a bad one is that a good healer, when that electrode is put on somebody's face or scar tissue or anything else, can make it just go instantly *bing*, and predict the moment he's going to do it. He can put his fingers behind him like this so that some other observer can watch it. And at the moment he makes it connect, he'll snap his fingers. And at that instant you will hear the meter go "beep!" See, he has no contact with this. There's no wires on the fellow doing this. The whole apparatus is on another human being, and yet he can throw an electrical current in there.

Can a thetan create energy? Well, he can certainly monitor its creation, at least. We can test it very positively and absolutely. We can make meters sag all around on a dial with this. Yes, a static, a thetan, can create energy. Energy can be created. And what energy is it? Is it an energy of the mind as different from energy of the physical universe? I am afraid not. It's that the energy of the mind is thinner when created by most thetans – before they're in good shape – it's much thinner than this old stuff. That's about the only difference. That's curious; it's about the only difference.

Now, that maybe stretches your credulity. We don't ask you to stretch your credulity. The old theta-MEST theory was just a theory. It was thrown in there to test things. And it was stated that a thetan was something that was motionless – a static – or theta, was something motionless (a static). We didn't have the term *thetan* at that time. And MEST was simply a solid – you know, it was all-motion thing which had become solid. In other words, here we had a no-motion thing against an all-motion thing, and this was the theta-MEST theory.

Let's go a little bit further and talk about communication. A communication is as good as it is a straight wire, strung between cause to effect, isn't it? And it's as bad off as it has to go through relay points. This you will get in Intensive Procedure under Via – a process known as Via. It's as bad off as it has to go through a lot of relay point. Okay? You see this clearly? All right.

It's as good as it's just one cause to effect. And it's bad as it is one cause to subcause, subcause, subcause, subeffect, subeffect, subeffect, subeffect, subeffect, effect. That gets complicated.

You have to use old energy to do it, and you have to do all sorts of weird things. But when you've got enough subcauses and subeffects intervening between a cause and effect, you have a solid. And you get such a tangled ball of energy that everybody has lost track of where the cause was in the first place and where the effect was, and it's like some kitten sitting down trying to untangle a ball of string. He'll just wind up by batting it around. He'll give up trying to untangle it and he'll just bat it. The dickens with it, you know? It'll get in his claws and he will try to separate it out of his claws and it'll get all over the floor. You get the idea?

The solid is simply made up out of these vias. It's no longer a straight line, and that's what a ridge is. People get these heavy-energy masses on their faces; they'll tell you about

them. And they get all sorts of deposits in their body and, you know, they get arthritis. What are all these things? What's this stuff? It's just simply too many vias. It's a case of too many vias. And that, of course, makes a problem. And the problem is simply this: what's cause and what's effect? And you get a solid. A solid is not a straight, understandable, locatable communication line from cause to effect.

People always, in this universe, are looking around to find God, who allegedly created this universe. They've just given up, that's all. There's a primary cause in this universe. Someplace or another somebody put in the first impulse. But your preclear, if he's a Black Five will sit there trying to find the primary cause-point, primary cause-point, primary cause-point, primary cause-point. No doubt in his mind about effect – he is. He's the effect. But where's this primary cause-point, primary cause-point, primary cause-point? He is, really, no longer even interested in doing this. He's doing this to be interesting when he sits down there in front of you as an auditor.

He's a ball of energy which has a lot of subcauses and subeffects so twisted up and so jammed in together, so many vias in this communication line, that he can no longer find the beginning and end of it. And so he gets lost.

What's this got to do with two-way communication? Well it has a lot to do with two-way communication because you're talking to somebody who has gotten onto the *MEST* side of the theta-MEST theory when you're talking to a tough preclear. He's on the *MEST* side.

Now, theta could be said to be the solver of problems and a perfect solution is a static. You can read all about that in the *Auditor's Handbook*. Also a perfect truth is a static. Theta is classified, qualified and defined as a static. You get a thetan close to being a static in that he has location, you see, and is in present time. And you get what we call a thetan. He's not quite a pure static. See that? He does have location and he does have a position in time. And if he gets this adjusted so that he is in present time, and so forth, why, he feels pretty alert and pretty confident. Normally, they count on bodies to keep them into present time and to keep them into contact with the various aspects of existence.

MEST simply means matter, energy, space and time, which is the material universe. It is composed of a bunch of communication lines of various kinds and a bunch of spaces, which consist of anchor points which are fairly solid, and from which has been lost – so it will persist – the cause-point. The cause of the line is lost, so therefore it persists.

All right. Theta-MEST theory, 1950, fall, can be reinterpreted today for an auditor, for the purposes of a two-way communication, this way: A thetan is the solver of problems and MEST is the problem. Now, if we classify it in this way, we will understand very clearly what our preclear is all about. The auditor is being theta and the preclear is being MEST. Interesting, isn't it?

And only because we are making it possible for this preclear to straighten out communication lines, do we have any business auditing at all. Because we will be cause for a long time, you see, in auditing, and he will be effect. But that effect is in the direction of making him cause. See that? So, he becomes more and more cause.

So, as he gets his communication lines straighter and straighter and straighter, he becomes more the solver of problems and less the problem, and so himself ceases to be a problem to himself, to his environment and to his auditor. See that? And he ceases to go around, gimping around on crutches or some such thing, being interesting. Well, that's the whole trick of auditing.

It is contained right there in – and nowhere else – the theta-MEST theory, the theory of communication, cause-distance-effect in a two-way communication system.

Now, do you suppose you're going to get much communication out of a problem at first? Huh? Well, he can't, because he's not cause. He's sitting there being an effect, isn't he? So he's not going to communicate out. Your first task is to get him – on whatever grounds or in whatever ability you have or anything you could do – to make that person emanate a communication line in some direction. And that is your first step in auditing. Make him talk. Make him reach. Make him outflow in some fashion, because this individual is doing nothing but inflowing. He's being the problem, therefore he is being MEST. Therefore he is the effect.

When you first start auditing, in a two-way communication system – and that's why we say "two-way" communication system – you're engaged in the simple communication formula of cause-distance-effect, with you at cause and the preclear at effect, and that's not a two-way communication. A two-way communication is cause-distance-effect, and then where effect is, reverting to cause-distance-effect where the cause was before, you see, back and forth. And that makes a communication. Got the idea?

So that's what you're trying to do with this preclear: trying to make him reach a little bit. Well, the funny part of it is, you can take a sick cat, and you can go over and tickle his front paw or something of the sort, or swat at it – and you must be gentle if it's a sick cat – and you eventually get him to a point of where very groggily and very stupidly he will sort of reach out, you know, experimentally toward your finger. And at that moment – being very careful not to withdraw too fast, not to make a startling motion – simply withdraw your fingers a quarter of an inch so that he has to reach a little further with his paws. And then withdraw your fingers another quarter of an inch. And he'll give up about there; two quarters of an inch is too far. So, he will kind of relapse, and you'll have to go through it again. You'll find the next time he'll reach an inch. And the next time he'll reach a couple of inches. And the next thing you know, wonder of wonders, you have processed a cat and he's a well cat. He doesn't have gallstones anymore. By doing what? Making him swat at you.

Now, you could take a little baby, a very, very little baby who can't talk who as a thetan is still completely discombobulated and isn't well in control of the body or anything else, and you can take this little baby and you can make him swat at you. And if you are gentle enough and if you don't make any fast motions – if this little baby is sick, if he's got a stomachache or something like that – if you just do this (make him reach a little bit towards you, just like you did the cat), he'll get well. You've made him cause haven't you? You've started a two-way communication in progress.

So don't forget it when you're processing psychotics. Same process works.

What is the process? He's a little less MEST, a little less a problem, being just a little less interesting, and is being a little more interested. That, in essence, is the fundamental entrance-point of a two-way communication.

Now, we come to the question, "How long is it going to take this cat or this baby to make up his mind to swat at you?" And we get into communication lag. Now, communication lag is established by the number of vias the fellow has on a communication line. That's everything it is. The number of vias on the communication line brings about the phenomenon we call a communication lag. You ask the fellow how he is today, and he tells you tomorrow. We ask him to give us a cigarette, and after we've got out one of our own and have lit it, he suddenly extends a cigarette toward us. He was alert all this time, actually, but the information – the incoming question and the outgoing question into his communication ballup – took so long, because there were so many vias for it to go through, so many relay points to hit, that a time ensued.

This is not quite correct, but is a rough approximation – what I'm giving you right this instant: approximately half the time of a communication lag is taken up by an inflow to the preclear. You said something, and it takes approximately half the communication lag for him to receive it and the other half of the communication lag for him to state the answer and get it back out through the vias, and expressed. You see that? You're not looking at something which is simply a slow income. You're looking at a slow income and outgo, too.

So we get all sorts of funny variations. Watch what I said: This is approximate, not correct, just because we get so many variations on it. You say, "Hello" to this fellow and he instantly starts to outflow at you. Well, it took maybe one-tenth of the communication lag for it to hit him and then instead of answering the question all he did was obsessively outflow at you. And nine-tenths of the communication lag is expressed in idle chatter which is apparently some kind of an outflow, but has no direction or intention and is not oriented.

You say, "How are you?"

"Oh, I certainly like that hat of yours. Yes, I've been thinking for some time of getting me a hat like that. Uh ... where did you. .. where did you get the hat? I uh ... I uh ... have trouble with my hats – you know, driving around in the car, they blow off every once in a while. I feel pretty good."

All you did was key some kind of a machine which would reply. And sooner or later *he'll* answer you. Now, do you know this can be so bad as an outflow – which is a communication lag, see ... The length of time between the asking of the question by the auditor and the answering of that exact question by the preclear is the communication lag.

Another communication lag is simply a processing lag. It's the length of time that it takes a process to be effective on the preclear. This is another kind of communication lag, you see. And there's another lag which is not a communication lag, but a betterment lag. It's how many hours do you have to process him before he can become cause. You see that as just another lag? Well, we see this first lag expressed in everyday life, and so on, by you saying something to the person and then they answer something else or they are silent. We don't care what they do. If they stood on their heads or ran around the block between your asking and their answering the question, that time is the communication lag. And it simply is expressing the number of vias and relay points through which this communication has to go in their bank before they can disentangle it and get it back out to you again. That's all it expresses.

It doesn't matter what happened in the middle. Remember: the distance, in terms of time, between the moment you *ask* the question and the moment when the preclear answers *that* specific question. If he never answers that specific question, as far as you can determine, you can just assume that he was *out* of communication – you know, it never arrived. And there's where you find most people on most subjects. They're out of communication on the subject. They *don't* answer the question *ever*, see. It just wound up in the vias and went in small, spinning circles.

Now, the length of time between asking the question and getting an answer is communication lag. And you, in using this in a two-way communication, discover the state of sanity of your preclear, and that the length of lag he has on any subject is his state of sanity on it: The more lag he has the less sane he is. That's all there is to it.

When we say *sane*, we mean how far away is he from truth. Truth is, of course, a static. And so he's just that involved in being a problem – MEST – having lots of vias, so forth. You get the idea?

It's a very easy thing to remember. But if you don't know communication lag, you'll never know how long to run a process.

An auditor wants to know who is the most aberrative person in this person's life. He simply says to him, "Name all the persons you've been associated with since birth." The fellow gives him some lag on the question itself – you know, says, "What do you mean 'birth'? Well, birth, uh ... You mean uh ... uh ... Oh, birth. Uh ... well, uh ... what do you mean by people? Do you mean relatives or other people?" This is all lag stuff, see; this is just junk.

A general semanticist will sit and argue, "What do you mean by 'known'? Do you mean closely in acquaintance with, or people you've known intimately? Or do you mean casual acquaintances?" You see, he has to get that word clarified. You're getting a symbol lag there, you see. It's a communication lag. It's just hung up on a symbol of some word you uttered. And he'll start playing this symbol instead of answering the question. See, it's really hung up, it never hit him at all. The symbol lit up and he started looking at the symbol.

So you finally get it through to him, and you say, "How many people have you been associated with since birth?"

And "Oh!" he says – he finally gets this, you know; ten minutes, something like that – "You mean how many people have I been associated with since birth'? Well, let me see. Ah, well, there's my mother, my father, my grandfather ..." And remember, Mother-Father stated in this fashion is a social statement. Everybody knows socially that we have mothers and fathers. So that's the first thing he'll give you, normally. He won't even think about it, you see. It's just a social-machine response.

He'll say, "Mother and Father, and there's my grandfather and my grandmother and my Aunt Tilly, and uh ... my Aunt Swilly, and uh ... Oh yes, now wait a minute uh ... Yes, uhm ... mmm ... Oh yes, my great-grandfather. Yes, my great-grandfather. And uh ... there was a teacher I knew. uh ... Miss Ink, and uh ... uh ... Let's see. Well, let's see now, there must be some more. Well, uh ... let's see. What were you talking about? Oh yes, people since birth. Yeah. Uhm ... um ... Let's see, what were you saying? Oh. .. , oh-oh yes, people since ... Well, there was ... there was uh ... uh ... uh ... Uncle Bill."

Heh, put it down in your little notebook. His great-grandfather and Uncle Bill are hot buttons on this bank. See that? He just lagged like mad before he hit him. And then he runs the whole length, and he tells you and describes these people for forty-five minutes – and all of a sudden, then says, "Of course, there was my mother." He named her first, but he never named her at all.

The last person he gave you is information that would never show up on an E-Meter. But you would have gotten dives on Great-Grandfather and Uncle Bill. You would have gotten mad dives. Any time you get a lag, on an E-Meter you would have gotten a dive as severe as the lag is long. It's just like reading a meter. See, the longer the lag, the more dive you would have gotten on a meter. In other words, the more charge there is on that – which is to say, the more vias there are on that line. Now, you see that clearly?

Okay. Now, right along with this whole subject of communication lag, we discover something fascinating. We discover something that's really very interesting: The person who is being processed is normally such a problem to himself, you see – too many vias – that his interest has obsessively centered on himself. People have told him all of his life, "You mustn't be interested in yourself," and finally ... This is horrible. I mean, if you can't be interested in yourself, you'll scale off on the rest of the dynamics, you see; you get no balance of dynamics.

And, by the way, in this particular subject belong, really, the Axioms of Dianetics – in



two-way communication lag. They have a lot to do with this. Also in favor of communication there belongs in here the Code of a Scientologist. That is just what kind of a communication line we've got to the society; the Code of a Scientologist keeps it a clean line. That's the only thing it's there for. And it should be known and followed just because we're trying to keep a clean lineup with the society.

But this preclear – let's get her back to this subject – he's being a problem. Now, Dianetics and Scientology don't want to be a problem to themselves, but as many cockeyed vias and impactions, and so forth, as are on the line will make the people of the organization introvert – that is, look back into the organization instead of outflow, you see. So you could view it as a whole preclear – all the organizations. The amount they outflow into society would determine the sanity of the organization itself, you see.

Well, that would be the number of problems they had inside the organization. The Code of a Scientologist tries to smooth these problems out. There are various organizational minds working all the time, trying to keep these problems from accumulating and smoothing out the old problems. But here's a problem: we introversion into the organization, you see, when there are too many problems inside the organization. And people don't look outside the organization to find actual problems.

This is your preclear. He's not looking outside at all. All he's doing is communicating inside himself, see, back and forth inside himself. Well, you get him to talk to you and he's in much better shape. Well, what is he mainly involved with? You'll find out the worse off he gets, the more problems he has. Follow me? The more problems he has.

*Problem* is that consideration which, in the field of consideration, represents MEST. See, problem – MEST. There's a lot more technology you can get out on this, but you just look MEST over and you'll find out it's always a problem, one way or the other. And the consideration level of MEST is problem. And the considerations of problem are simply how many vias are there in this problem, how many connections are there which can't be traced? How many unknown hookers, vias, short circuits, and so forth, are there in this problem? You get those shaken out and you no longer have a problem; you have some kind of an organism. It can still be a problem because it's got a lot of vias; but boy, it's a known problem, you see.

All right. Let's look at this preclear and realize that when we're processing him we are looking at an enormous accumulation of problems. Now, at one time or another he put up a big screen out here and he said, "There are going to be no problems hit me. See, I'm going to proof myself against problems – you know, 'cause I don't have to have any problems. I can have actual MEST and I can have space. And I don't have any problems, and I don't need any problems. And their problems are theirs and I don't need them."

And then the screen came closer and closer, and got more and more pressure on it – actually and literally true – until one day he practically *was* the screen. And now he develops a tremendous appetite for problems.

Has your preclear got an appetite for problems? He's got such an appetite for problems that if you solved one for him, he'd find another one, and another one and another one and another one and another one and another one. So, we get the most potent process which goes along with two-way communications. There are several, by the way. Description Processing is a two-way communication process. But this is a more potent one, and this is where we'd better start out with some preclear we're having difficulty with. We'd better address the present time problem: "Do you have any problems in the present time?" And you know, I start every session with that sort of a thing. I don't care if I processed the guy yesterday. I want to know if he's got any problems today. His wife

might have left him this morning. You see?

Present time problem will often keep an auditor from progressing into the case even vaguely. The guy's so tied up with this problem, he is so confronted with the problem, that he has no chance to communicate outward. You hit a guy in the belly with a .45 bullet and you will see that he introverts. He is so involved with this sudden, inexplicable, very complicated set of communication lines that he can only look at that set of communication lines. He can't look out at the environment and even see who shot him. You see that?

Well, get your preclear hit in everyday life by some tremendous problem in the range of thought – you know, he's got to worry about it, he's got to think about it. And you're going to process him now without doing something about problems? No, you're not. So there is a pat, snap, easy process that fits right in with two-way communications.

You ask him what problems he's got in life. He'll tell you a few. You ask him what problems he's got in life some more. And then ask him what problems – here is the pat, exact phrasing of this question: "What problems in life could you be to yourself?" And "What problems in life could others be to you?" The first one comes first, "What problems in life could you be to yourself?"

Now, if you want to get this fellow really involved in talking ... You can even get a psychotic on this range. He just starts opening up. Your object, however, is not to get his confidence, not to do this, not to do that and blah-blah-blah-blah-blah. Your object is simply to make this man capable of creating a sufficiency of problems so that he'll have no scarcity of them and won't have to hang on to them. Unless you get him in the kind of a state so that he doesn't have to hang on to these problems, unless you get him into a state where he realizes he can create an infinity of problems concerning himself, concerning life, and so forth – and no longer has to suck up like a sponge every problem that comes his way – he'll go right on being a problem, won't he?

And every time you get rid of a problem, he'll come up with another problem. And that makes a long term of auditing, doesn't it? So with the two-way communication system you have him start out talking about the present time problem, and then ask him what kind of problems others could be to him. Or, if he's at a lower range, you use both these questions. It doesn't matter which one you use first: What kind of a problem could others be to him? What kind of a problem could he be to himself? And every time you get on one of these things, you know, I mean you just beat that doggone lag flat!

"What kind of a problem could you be to yourself? Give me another kind of problem you could be to yourself. Give me another problem you could be to yourself. Some more problems you could be to yourself. Some more problems you could be to yourself. Oh? Yeah? That's . . ." Remember, stay interested. "More problems. More problems. That's a good one. That's hot. Give me some more problems you could be to yourself. Oh, some more, some more." And you know all this time he's draining the bank, draining the bank, draining the bank. He's picking up old problems, his mother's problems, his father's problems, everybody's problems, problems, problems. He's draining the bank of problems.

He's going to come up with a "problem starvation" here shortly, so he's going to get fantastic. And after a while: "Well, let's see, I could suddenly be 11 ninety feet tall and not be able to go through the door. I ... *rruhm-rruhm* He'll get wild, you see, exaggerated, and so forth. And then finally he'll settle down and he'll maybe get serious again. And he'll get this way and he'll get that way. But sooner or later you want to ask him this question: "Well, how many problems *could* you be to yourself?"

"Oh, quite a few."

That's not the answer you want. So, ask him – ask him a little bit more thoroughly on the subject of problems. "Give me some more problems you can be to yourself." The answer you want is, "I could be an infinity of problems to myself. I could be all the problems that there are in existence to myself." Because you've gotten into doing what? You've gotten into creating problems. And as long as a man believes he cannot create, he will suffer a scarcity which he will then try to pick up secondhand.

And the last rung where you find these boys is problems. So there it goes with a two-way communication. And that is the substance of this process: "How many problems could you be to yourself?" "How many problems could you be to yourself?" – that's the central question. You could also say, "How many problems could others be to you?" – that's a secondary question. "How many problems could others be to you? Give me some problems others could be to you. Some more problems other people could be to you. Give me some more problems others could be to you. Give me some more problems. Some more. Some more. Some more. Some more."

"Uth-thuh-thuth! Hu-hraa-rrra!"

And finally, you know, watching communication lag, you'll find this take place (you want to swap back and forth on this): "Give me a problem you could be to yourself." You see? And he says, "Oh ...". And you know what you're liable to find sometimes? *Brdrdrdrdrdrdrdrdrrr!* You're just looking at a machine manufacturing problems. He'll get so many problems he could be to himself that he can't enunciate all of those problems to you, they're just going through so fast. You've just taken the dams down on a problem-manufacturing machine. See?

And then he'll flatten out. That's an obsessive sort of a communication. He actually hasn't answered the question at all. He's trying to stop the dam on this thing. Then finally he'll say, "Yes, well, the kind of problem I could be to me is to be sitting here talking to you. The kind of problem I could be to me is to be sitting here talking to you, and that is the kind of problem I could be. Now, let's see, I could be another kind of a problem. I could have a headache. Yes, I could uh ... I could have a headache because I've been sitting here. I have a headache. I have a headache because I have a headache. Let's see what other kind of a problem could I be? What other kind of a problem could I be? What other kind of a problem? Well, let's see now, what other kind of a problem? Oh, I don't know. I ... I could have sore feet." See, the vastness of this man's imagination is immediately demonstrating itself to you.

There's two-way communication. As long as you keep this boy on the subject of problems he'll talk! You got that? He'll talk! And he won't leave the subject of problems until he can create problems at will. And that's what you do with two-way communication. But remember its natural anatomy: cause-distance-effect; effect turning to cause, coming back across the distance and being the effect again. You understand that?

An auditor who is good does this with interest. He can be interesting and interested. He never gets restimulated, because he knows where he's going with this process and he knows that it works. And that's the main reason he won't get restimulated. It becomes a game.

All right. The preclear will get better and better under this. He will also have some of the fanciest somatics you've ever seen. Let's take a fellow with bad legs. "How many problems could you be to yourself?" He will tell you about nothing but legs. Don't specify legs, see? Just "What kind of a problem could you be to yourself?" Don't talk about legs. *He'll* talk about legs.

And one of these fine times he will stop being so fascinated with his legs, because there's some deposit of energy in there he finds delicious on the subject of legs. He's very interested in that problem about legs. Legs, legs, legs, legs, on and on.

So, two-way communication in its essence is just simply getting the preclear to talk. You're talking to him. You get him to talk to you. Get him to write you something. Get him to do something to outflow. And the next thing – and the easiest way to go about it – is to get him on the subject of problems, and you've got it.

Okay? Right.

# ELEMENTARY STRAIGHTWIRE

*A lecture given on  
7 October 1954*

I'd like to talk to you today about Elementary Straightwire. And under this subject comes the Auditor's Code, *Self Analysis*, memory and mass, past-life loss of memory, and the fact that MEST knows a datum.

Now, Elementary Straightwire is a very interesting subject, particularly since it can utterly change the mind of anyone to whom it is addressed; it is a very powerful process, and is one of the basic processes of Dianetics and Scientology. The first Straightwire that was used was evidently used by Hippocrates, who knew its value back in Greek days, since he says, "A patient is not well until he has told at least five people about his operation." And he evidently made a practice of this sort of thing.

But we don't hear about it seriously as anything useful, until the days of Sigmund Freud when he began this endless thing known as associative ... Matter of fact, I've forgotten most of the material in psychoanalysis. There's a terrific amount of material on the subject of you get the fellow to talk, and he keeps on talking, and if he talks enough years, why, he will eventually dredge up something.

Let's compare that to the Aesculapian practice and find out if there's a considerable advance. The Aesculapians practiced in the early days of Greece, by hypnotic suggestion. They used hellebore to produce a savage and violent shock in the person, and then would talk to him in such a way as to produce dreams, which they would then convince him, afterwards, was a visitation of a god, and this was all very interesting.

But that actually is where psychiatry gets, intimately and directly, the whole theory of shock as a therapy. Nuts. The Greeks and the use of hellebore – a psychiatrist does it today with electricity. I mean, it's just as unworkable today as it was then, but it's something to do – better than standing around, I guess, smoking a cigarette. So they do that.

Now, you say, "What does this have to do with Straightwire?" I'm just demonstrating to you that first we had an impound – you know, we inflowed like mad against the person and then after a while we let him outflow – without any directive material or direction, really, on the part of the doctor treating him – and then we got up to the field of more selective recall. And that's practiced to some slight degree by Jung and Adler. And we finally come up to the Dianetic auditor, 1950, and we got what is known today as Straightwire.

You can see that Straightwire is pinpointing the trouble and using a knowledge of the mechanics of the mind in order to locate and pinpoint the difficulty. The Freudian analyst lets the patient regurgitate Lord-knows-how-much material just in the hopes that the patient will stumble over something, and sooner or later, then, the analyst will be able to evaluate it for him.

That is Straightwire, if you wish to call it that. And the Dianetic auditor pinpointed it, out of a knowledge of the mind. He was looking for incidents appertaining to pain and

unconsciousness. And he was trying to get the locks which held such engrams in suspense – and it took a lock. So the auditor, by Straightwire, could hit one of these locks, and he would simply shoot for it. And he knew about valences and he knew a great deal of other material, and so he was able to pinpoint these held-down points in the computer, you might say. And by Straightwire, just getting the fellow to recall them directly, he could relieve the tension on the case.

Quite remarkable material, quite remarkable results, have ensued from just this ordinary, but rather complicated, use of Straightwire. You see what that is, then? It's ... Knowing that he could get into his mother's or father's valence, you might ask him, "Now, can you recall a time when you decided to be like your father? Do you recall a time when somebody told you you were like your father?" He'll eventually remember something like that, and the valence mechanism will shift.

All right, there are other things. "Can you recall a time when you..." (overt-act-motivator sequence) "Can you recall a time when you told somebody they were just like their father?" You see? And if he could recall such things, why, it would cause a resurgence in the case, and he would get out of his father's valence, and so would be rid of all the maladies he was carrying around which were actually his father's maladies and did not belong to him.

Now, as we look along this line which goes from the ancient Greek until now, we discover simply this: That people who were practicing this knew more and more and more about the actual mechanics of the mind and the factors which were the most vital factors in the mind.

Freud got onto the dynamics. He got onto the dynamics, at least, by emphasizing the second dynamic. He had seven more to go, but he nevertheless was on the way.

And because sex is a hidden thing in this society – naturally, any time you can get anybody to remember anything about sex, you are getting him to remember a hidden communication, which is a tremendously important process all by itself. And you ask somebody, "Let's point out some hidden communications. Let's point out some hidden joys. Let's point out some hidden satisfaction," anything like this. Or "Give me some unknown data." The fellow will sit there and be ... This is, by the way, a technique. It's impossible for him to answer this question. You ask him, "Give me an unknown datum," and what happens is every time he looks at a datum that he considers unknown it immediately becomes known.

And he just reels off these thousands and thousands of locks at a great rate of speed, one after the other, you see? – all the time trying to find an unknown datum. You see, he has taken the knownness off the bank. He as-ises the knownness from the bank, you see, and that leaves the unknownness on the bank. And all you've asked him to do is as-is the unknownness which is on the bank.

Now, as-ising unknownness is quite antipathetic to trying to remember something, you see this? As-ising unknownness is not as-ising data. But unknownness is itself a sort of datum. It is the consideration that something cannot be known and somebody never as-ises this. As witness this fact: The whole field of psychology has been so confronted, so thoroughly, with this datum – that something cannot be known – that it has refused, bluntly and precisely, to admit at any time that the problem to which it was dedicated was a workable, solvable problem. What are they working on it for? You want to know the difference between Dianetics and psychology, just take a look at that.

They do not believe the problem they are working on can be solved, because I've had psychologist after psychologist, psychology department after psychology department, tell

me "The human mind, of course, is far too complicated to be solved; you realize that."

Well. I asked them, "What the devil are you doing sitting there, then, calling yourself an expert on the subject of the human mind? If you believe the problem can't be solved, then what are you doing on this track? Get the ties off the rails and let's get going!"

And that's why you, when you're out there trying to train somebody who has been a psychologist, will find yourself going appetite over tin cup with this fellow, because you're training somebody who has made the assumption that the problem is not capable of solution. And you're teaching him the solution in the teeth of the fact that it can't be solved.

We have had psychologists in training for four years in the field of Dianetics, and at the end of four years have discovered that they have not absorbed the most basic principle there was. Just recently we discovered that a psychologist told us that we had made an unreasonable assumption: That some slightly greater freedom was available to the average man. He said we'd made this as an unreasonable assumption. The unexamined assumption in the subject. Where's he been for four years? That's one of the first assumptions we make: That a greater freedom can exist for the individual, and by that greater freedom, that he is then less driven into channels which the society frowns upon. It is restriction which brings on crime, not freedom.

All right, the field of psychology, then, was running up against this exact mechanical thing – unknownness. And they themselves had postulated that unknownness to aid and abet the fact that unknownness can actually exist in the bank – unknown datum. So, one of the trickier forms of Straightwire would simply be to ask somebody, "Give me some unknown data. Give me some unknown times and unknown places."

What is stupidity? You want to raise somebody's IQ? Simply ask him for some unknown times and unknown places, because the definition of stupidity is simply this: Having lost the time, the place and the object. And if you can get somebody to lose time, place, object, and lose the time, the place and the object often enough and long enough, he will be stupid, believe me! Stupidity is just that, and no more. I refer you to the printed edition of *The Auditor's Handbook*.

All right, let's look at this, then, and discover that by Straightwire we could as-is, off the bank, known data and leave there great masses of unknown data; and thereby, just by practicing Straightwire too long, we could make a person more stupid. You got that? But by practicing it for a short time, we could make him brighter – unless we add into it the fact that we can ask him for unknown data, which means that we could use, then, Straightwire forever and he would just keep on getting brighter. And understand this about Straightwire: If you simply ask him for known data, known data, known data, known data, he will eventually get a great deal of stupidity piled up, see, and he will be more stupid. Do you see that?

If you ask him for just a very short time – you know, if you only Straightwire him ten minutes or a half an hour or an hour, or even ten or twenty hours; you know, just Straightwire – you're going to see him get brighter and brighter and brighter and brighter and brighter, and then he's going to get more stupid and more stupid and more stupid and more stupid. And he'll finally get back to the point where he was when you first started asking him, and then he will go below that point.

So, we're talking about Straightwire as a momentary or limited technique, and also because we know about this unknown datum as an unlimited technique. So if you understand what I've just said to you, then Straightwire becomes an unlimited technique – if you remember to ask him every once in a while, "Well, give me some unknown

mothers."

"Oh," he'll say, "some unknown mothers? There's only one mother as far as I am concerned. Unknown mothers – I don't know, I suppose Ed had a mother, um-um-um-um-um, yeah. Yeah, there's ... Well, there's little Johnny's mother. Unknown mothers you want, though. Yeah, well, excuse me. Well, there was Bobby's mother, and there was Aunt Gracie's mother, and there's a great-grandmother, and she was somebody's mother, yes, and there was a ... I had a dog one time and – wait a minute! I'm sorry, I'm sorry, you're asking me for some *unknown* mothers. Yeah, well, I'll give you some in just a minute. And then there's Joe's mother and Bill's mother, and then there's mother's ... I-I-I don't know, I ... It's elusive, you know, I just ... I almost find one, and then I ..." And all of a sudden he'll say, "You know, this is kind of dumb. You're asking me for unknown mothers. How could I know them, I have to assume I don't know them before I can then look for them and not find them."

And you say, "Well, that's all right; that's all well and good. Just give me some unknown mothers." And great stretches of Straightwire occur, Enormous vistas of life open up that he's never before inspected. Why? Because he as-ised all the knownness off the bank, and anything that was a little difficult to know, or that he had to reach for a little bit, why, he said then, "That's unknown." Well, you've asked him to pick up all those walls, you know. Of course, he picks them up and there's a picture behind each one of them. See the trick?

Then how does Straightwire become an unlimited technique? By occasionally interjecting into it requests for unknown times, places, objects, persons. Ask him for unknown times, places, objects and persons. You'll get back into past lives so fast that you'll wonder how on earth he didn't remember them in the first place. See that? All right.

Then, Straightwire at large becomes unlimited if you remember to as-is the unknown factors gut of it. Now, another factor in the field of interest comes this way: If you ask a fellow to remember all the things which were interesting in his life, he would as-is off – you know, erase – all of the interest in his past life. And you would say, "Well, that's fine, he'll then no longer be interested in his past life and so it'll go away." Oh, no you don't! You've left the disinterest on the bank.

Now, if you ask a preclear, sometime or another, to take a look at the lamp in your office and get the idea of being tremendously interested in it, and then without calling back to him any of the *energy* he's put out toward it, simply to take his attention off of it and abandon it – the beam he's put out will smack him in the face. You see how you do this? You tell him to get interested in something: now tell him to take his attention off it and – you know, cease to be interested in it but don't take the beam off of it; you know, just leave himself connected to it but cease to be interested in *it-bang!* Horrible.

All right., what's this? Interest is itself, at first – most basically, of course – is a consideration. Interest is basically a consideration. But that consideration develops into energy particles which are just as real as any energy particle. And a fellow can get connected to things and then become – with interest – and then become disinterested in them and still remain connected to them. And so he has a tendency to become very, very solid.

So if you simply asked this person for all of the interesting things in his life – "Remember a time, now, when you were interested in your mother. Remember a time when you were interested in your father. Remember a time when you were interested in dogs. Remember a time when you were. ..." *Zzup. zzup.* The next thing you know, jam! What have you done? With the assumption that he was to find some interest in dogs, he



did. But he created some new interest for the bank as well as the interest which was already there, you see? Now he takes his attention off, he hits the disinterest about the subject of dogs and doesn't as-is it or erase it.

So, a Straightwire question which would plow it up and make him *extremely* happy, would be to "Give me some times ..." By the way, it'd make him awfully miserable at first; and again, this makes an unlimited technique if you do this: "Give me some times when you were disinterested in your mother. Disinterested in your father. Can you recall a time when you ceased to be interested in moving fast? Ceased to be interested in speed? Can you recall a place that you're no longer interested in?" Get the idea? He'll all of a sudden start to come up to the surface.

What happens? Interest thrown at any energy mass causes it to begin to dissolve, and throws into restimulation the disinterest which is already there.

Now, here's the explanation of the dilettante I was talking to you about in the last lecture. He's as-ised all of the interest. He has created no new interest, and he has left in existence disinterest. And this disinterest exists as energy deposits which then absorb any interest he puts out. And this is the mechanics behind interest and disinterest, and why your dilettante is very often completely bogged in a very short space of time. He starts to be interested in something and he bogs on it immediately.

Now, one of the odd angles of Straightwire is that Straightwire – in the field of interest – can be accomplished very, very much on the order of shotgun. In other words, you can ask for a concept and run a concept. You're then doing a sort of a shotgun Straightwire, you see? And it's not anywhere near as good, really, as pinpointed Straightwire where you're getting the specific incident.

You know, if you're asking him and he remembers specific incidents, it's very good. And you're running Straightwire if you're asking him for specific moments when and where, you know. That's Straightwire. And if you're asking him "give me a concept; run a flow; get the idea," you're not asking him for specific incidents. See what you're asking him for? You're asking him for a shotgun, scattered all over the place, and it's nowhere near as good as pinpointing.

Now, this you must know about Straightwire: It is better to get pinpointed, actual incidents than it is to shotgun with "Get the idea, now, of sitting there and being disinterested." It'd be much better to use Straightwire. "Give me a time when you were disinterested in life." And have him remember an actual time when he was disinterested in life. See that?

The essence of Straightwire, what we mean by Straightwire, is the recovery of the actual *time, place and object*. Now, let me be a little more specific: The recovery of a memory which immediately and actually appertains to time, place, object – remembering all the while that there are two things that can get in the road: one is unknownness, and the other one, disinterest, These two things will get in our road.

We ask him for all the known times and places, endlessly, and we'll have simply as-ised them all. See that? And we ask him for all the interesting things in his life, and we will have as-ised them all – in other words, erased them. If this fellow isn't producing very much interest, we will leave him in an unknown state of mind – "Who am I?" "Mr. What-Wall" – and we will leave him in a disinterested frame of mind. Unknown and disinterested. On the one hand, stupid, and on the other hand, disinterested in existence. You see that? So Straightwire, then, must take care of these two problems, and if it doesn't take care of these two problems, it's not good Straightwire.

All right, let's go over what Straightwire is again. Straightwire is: Specific points in

time, space and specific objects – very specific, you see. You're asking for *the* time *when*, *the* object *that*. See? *The* place *where*, with (added to it) "Give me some unknown places where; Give me some disinteresting things," but making sure that he gets the exact place, the exact time, the exact object. In other words, "remember." Follow me now? All right.

Straightwire has some more to it. Why is it called Straightwire? It's called Straightwire because it is stringing a line between cause and effect, directly and with no vias. *Straightwire*, as opposed to wire which runs through relays. You want direct cause and effect.

Now, a thetan has gone all the way through this universe, unable to discover cause. Why can't he discover cause? In the first place, he's never going to really discover cause, because cause is without mass, without energy or wavelength, has no location in space, has no time; and that is the biggest cause there is. That's a static.

Now, actually, in view of the fact that a thetan actually has no mass, no energy or wavelength, no space or location in, and no time – in view of this fact – and in view of the fact that he can yet change his mind, make considerations and render effects, we discover that he would be an unknown cause, wouldn't we? And on the other hand, he would also be actually an unknown effect. So an unknown cause to an unknown effect gradually drives a thetan daffy. You see this? He can never find this cause. He can find the last particle of energy in the last space, but beyond that, there's-rrrr! See? And when he's trying to make an effect on somebody, he gets the idea after a while that he can get down to that last particle of energy in that space, in that time, and beyond *that-nyah!*

So he never gets to an ultimate, he never gets to an absolute effect and he can never discover an absolute cause. And for that reason we have, in Dianetics, the Axiom "Absolutes are unobtainable." And that's exactly what that means. It doesn't mean anything else, it just doesn't happen to apply to that. Absolutes are unobtainable. What are the absolutes here? Cause and effect.

So, the best he can ever do is discover "assisting causes" and "assisting effects." He can discover the energy, the times and the spaces which assist causes and which assist, effects. When you're giving him Straightwire, you must know that you are always going in the direction of an unsolvable effect, an unsolvable cause. And remember, the only thing that's ever worried him is the fact that it is unknown or unsolvable, and that it is uninteresting, really. That cause, that effect, never themselves as energy masses could be called interesting or uninteresting. So he gets the idea that they're disinterested.

Man has a great avidity for this. He mocks up all sorts of saints and builds them out of plaster, I call to your attention, in order to demonstrate to himself that a thetan can be interested in him. In other words, he tries to do it by mock-ups, because he can't do it really.

So when you're rendering and delivering Straightwire, you must realize that the hulk of the concern on the bank is wrapped up in "uninteresting" on the one hand, and in "unknownness" on the other hand. Unknown what? Unknown cause.

Stupidity is unknown place, time and object. So, that's anxiety too, you know. It's about all there is to it. Anxiety, fear, worry – what's all this connected with? It's connected with simply this: an unknown cause, an unknown effect. Did he really do it? Did he really cause the effect, or didn't he? No certainty. Because he depends for certainty on impact.

Impact certainty steps in here, and he said, "Well I can at least be certain that there's a wall over here." And he goes wandering around too long, getting too concerned with the ultimates and absolutes of cause and effect, and he begins to neglect the fact that at least there's a wall here. See, he neglects this "at least there's a wall."

So, by Straightwire, you can show him that there's an awful lot of memory on the bank that he is overlooking. He gets so desperate about this thing that he will forget things. He'll make a postulate that he can no longer remember them. And so you get a person with a poor memory. A person with a poor memory though, remember, is just doing this: he's obscuring place, time and object, isn't he? He's just obscuring this thing.

Now, of course, because Straightwire deals primarily and basically with communication, hidden communication becomes very important in the field of Straightwire – so important that if you could take somebody out on a street corner where there are a lot of people and there's a lot of scenery and a lot of things going around, and simply have him point out some hidden communications, he would feel better and better and better and better. That's not Straightwire. That's environmental observation. That's environmental observation. See that? That's not Straightwire. That's an 8-C with a concept, or an 8-C with an idea. You're making him spot the vicinity. Straightwire, then, refers immediately to the past. It refers immediately to the past.

Now, one of the most dangerous postulates that comes up out of the past is that the past can affect you. But if you didn't have the postulate the past could affect you, then nothing could affect you. And a person gets an idea though, that a past is affecting him far, far too much, and Straightwire is indicated – definitely indicated.

Many, many combinations, infinity of combinations, could be applied, but in Dianetics and Scientology we use the knowledge of the mind in order to pinpoint what we should ask for. So let's ask for some unknown things, let's ask for some uninteresting things, let's ask for some hidden communications and let's ask for the various other items which are of the obscuring kind, and remembering at the same time to intersperse questions which are really real. You know, ask for the data too, but don't neglect or forget to handle these unknown, uninteresting factors. Don't as-is all the data off the bank and leave nothing there – a soggy mass of stupidity.

All right, the most basic and elementary Straightwire – remembering all these other factors – the most basic and elementary Straightwire is of course ARC Straightwire. But when we say *Straightwire*, we are simply talking about stringing a line from cause to effect through the past. And that's what we mean by Straightwire. And it's direct, pinpointing questions which bring this to the attention of the individual. What bars him from remembering all there is to remember is, of course, the fact that many of the data, he has pronounced to be unknown; and much of the material, he has withdrawn from, because it was uninteresting.

So if we include these factors in, then we could Straightwire straight back to the beginning of all time, and Straightwire out the postulate of time itself, if you wanted to.

Now, as soon as we go into the subject of Straightwire, we begin to realize that there are a tremendous number of combinations of questions which we could ask a preclear. An infinity of questions just as there are an infinity of life motives and forms. So we have to know our basics very, very well to keep from wandering into the unproductive bypasses in the bank.

Now, the preclear who is sitting in front of us has lost cause-points. He doesn't know what caused the effect, he doesn't know what is causing the effect, there is a hidden cause scattered around in his bank and he is looking for it. And he will look, look, look, look, look, and scale off all available data, and not scale off the uninteresting data, and not scale off or erase the unknown data, and so he will eventually leave himself in a fine state of *Homo sapiens*.

How does he get to be *Homo sapiens*? He starts looking for cause, cause, cause,

cause, cause – "We can't find it, don't know where it is, don't know where it is, don't know where ... Well, there's one. No, that isn't it. There... No, that isn't it. There – there's ... no, that's ... Oh! No, th ... Uh!"

Finally, he'll even welcome a bullet. He knows at least the bullet killed him. See, that's certainty now; he's certain now. Well, *you* must get him to be fairly easy about the ideas of cause and effect.

One of the good ways to do it is to simply ask him questions which direct his attention immediately into those factors which are the factors of Dianetics and Scientology; and this is survive; the eight dynamics – in Scientology, the Mystery to Know Scale – and very, very and most importantly, ARC: affinity, reality and communication.

Now, ARC Straightwire is quite a technique all by itself. But when we're asking him for things, remember to remember your fundamentals, and apply and use those fundamentals on him. Don't ask him for times when all of his schoolbooks were lost. You know, "Can you remember a time when all your schoolbooks were lost?" This is not an important question. An important question would be "Give me some times when you decided not to survive." *Verrrrrrrr!*

If he can't remember any, well, "Give me some unknown times when you decided not to survive." You got the idea?

You could ask him, "Now, when did you first get interested in this type of psychosomatic illness?" See what it would do – what would happen to him? "Give me some times when you became disinterested in this psychosomatic illness." And it'll go away. He'll skim off all the interesting points while he's looking for the uninteresting ones, you see?

So, remembering these tricks and these basics, and remembering that life is pretty well patterned out by these various fundamentals which we find are the common denominators of existence – and you will discover as you begin to use them that they are the common denominators of existence-why, we can produce some tremendous results with Straightwire.

Well, one of the mechanical ways of producing results is ARC Straightwire, and ARC Straightwire had an elementary form. Its most elementary form was-and boy, you'd better know this one by heart, shall we, because this is a very elementary form indeed-"Can you recall a time that is really real to you? A time when you were in good communication with someone? A time when someone was in good communication with you? A time that is really real to you? A time when you were in good communication with someone? A time when someone was in good communication with you? A time when you felt some affinity for someone? A time when someone felt some affinity for you?"

Now, that's the most elementary form of it. But if you use that very long-if you use that very long-remember to use the reverse side of it. All angels have two faces: a good face and a bad one. And so it is with the bank. It's got a good face and a bad face. "Can you remember a time that's really unreal to you? Can you remember a time when someone refused to communicate with you? Can you remember a time when you refused to communicate with someone? Can you remember a time when there was no affinity? When nobody felt any affinity for you?"

If you don't reverse the coin, sooner or later you're going to bog your boy. You'll just as-is off everything. You know, all angels have two faces-so does life. Has a good face and a bad face.

All right. The most elementary form, then, you will find in the next-to-the-last list of *Self Analysis*. And you will discover, however, that by reversing its face it becomes an

unlimited technique. But as for a quick boost and a good assist, and a temporary, limited technique, which you're only going to use for a few minutes, an hour, something like this, just ARC Straightwire-"Remember a time that's really real to you"-is excellent. You have to test this out to really know it.

Now, of course, there is a more basic Straightwire than this. We actually-if we're starting to research the memory-we had better start in with the factors which make memory. And there aren't any hidden factors which make memory, besides remembering and forgetting. Any time you think there are any more factors to memory, you ... Because memory, by itself, simply implies this mechanical action of remembering and forgetting.

Memory is not necessarily living at all. It's just a mechanical little machine that goes whir-whir and delivers you the datum when you want it. So we have a more basic Straightwire: "Remember something you wouldn't mind remembering," "How about recalling something you wouldn't mind forgetting." See? That's the two factors of memory. And it will certainly knock this little machine called memory either into line or out of operation entirely-at least you produce an effect.

Now, those are Straightwire in its most elementary forms, and we discover that the rendition of Straightwire is more important, however, in many cases, than the question asked. You've got the question asked, you can commit this to memory, and it ceases to be all-important when you know what all the forms of Straightwire are.

If you want some forms of Straightwire, by the way, open up *Self Analysis* – old-time *Self Analysis*. Boy, there's Straightwire in there to end all Straightwire, and if you add to its factors "uninterestingness," you know, and "unknownness," why, it'll just reel off everything for you. There's practically every Combination of life in that old book. It's based on the formula of control: start, stop and change – the whole book is. The factors of control are start, stop and change.

Now, the rendering, then, of Straightwire becomes all-important, and this becomes the variable factor. The other factor is not variable. You can commit these things to memory – it's very easy to know, and so forth – so the variable factor becomes your skill in administering Straightwire. And your skill depends first and foremost upon (1) getting a two-way communication with a preclear which remembers to keep interested. You even see sessions given by auditors as demonstration sessions in which there is not enough interest. You can notice that there really isn't enough interest. He's just giving a demonstration, he's not interested really in making the preclear well. And you can notice that the session is not delivering. You know, he's just demonstrating the session. If he were really in there auditing, he would be interested – he would be interested in the preclear, not in giving a demonstration. See that?

So the interest factor must be in there while you're giving this, which means that you've got to maintain everything we know about a two-way communication in order to deliver Straightwire.

Now, we've got to observe the communication lag. The auditor has got to stay interested, and he's got to observe this communication lag, and he's got to repeat that question and get incidents as long as there is a communication lag upon obtaining those incidents. "Remember something real," you say to somebody. It's nothing to have somebody tell you forty-five minutes later, the first one – just nothing for this to happen. Well, you'd certainly ask the question again, then, wouldn't you? And you'd ask again and again and again and again and again until he could finally spit them out in a fairly quick fashion. See that?

So communication lag becomes all-important. Straightwire, because we can codify it,

because it is very precisely codified, because we can understand its factors and even commit them to memory, becomes unimportant in a form just as soon as you know it. By the way, you'd better know those forms before you assume it's unimportant.

But as soon as you know that, then we must pay attention to the only factor which can vary, and that factor is the auditor's presence and his delivery of Straightwire. It's how he administers his questions to the preclear. And if he can do a good job of it, of course, his preclear will get well rather rapidly. And if he does a poor job of it, his preclear won't. If the auditor is good at Straightwire, we are assuming already that he is good at two-way communication, observing the communication lag, and that he will pursue the technique as long as he believes that it is producing change and result in the preclear.

All right, now let's look at the code of how you administer any kind of auditing and realize that if we're talking now about the administration of a technique to make it workable, then we'd certainly better codify the various "can't's" or "don't's." Now, over a period of four years we've learned a great deal, *a very* great deal, about what not to do to a preclear and what to do to one. And although the first code as given in Book One was a very idealistic and workable code and was better than no code at all, in four years of accumulated data we have actually accumulated a code which is a very, very good code, and which does contain the factors which immediately and directly knock to pieces a case.

And if you paid attention to the Auditor's Code and knew your business and were interested in your preclear, why, you would just sail right along beautifully – be no other factor to pay any attention to at all.

Well now, this Auditor's Code is compiled – 1954 – it's compiled out of experience, a great deal of experience, and you should treat it as such. This is not something that LRH dreamed up, it's not something that the HASI is trying to force off on you, it is something that auditors like yourselves have learned over a long period of time. And by isolating all the common denominators of failures in cases we have finally succeeded in getting the Auditor's Code together.

And I'm just going to read it off here. You'll find in one of the PABs, a complete explanation for every step of this code. Well, there's no reason why we should go into that now. I'll simply read you the code.

1. *Do not evaluate for the preclear.*

2. *Do not invalidate or correct the preclear's data.*

Those are the two "shuns." No evaluation, no invalidation.

3. *Use the processes which improve the preclear's case.*

You say, for heaven sakes, that doesn't have to be in there. Oh, yes it does! You know why it does? Horribly enough, an auditor quite commonly uses the processes which would improve *his own* case. The preclear and an auditor have been put on E-Meters and then the things the auditor has been running at the preclear have been repeated. And it's been discovered that the auditor reacted on them and the preclear didn't. In other words, the auditor had been auditing, all the time, the things that should have been audited on him, not what should have been audited on the preclear.

4. *Keep all appointments once made.*

If there's anything you want to bog a preclear down with, it's just don't keep the appointment. If you're not going to keep the appointment or if you're sloppy at keeping appointments, for heaven sakes be sloppy in making them! See, this doesn't say you have to be very precise about appointments, but if you make them, keep them. If you make them, then it's just your hard luck, you've got to keep them, even if you've got a broken leg. Because what it does to a preclear's case, shouldn't happen.

You know, you're half an hour late for the appointment, something like that. What are you telling him? You're telling him "I'm not interested in you, Mr. Preclear." And you think after that that you're going to get anyplace with this case? Boy, you're sure not. He's going to stick and bog and everything else. You've just told him, by being late or not keeping the appointment, that you aren't interested in him. And boy, does he take it to heart. Because boy, is he being a problem, you see, and he's got to have interest to live. And he'll just go to pieces – happens all too often.

*5. Do not process a preclear after 10 P.M.*

Why 10 P.M.? Well, 10 P.M. We just found out that preclears who are processed after 10 P.M. are boggy enough so that a technique which would have been okay at 8 P.M. will shoot them on over to 2 P.M. [A.M.]. And you process anybody after 10 P.M., you're liable to be processing him at 3 and 4 P.M. [A.M.], because he isn't alert enough at those hours of the day. He's built on algae, and at night – you know, plankton, monocells, so forth; that's his past history of his body, and these things quite customarily and commonly are starved for energy during the hours when the sun is not present. And whatever his habit patterns of existence, his body cells are going to react. And if you're having any difficulty with your preclear at all, his body is drinking energy off of him every time – as a thetan – every time he tries to produce any energy. The body is starved at those hours and so sucks up the energy of the thetan, and you can't do too much with him.

You start, in, then, running a technique, and all the body will do is just suck up the energy. You can count on the fact that if you are adventurous enough to go to 10:30 on a preclear or two, sooner or later, you know, you all of a sudden will be processing him at 2:00. Why? Just hour after hour after hour, you see? He's on the verge of spinning. Fellow's perfectly normal, usually. So just don't process past 10 P.M. That 10 P.M. deadline gives you enough to kind of square it away and straighten it out and cut it out, see? But past 10:00, you've got no chance.

*6. Do not process a preclear who's improperly fed.*

Same thing. Body's too starved. They spin; they can't run as an engine. So the thetan is trying to pump this body up and make it run and be audited at the same time, and it just doesn't work – body requires food; a thetan doesn't.

*7. Do not permit a frequent change of auditors*

*8. Do not sympathize with the preclear.*

*9. Never permit the preclear to end the session on his own independent decision.*

*10. Never walk off from a preclear during a session.*

*11. Never get angry with the preclear.*

*12. Always reduce every communication lag encountered by continued use of the same question or process.*

*And 13. Always continue a process as long as it produces change and no longer.*

Oh, boy! Those two – altogether, those two are the difference between a good auditor and a bad auditor.

I'll say that again. These two: Always reduce every communication lag encountered by continued use of the same question or process. If an auditor won't do that, he's a bad auditor. What makes a bad auditor a bad auditor? The fact that he doesn't do this. That's what makes him a bad auditor. You know, he can get away with murder in other directions and still not be a bad auditor. But a bad auditor does this one, and this one: Always continue a process as long as it produces change and no longer.

A bad auditor will Q-and-A with a preclear. See, he'll duplicate the preclear. The preclear gets a change, the auditor will change the process. Preclear gets a change, the

auditor will change the process. No, no! This process was going to go along and produce a great many more changes. And instead of going along and reducing the process lag, why, the auditor changes the process. He's just duplicating. He's weak, you know? The preclear changes, so he duplicates the preclear and he changes the process. And the preclear changes again and he changes the process. Next thing you know, he's got the preclear in the midst of all these changes – bogged.

See, he just didn't finish off the process. Now, that's a bad auditor. We can chalk them up ... By the way, it's a very interesting thing, but their accident rate (their accident-proneness), their changingness of techniques on the preclear, and a dozen other factors, all go along together. And given some of these factors, we can say to ourselves, "Oh well, he'll probably change processes on the preclear every time the preclear changes." That's a bad auditor. Just grind it through. As long as the preclear is changing under that process, run the process. The other rule is: The process which turned on the somatics will turn them off.

So, you'll leave the fellow all hung up, you see, if you change the process every time he gets a little change.

That was quite a victory, by the way – learning that. Learning that one, smelling that one out amongst auditors and being able to point it out to them was quite a victory in the field of processing. We understood an awful lot, all of a sudden, and we understood that the auditor changing this process all the time on the preclear was actually what was spinning preclears and making this auditor get no results.

14. *Be willing to grant beingness to the preclear.*

Damn few auditors do until they are in good condition.

15. *Never mix the processes of Scientology with those of various other practices.*

Now, of course that also applies to Dianetics. And this is also the Auditor's Code of Dianetics.

All right, so much for that Auditor's Code. Take it, live by it, abide by it, and you will discover that all these hitherto mysterious manifestations on the part of your preclear will start to become very easily understood indeed. You'll say, "This preclear's case is not progressing. Go and read your Auditor's Code. Did you do any of these things?"

You say, "*Ahhhh, ah-ah-ah-ah-ah!* You know, that fellow's awfully thin, I wonder if he's eating." You chump, you've been processing somebody who never ate breakfast and who couldn't stomach dinner, and he's been going downhill, downhill, downhill. A preclear who is improperly fed – didn't have anything to do with your auditing, it had to do with beefsteak. Some preclears will buy an intensive off of you and then be so broke thereafter, that they will not be able to afford food while they're in the area. So they'll eat engrams.

Now, *Self Analysis*, as a book, is a good book, as such, which can be trusted to people who ask you how they go about processing somebody. Shove them a copy of *Self Analysis*. It tells them how to do it, saves you a lot of time, and they won't get into trouble with it. They can go out and fool around with this on a case for a long time and produce good results. Of course, they don't know all there is to know about it because they have that book, but that is your little pal. That keeps you from rendering enormous quantities of charity auditing. That keeps you from having to practically educate some co-auditor's auditor, see? You say, "Well, here. Here's *Self Analysis*. Here's a copy of *Self Analysis*. Take that home, and you do it just like it says, right there."

By the way, if you tell them to do it together, or to have three or four people get together and do it together, it's a lot of fun. It's a great game, *Self Analysis is*; a lot of



sport. That's your stopgap. What do you do with these people, you know, that want to be educated by you free of charge, all in one evening, as to how they're going to get their mother out of the spin that they put them into? Hand them a copy of *Self Analysis*.

Now, memory and mass: If we're talking about Straightwire, we're talking about memory, then, aren't we? We're talking, then, about mass. When a person loses a mass, he very often fails to differentiate between the mass and the memory of the mass. And when he loses a mass, he loses the memory of the mass. You know, loss is loss – loss of mass, loss of memory.

A fellow loses a body all of a sudden; this body has been walking for him talking for him, speaking for him, spitting for him. It has also been – he thinks – remembering for him. So he loses this mass, then he doesn't remember his past life. See, he thinks he's brand-new and fresh, right there. See how this would be? Lose the mass, lose the memory. Get the mass, and very often, recover the memory – so that you have a fellow's memory sometimes getting better after he's been in an auto accident. Smash! Peps him up, gives him some new somatics and new ridges. His memory is better. You also find it getting much worse sometimes after such a situation. Amnesia, by the way, is an interesting manifestation of a thetan going away and picking up another body.

Now let's go into the fact that MEST knows. And let's understand this pretty clearly. Anybody who goes over the line, when he himself can't know, decides that MEST knows. Knowingness could be divided into the knowingness which is simply the thetan knowing, and on the other hand could be a fixed datum – MEST doing the knowingness for him.

Now, let me point out to you that a small cannon knows it's a small cannon – doesn't know anything else. But it sure knows it's a small cannon, doesn't it? In other words, that's an identification knowingness. And somebody comes along and finds this a very, very easy way to remember this.

The cannon knows it's a cannon; there it is – this is the way it looks, you know? This is a rather aberrated view, by the way, but this is the way it looks to people. A cannon knows it's a cannon. That's all it knows. And John Jones knows he's John Jones. That's all he knows. You get a similarity here?

When a fellow can't solve any problems at all, he picks on the most obvious identity he can and becomes that, because he is given the picture of *NEST* out here all the time doing that. This wall knows it's a wall; it doesn't know anything else, it just knows it's a wall. That's what he thinks about that wall, see? He thinks the wall knows it's a wall because it's in the form of a wall. And when he looks at it, he knows it's a wall. It's identified. It has an identification.

All right, the wall is a symbol – a symbol. It's a solid symbol. A symbol has mass, meaning and mobility. Remember this: A symbol has mass, meaning and mobility. Where does it get mass, meaning and mobility? Particularly though, where does it get its meaning? It gets its meaning from the orientation point. What is the orientation point? It is the viewpoint from which the space is made, to make the space in which the symbol moves. Orientation point. Viewpoint. It is that point of viewness which is making the space which knows what the symbol is and where it is moving. Very often a preclear's orientation point is his mother – or his father or his grandparents or the army, or something. That's his orientation point. See?

And as he moves around, he moves in relationship to this orientation point. Remember, the orientation point is always fixed – thought of as being fixed – and if the orientation point moves, then this symbol gets lost. Mass, meaning and mobility – a symbol has mass, meaning and mobility. It gets its mass, meaning and mobility, it even

gets the space in which it moves – it thinks – from the person that is doing the viewing in that particular life.

So we get somebody depending upon Mama as an orientation point, and then Mama dies, and after this the fellow feels lost. Now, all things in the universe are moving in relationship to other things, so therefore we have to think of one space as being motionless, don't we? One *point*, rather, in space, has to be motionless in order to measure the motion of all other points. See, we've always got to have one point and consider that one point fixed in order to get the movement of other points, and to check and orient the movement of other points.

If we consider all points in motion and no points fixed, we have chaos. And that is the definition of chaos. If you're asked on an examination what chaos is, it would be all points in motion, no point fixed. How do you straighten out a chaos? You get one point not in motion.

Now, how on earth are you going to do this if all points are really in motion? Well, they're only really in motion because the preclear considers they are. So let's have him fix one point.

This person, every time he's lost his orientation point ... You know, he moved away from his small town and went to the big city. A small town was his orientation point. Every time he's lost this, that, other orientation points, he just gets more and more lost, more and more lost. And finally all points start to go into motion as far as he's concerned. Then the small town isn't fixed and the city isn't fixed and earth isn't fixed and nothing's fixed and everything is just moving.

Well, the remedy for that is to have him pick out, choose, a fixed point, and simply select it as a fixed point and see how other points are moving in relationship to it.

What's this got to do with Straightwire? Straightwire is *all* conducted by symbols. Symbols are things which have mass, meaning and mobility. The bank itself has mass, meaning and mobility. An engram is simply a symbol – the words are simply symbols. So therefore, there must be an orientation point somewhere. And if the preclear himself is lost, if he considers himself also in motion, and all the engrams and particles around him in motion, how on earth are you ever going to give this boy any straightening out at all?

The remedy of it is try to make an orientation point out of him. We make an orientation point out of him by showing him that he is in a time. See, well, that's a big jump, you know; he's in a time. We make him find the walls of the room and walk around and touch them. Yes, but you've got him moving, haven't you? Oh, not particularly. He can move – at least he sees the walls are motionless. So he'll choose and then he'll have the walls motionless, see? You make him actually dramatize being a symbol, which is what he's dramatizing. You make him move around in relationship to some fixed walls – one of the reasons it works.

Well now, on Straightwire, remember that a fellow could get into such a chaos of particles, chaos of incidents and a chaos of unknownness – theoretically – he could get into all this chaos of everything moving where he'd be moving too, and he'd just get lost and disoriented and he wouldn't know where he was and he'd be in a fog. That is the state a preclear is in, who is in a fog. See, everything's in motion.

So, we had better have him be in present time for Straightwire. Straightwire demands as part of its conditions that the preclear be in present time while he is, and we are remembering then. We are not then returning him down the track to these incidents, are we? We're just going to have him be in present time and recall these incidents, and maybe point out where they occurred, and tell you when they occurred, and what they occurred

to.

But we're making an orientation point out of him with Straightwire, and we are making all these engrams – meaning symbols, objects, places and times – into symbols, which is what they should be, what they are. And as far as the preclear's concerned, there's only one orientation point anywhere that could exist, and that happens to be himself. He is his best orientation point. So we go in the direction, then, of having him be able to handle these symbols of memory – these engrams, these locks, things like that. He has to be able to handle these symbols of memory before he himself can consider that he himself is not a symbol.

And when he can handle all of these symbols as memory, he then considers himself to be an orientation point and so to have some fixity. Then the world can move in relationship to him. This isn't bad – this isn't bad. It's bad when it's done obsessively. You know, the fellow says, "I'm the only one alive." Well, that is the basic obsessive dramatization of insisting on being an orientation point without knowing what one is doing. The difference between an obsession and a sane action is just that. There isn't any other difference of condition, except that a person with an obsession does not know he's doing it. He doesn't know he's the author of the obsession. And a person who is... simply knows he is the author wouldn't have an obsession, he'd simply be sane. Okay?

Elementary Straightwire is recommended to you on cases which are having a great deal of difficulty, and I repeat to you, Elementary Straightwire consists of ARC Straightwire just as given, next-to-the-last list, *Self Analysis*, and "Something you wouldn't mind remembering" and "Something you wouldn't mind forgetting." And that is Elementary Straightwire. And all these other characteristics which I have given you are added to it, are piled up on it, and have a great deal to do with it, of course. And the first thing you want to know is how to utilize, with the Auditor's Code and interest, Straightwire, in order to make a preclear into a better orientation point and much less of a symbol than he is.

If you can do that properly, you've done it.

Okay.

# OPENING PROCEDURE OF 8-C

*A lecture given on  
8 October 1954*

Today, I would like to talk to you about Opening Procedure 8-C.

Opening Procedure 8-C is the most single important mechanical process that we have, and just because it is a single important mechanical process is no reason to believe that it doesn't have a precision. It is not a speculative science. It's a process.

I want to make that very clear. 8-C's Opening Procedure is not a variable process. It works as it works, as it is put together. And a great deal of innovation on the part of the auditor – the introduction of a considerable amount of significance, consideration, into the touching of walls and so forth – is destructive of the process. This is a process which is without significance. It is done without significance.

As far as the preclear is concerned, there is no reason why he is touching the wall. He is simply touching the wall. Now, let's make that very clear. We don't tell the preclear, "All right. You see that spot up there? Now get an idea what it is, get interested in it. Now go over and touch it."

No. See, this is adding significances into the process. "Now, you see that spot over on the wall? Go over and touch it. Fine. You see that hinge of the door? Touch it. Do you see the handle of the door there? Touch that."

No significance. No significance of any kind introduced into the process at all.

Now, I'm going to leave it up to your Instructor to give you the exact commands of 8-C, give you precision demonstration of it, because it is certainly best learned by an observation of its being done. The process is found, as it exists today, in Issue 24-G of the *Journal of Scientology*, where it is given as the Opening Procedure (three parts) of 8-C.

And it was initially and originally invented by myself to give the auditor an opportunity to observe whether or not the preclear was capable of or willing to obey the orders of the auditor.

Now, we look at the basic on this and we discover that many of the cases who were being processed and who were not progressing during processing were not progressing simply because they were not following the auditing command.

This was true of running engrams, and where the running of engrams broke down, it was because the auditor could not intimately observe whether or not the preclear actually was running what he was told to run.

Now, a survey conducted over a group of twenty, where eight of the cases were not making progress, and where we were getting a big "nothing happens, nothing happens, nothing happens," finally elicited a confession from all those eight people that they had yet to obey and execute the auditor's command. And here were people who had ostensibly been under auditing for 250 hours on the average.

Well, this should tell you something. This should tell you something very, very positively: That if your preclear sitting there or lying there on the couch – they don't lie on a couch anymore – but sitting there in the chair, is getting no communication change,

please mark it up as a positive, observed fact that he is not doing the process the auditor is asking him to do. Now, this is a hard thing for us to accept, isn't it?

This has been true of *every ... Ah*, let me underscore this. If there was some way I could write this in italics or balls of fire, I would. But *this has been the factor behind the failure of every technique and process, when it failed, of Dianetics from the first days of its first issuance, right through till now.*

And there's no reason whatsoever to suppose at any moment – that by some necromancy, or the intervention of Yahweh – to believe that preclears suddenly, because we have new techniques, will cease to do this.

When they don't get a comm lag, when they aren't progressing, they aren't executing the order given!

Now, one preclear told me rather brightly and brilliantly one time ... He was audited for a whole week. We gave him an intensive, you know. And at the end of that week he had not gotten any better at all. And I brought him in and confidentially said to him with a kind of a little snicker, you know, "Well, I guess you sure got around the auditor, didn't you?"

He said, "Yeah, I sure did!" And he said, "Thirty hours," he said, "but during that time I did get a lot of processing in. You know, I processed various locks, and so forth."

And I went and got a hold of that auditor, and I said, "For the love of Saint Christopher, what can possibly be going on that you could audit a person for thirty hours, particularly at that tone level, and not suspect that he had yet to execute ..."

"Oh, yes, he executed all of them," this auditor said. "Well, he said so all the time. He gave me the proper responses for all of this sort of thing."

Oh, boy! Hm! How grim can we get? In other words, the Foundation had simply thrown away at that time thirty hours worth of auditing.

Well now, I investigated around and I found out that preclears were so able at doing this that auditors very often could not detect it. And I went over the Tone Scale with auditors very carefully. And I showed them the Chart of Human Evaluation as given in *Science of Survival*.

And I showed them right there where it says "neurological illness." You know, it says right straight across the line under "lies": "person is incapable of doing or telling the truth." And they will demonstrate that in auditing.

Now, this may seem very oppressive to you. This may seem like a tremendous distrust in the human race. No, it is not a distrust in the human race. Disentangle that immediately. Because what it is, is a misprediction of the human race to believe that somebody at that level of the Tone Scale will execute auditing commands.

They won't – unless they are so closely and so intimately supervised that the auditor has no doubt in his mind as to what is going forward with this preclear.

And that was why Opening Procedure 8-C was born. The only reason it was used at first was to discover and demonstrate and lay out a pattern of obedience of an auditing command.

When it was first born, it was in a simpler form. You just simply told the fellow to go over and put his finger on the wall and take it off again.

And then it was discovered – I found out much to my amazement – that this was a tough process whenever you asked somebody to make up his mind when he was going to take his finger off the wall, and so forth. And I found out there were three steps.

Roughly, the three steps are the auditor doing all the direction, making it unnecessary for the preclear to make a choice. The next step is to give the preclear the opportunity to

make a choice. You see, you gave the preclear no opportunity to make a choice that first time. And that, by the way, is quite agreeable to almost every case level.

Every once in a while somebody will say, "Opening Procedure of 8-C was too tough for this case."

Aw, just take a long look down your nose at that auditor, would you please. for me. Because he was not running it A, B, C, you see, the three parts. What he was doing was asking the fellow to make a choice.

He'd ask the fellow, "Now, pick out a spot on that wall and go over and put your finger on it."

Oh, no! I mean, he's asked the fellow to pick out a spot. The fellow ... There's five spots on the wall that are obvious ones – old nicks and tacks, and things like that – and yes, this is too tough for the preclear. Now, you wouldn't believe it, but it is; it's too tough. The preclear will look at all those five and he has to make a choice amongst those five and it's too much for him. See? Beyond him.

So the auditor picks them out for Step A. And then, in Step B, he permits the preclear to make a choice. This is the anatomy, really, of the process.

And when the preclear can make, freely, choices amongst spots, you know, and do it with great alacrity and with great certainty, and suddenly pick up a spot and go over and touch it, and so on, then you go on to having him make up his mind *when* he is going to touch the spot and *when* he is going to let go of the spot.

But it takes, sometimes, a lot of hours of Part A and Part B before you can ask anybody to make up his mind doing such a thing.

By the way, in running Shifting Attention by Duplication, you can simply ask a person to make up his mind when he's going to take his attention off one of the objects and put it on the other object. And he's liable to fall flat on the floor, whereas he could do it before. He could, at the auditor's direction, simply take his attention off the object and put it back on the object and take it off and put it back.

But you ask him to make up his mind *when* he is going to take it off and you're going to have a preclear go ssszzrrrn-crash! See, it's just too much for him. It's pretty hard to imagine that people can get into this kind of condition, but that's the kind of condition they're in.

Well, we have to face up to the reality of preclears in order to get an accurate prediction of them. The accuracy of prediction is that almost any preclear you run into who is having any difficulty whatsoever in life or with his body is in need of a considerable dosage of Opening Procedure 8-C. And he's in need of a lot of it.

The method of giving the command must be remembered. The auditor is interestedly telling the preclear to undertake a physical action and to make and break contact with the physical universe. You got that? And 8-C is totally and 100 percent devoted to objects, walls, barriers of this character. Totally devoted to that.

Spotting Spots in Space is far, far, far too tough for your preclear. It'll just blow him up. It just reduces his havingness all over the place.

All right. If this is the case, then we had better be very alert to the value of this process. It is, as I said, easy to demonstrate. It is very easy for your instructor to demonstrate this process to you.

As he demonstrates it, he'll simply take a person and, running Part A pick out spots for the person to go over and touch, make sure that the person goes over and touches these spots – and doesn't even tell him to let go of them; just goes over and "Touch the spot." And the auditor picks out another spot and has the person go over and touch that spot.

And that is all there is to it. See? The auditor picks out the spot and he tells the fellow to go over and touch the spot.

See that? That is all there is to it. There's nothing else. There isn't any complexity entered into that process at all at Step A.

Now we get a complexity ... Every once in a while an auditor suddenly alerts to the fact that, you know, he quite ordinarily omits Step A. You know, he tells the preclear to pick out a spot as his first step. And with most auditors this is associated with 8-C, which is Part B.

Part B is the auditor tells the preclear, "All right. Go over and take a look at that wall. Pick out a spot on it. You got it? All right. Go over and touch it. Fine. Pick out another spot on it. Touch it." That would be the most elementary command and, by the way, the most elementary thing here is the best thing.

Now, when he has done that for a long time – you know, told him to pick out a spot and touch it, and told him to pick out another spot and touch it, and told him to pick out another spot and touch it – *then* he says, "All right, pick out a spot on that wall. Go over and touch it. Okay." And he shifts over to C, you see. And he says, "All right. Now, make up your mind when you're going to touch it, and touch it. Now, don't let go of it. Make up your mind when you're going to touch it and touch it. Okay, now make up your mind when you're going to let go of it and let go of it." Bang, bang. Preclear will do this.

"All right. Pick out another spot somewhere in the room. Good. Now make up your mind when you're going to touch it. Touch it. Make up your mind when you are going to let go of it, now. Let go of it. Okay." See? That is all there is to it.

But the number of variable actions which can take place on the part of your preclear, the number of things he can say, very often gets the auditor to disobey part of the Auditor's Code and vary the process, changing because the preclear is changing, you see. And the auditor will start to get – this is the error that an auditor makes in this – he will start to get very significant in doing one or another parts of 8-C. He'll start to get very, very significant, you know?

Like he puts an orange up on the dresser, you know, and he says, "All right, now, spot a spot on that orange. And, now, is it an orange? Have you touched it? All right. Now pick it up in the air and examine it very, very carefully. Now put it down. And ..." This is not an indicated part of this process.

It's not a bad process, but it's not 8-C. You see that? I mean, we're just adding some frills, and so forth. An auditor only does this when he finds it unbearable to experience what he considers to be the monotony of ordering somebody around.

Well, believe me, it's more auditing for that auditor to order another body and human being around, and have it actually execute what he says, than anything else you could do to an auditor. Because he is regaining his ability to give people orders.

Ah! So this one works both ways. How could you possibly get a restimulation? Well, you could get a restimulation because the auditor's inability to duplicate is such that he can't stand even the variability of 8-C, you see.

8-C is quite variable; it's quite fluid. The idea of having this preclear walk around, you see, and do nothing but touch a spot and make up his mind when he is going to let go of it and let go of it. And the auditor has a tendency to run Part A for ten minutes and Part B for fifteen minutes and Part C for twenty minutes, and say, "Well, that's that; I've run 8-C."

Oh, no, he hasn't. It would go quite the reverse. If he really was in there pitching and he had some preclear ... By the way, let me give you these categories of preclears. When

we say tough preclear, we mean an insane preclear or a neurotic preclear or a preclear with a psychosomatic illness, because he is physiologically insane – Book One, *Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health*. You remember that? Hm?

Psychosomatic illness is physiological insanity. It is being expressed by the body rather than by the mind. And it's nonetheless insane, even though your boy is perfectly sane. See, mentally he's perfectly sane. Physiologically, he's crazy.

So somebody shows up that has a bad case of sinus. Does this indicate that you immediately do everything that you can think of to try to immediately get interested in, get him interested in, have him get interested for, his sinus? – and walk him around, because he talks to you rationally, because he can think, because he can compute, because he's got eighteen college degrees or no college degrees, hm? Is this indicated because this fellow talks to you rather clearly, because he doesn't seem to have any particular communication lag, you know, in his speech with you? Is it indicated, then, that you should go into a tougher, deeper process? Boy, it sure is not. Because you are looking at physiological insanity!

Let's be real crude with the usage of this word *insanity*. It doesn't mean anything in this society anyhow. It means something that is irrationally out of control. Well, you could say actually an automobile careening down the street without a driver at the wheel is insane. Or one being driven by an Arizona state highway policeman is insane. I mean, either way you want to look at it.

I don't want to get the Arizona State Highway Patrol in bad. And I don't mean to mention them too arduously. And actually, I have absolutely nothing against them. There's hardly anything there to have anything against, except that their licensing of people – by the lousiness of their testing before they give licenses – completely evades any information such as you have in Dianetics and Scientology. They just hand them out. They give anybody a license. They go down there and make two right turns. If they can make two right turns they're all set. And then the highway patrol can get very, very busy picking these wrecks up and cursing these drivers, and having this terrifically arduous schedule.

Only 10 percent of those drivers – only 10 percent ... ! I'm giving you a practical application, actually. Only 10 percent of those drivers out there are going to cause any accidents. They're trying to succumb, so they want you to succumb, too, and we don't want them on the roads. And the place to pick them up is when you give them their ticket to drive. And you pick them up by their ability to drive and their fitness in life. And then you license them and let them drive.

Why would it do utterly no good to issue a license to anybody and then make tough penalties? Well, let's get a practical application of Opening Procedure 8-C – real practical.

It's because these individuals who cause those accidents are at a level on the Tone Scale that finds them utterly incapable of reading, understanding or obeying an order! So it doesn't matter how many arrests you make or how many regulations you pass or how many speed signs you put up or how many little Boy Scouts with tin badges you've got riding around on the highways being nasty to everybody. It doesn't matter! You're still going to have that 10 percent out there speeding, going through stop signs, careening out of alleys, driving cars with tires about to blow out, and just aching, you see, to smack you off.

See, what difference does it make how many regulations? The only thing we can assume is that this organization and the highway departments around here must be so inverted that they have to fix it up so they can fight with themselves. They have to create a



situation which they can then fight.

But do you see this? Because if the number of preclears you get demonstrates the percentage that will not be able to follow an order while they're sitting in an auditing chair – if not supervised by making them walk around the room – what do you think would occur out in the society at large?

So what good would it be to have ordinances of any kind, or regulations or orders or rules? Now, that's a practical application in life. I'm not particularly hot against the Arizona State Highway Patrol. They are no worse, no better than California, New York, Pennsylvania. New Jersey is the big kick. They wear Fifth Invader Force Uniforms. One hundred percent. And all those boys are so keyed in they don't know whether it is traffic going by or flying saucers – just as a side comment.

But let's look at this now, and apply this broadly and generally to life: If you're going to lay down regulations over a whole mass of people, there's going to be a percentage there that will be incapable ... It isn't that they want to be even disobedient or go the opposite direction or anything like that. They're just incapable, utterly – oh, they're seemingly very intelligent people – of reading an order and understanding it and then obeying it. A big number there, you see. Very big number.

Well, if this is the case in the auditing chair, it's the case in the society. What you're doing is terrifically practical. Very practical – nothing if not practical.

So let's just knock it out right now, that the largest percentage of your preclears are going to be able to follow orders, because you're getting a very large number of that 10 percent in the auditing chair. You're getting people who are sick. If somebody's sick, somehow or another he can't follow orders – follow me? – so that we're going to discover that this is the biggest jump you're going to get them across. It isn't that it's a good thing to follow orders. But it's a very bad thing to have to resist them. You see that? It's an entirely different thing.

We don't want to make a slave out of this preclear. If we did, we could dream up processes that would have him in a state of any citizen in the country. We could have him paying taxes and not caring who spent them, and so forth. We could put him into a dreadful condition in no time at all.

So anybody that tells you, by the way, that either 8-C or Opening Procedure by Duplication is an effort to make slaves out of people, you say, "What do you think we are? A bunch of amateurs? You know, if we wanted to make slaves out of people – we'd probably start with you – boy, what couldn't we do! Ha!" We would simply include all of psychiatry into our practices as one measure.

Well, that is the simplest look at 8-C, the simplest rationale behind it: Get the preclear to follow orders. If he won't follow orders, if he won't follow directions, then he can't give himself a command in life and obey it.

He says to himself, "Well, I think I will go over and see Aunt Mamie," and he stops in at the local bar and he never gets over to Aunt Mamie's. He wonders how this happened.

He had good intentions of going over and seeing Aunt Mamie. She was sick, after all, and died the next day. But he had good intentions. But somehow or the other, he got into this bar. Now, how did he get into the bar? This is the subject of orders, isn't it?

You know, they say a place called hell is one of the most beautifully paved areas anywhere, and has the most gorgeous paving. Its paving is made exclusively out of good intentions. Isn't that right?

Well, what good is a good intention if it can't be executed as an order? And that's all that's wrong with a good intention – the only reason hell would be paved with it. It's never

executed as an order; a person can't carry it out or couldn't receive it fully or entirely.

How many people have misunderstood your intentions with regard to them? Hm? You can think it over and come up with a dozen right offhand if you wanted to. How many people have misunderstood your intentions? You had perfectly good intentions around them and, gee, what they made out of these things.

Well, they are doing the same thing with their own bank. As a thetan, they might be trying to dream themselves up a decent existence, and it keeps going into bypasses and so on. They can't obey their own orders.

Well, if they can't obey their own orders then they're a robot that is just wound up and let go down the street like an automobile with no driver. You can say very well of most preclears – when you say "their self-determinism" – you can say "*What* self-determinism?"

I was quite curious one time. I was auditing one of the better auditors. He had been in an altercation with someone who had been in a highly executive position right over him, and this person was on a school board.

And so I asked this auditor, "How about you just changing your mind about this person's orders?"

And he did. (He was exteriorized very nicely.)

"All right. Now, how about changing that person's mind about you?" "Oh," the fellow said, "I couldn't do that. That would interfere with that person's self-determinism."

And I said, "Take another look."

"Oh," he says, "*what* self-determinism!"

No determinism present. It's just random. It's like you throw dice, you know, into a cup and scatter them around and the fellow intends to go to the ball game: He shakes the dice, he puts it out, and the dice say something else. And he doesn't go to the ball game. You know? People just go through life like an ion knocking around in a tube. You know, bang-bang-bang-bang – just anything that deflects them, there they go!

Now, I'm being very hard on the human race – very, very hard. "Why," you say, "would you do anything for the human race at all if you feel this badly about the human race?"

Well, I am just demonstrating to you that the Chart of Attitudes, as contained in the *Handbook for Preclears* discovers that an auditor should be absolutely topside all the way across the line. Every top button of the Chart of Attitudes should be an auditor's consideration of existence, except one: Trust!

And that column ought to be completely reversed for an auditor, so that it's Distrust at the top. He shouldn't trust a preclear as far as he can touch him. He shouldn't – just for these reasons.

I have had the most mild, the most charming, the most plausible preclears you ever saw, sit down in an auditing chair and swear – and would have sworn on stacks of Bibles – that they were running the auditing command. *Hmn-mm*.

You'd say, "All right, now let's remember a time that's really real to you," and they'd get a couple of locks on Effort Processing, which they were doing privately, you see, about the times their mother beat them. Oh, this is real wild, but that is what they do.

Now, I want to call to your attention how orders and commands fit in with this. Do you know that all of Book One, *Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health*, is devoted to only two things, really, basically. The things that are stressed in that book are only two things: one, orders and commands as they are represented as coming from the engram bank, and present time. The fellow is stuck on the time track or someplace else

than here.

You notice now? That book is devoted to those two highly stressed points. There's a lot of other things in that book, but those are the main points. You recognize that?

So commands, as engramic phrases and all that sort of thing, are primary. And present time is primary with that book.

And that's 8-C. Present time: You're giving him present time because that is all the present time he'll have. And you're showing him that it won't kill him to obey a command, and he stops resisting commands. And the moment he stops resisting commands, engram orders cease to operate on him. So give it well, give it long, give it correctly, and it works from beginning to end.

The only thing ever that's going to be wrong with you in auditing a case will be the fact – as you will say to yourself, woefully, afterwards – "I didn't give him enough Opening Procedure of 8-C."

As I have told you, I fully expect your Instructor to give you the firmest sort of a demonstration on this. And I'm trying to drive home here the basic theory of 8-C, and I'm trying to give you as best we can the precision with which 8-C must be done.

8-C has these three parts. Now, don't believe for a moment that you can simply skip around in these parts. They are arranged in the degree that a preclear can follow them. And you do Part A, and then you do Part B, and then you do Part C. But how long would you do Part A?

Well, to give you some kind of an idea of this, I would say that you might be able to get an idea by the fact that we are giving auditors who are going to be giving intensives and – directions and instructions on this of about fifteen hours of 8-C on a preclear.

And of those fifteen hours, of course, we would break down Parts A, B and C more or less as we wished, but certainly it would be five, five and five. You see? Five hours of A before you would go on to B. And then five hours of B before you went on to C. At least that.

You will find, however, that it's staggered. It probably should be eight hours of Part A, you see. And then a lesser number of B, and the final number of C, which would be relatively short – maybe only a couple of hours of Part C.

All right. Here's a process – the foremost mechanical process of Dianetics and Scientology, and belongs in both sciences.

One of the things it does is finish off and demonstrate to us rather clearly what was going on with Book One. You sat down and started to audit somebody very nicely, and you wanted him to run an engram, and some locks, you know, and so forth. And he said he was doing it, and apparently this was what was going on – dodge, dodge, dodge, dodge, dodge.

Sometimes they would be overt enough to tell you they were dodging, but if they were really having a difficult time they would never tell you. They would never be running that engram. And that is a primary point of failure on Book One.

Now, in addition to that, we were trying to resolve engrams only because they had a command value on the preclear. So let's solve the command value of engrams simply by making this person capable of accepting and executing an order directly.

Now, there's one phrase that an auditor can inject into any part of 8-C: "Who touched it?" or "Who's doing it?" The fellow will tell you, "Hmm-mmm . . ." You'd be surprised. Some psychotic: "My hand is doing it. My finger is doing it." Something on that order. He won't say, "I'm doing it."

And gradually he gets up to the realization that he is doing it. And this will come as a

new and novel thing to him: There's a driver behind the wheel of the car. So, an auditor can ask this anytime he wants to: "Who's doing it? Who's touching it?" – see, just to point up this fact.

But he shouldn't get novel. Nothing is required of him to vary the process so as to make it very drastically interesting to the preclear. He will be fascinated to discover that it is a very interesting process to a preclear. A preclear can go on and do it and do it and do it and do it and do it. It's fabulous.

Now, I want to take up with you some of the more fundamental theory underlying such a thing as 8-C. But, of course, it's a fundamental theory which underlies practically everything. And this is the concept of pan-determinism.

Now, you'll hear a lot of this word, and you will wonder what this is all about. There are efforts in even Book One to give some sort of an idea of what we meant by self-determinism.

Now, survival is on eight dynamics. Book One – there are four dynamics. There are four dynamics because we were only covering the subject of mankind, you see. But there is, nevertheless, survival on eight dynamics. Self-determinism would be survival on eight dynamics, wouldn't it? But that's a misnomer, isn't it? And everybody has misunderstood that word ever since, so let's get it straight right now.

If self-determinism is on eight dynamics, and nobody understands this because you keep calling it self-determinism and the first dynamic is the dynamic of self, this confusion had better be resolved by the introduction of a new word called pan-determinism. Pan simply means across. Pan-determinism. So we have pan-dynamic, see. So the fellow is determined on eight dynamics; we would say he was pan determined.

And it's quit different than self-determined the way it is normally been understood. Now, the odd part of it is, that auditing is a problem in the third dynamic. It is always a problem in the third dynamic whether you like it or not. There is the analyzer or the thetan, which analyzer or thetan or awareness of awareness unit – whatever you want to call it – is capable of determining the course of the body. We have several parts there. The awareness of awareness unit, the thetan, has machinery. He has various odds and ends of automaticities which serve *him*. And then there is the body which has a reactive bank which serves *it*.

So the awareness of awareness unit has certain types of intimate machinery and computers which serve it, you see, and then the body has a whole category of machinery – which is mentioned in Book One; we called it the somatic mind, you see. The body is served by this automatic machinery which runs the body and then by another type of machinery, which we called in Book One the reactive mind, you see, which actually did thinking on a body level.

But this reactive mind and the somatic mind actually are two things which don't cleave apart very easily. They're very closely associated. The body acts as it does, keeps the form it does, because of the reactive mind – just no more and no less than this. We could delete, then, contrasurvival experiences from this reactive mind; we'd find the body being more alert and working better, wouldn't we? But if we deleted the entire 100 percent somatic and reactive mind, of course, such interesting things would happen as the heart would stop and the body would stop breathing, because this is on that same type of machinery.

All right. We have in man, then – in a human being – a composite picture: We have this awareness of awareness unit, the thetan, the awareness of awareness unit with its

various computers. And then we have the body with its sets of computers. And we have, then (1) the analyzer (awareness of awareness unit, thetan), (2) his computers and machinery, (3) the body itself as a form, and (4) the reactive-somatic machinery which operates the body. And there's one other thing. There's one other thing which is part of this somatic machinery, and this you might call the electronic structure of the body. The body has anchor points scattered through it, which, when they become shattered or disarranged, changes the space picture of the body. So this is another thing which would be (5). Five things here.

Sometimes you ask somebody to close his eyes and look around; he does this very easily. Sometimes you have to work on him for a while to get him to do this, but he can see the golden balls, golden sheen of connected links which make up the electronic structure of the body itself.

And he'll all of a sudden realize that one of these is out of position, so we ask him to mock several up in proper position and throw them away. And he exhausts the charge that's on that area and the proper anchor point will move back in – snap! It's a little fabulous mechanism. Beneath all of this skin and bone, you see, the thing that holds it together and gives it space is this electronic structure, which is actually no more and no less than an electronic terminal pattern that goes through the body. It's quite curious. It holds the body in the shape it's in, keeps it in that space.

Now, if we have these five things and they are all interacting, and we're processing this preclear with all these five things there, why, Lord help us. We're not dealing with a first dynamic, are we? We are dealing with a third-dynamic problem. And on the Know to Sex Scale, we of course run in the second-dynamic problem too, so we're actually dealing with the first, second and third dynamic simultaneously. It's pretty hard to do.

All right. Let's look at the whole subject of pan-determinism and find out that we had better, then, include everything and anything that we're going to run into by simply saying let's include the eight dynamics and say that we want determinism on these eight dynamics. And that's what we're striking for. And strangely and peculiarly, if you do this and if you add this up and look at it this way, all of a sudden cases that were hung-fire start to resolve. And this is pan-determinism.

Pan-determinism means "the willingness of an individual to monitor two or more identities, whether or not opposing." That's the definition. "The willingness or ability of the individual to monitor two or more identities, whether or not opposed."

In other words, here are two people in a fight. A third individual there is perfectly willing to take *both* sides of the fight. You see that? He's willing to take both sides, therefore he's pan-determined.

Now, let's differentiate by using self-determined – again, somewhat improperly – by saying he's self-determined if he's taking one side of this fight and fighting the other side. You see, he's immediately selected out the other side as not determined by him. And the only way you can get into a fight, actually, is go into the subject of self-determinism exclusive of pan-determinism.

Now, this is all covered in Book One under "viewpoints." It says that a duck has one idea and the hunter has the other idea. Remember that? Well, a pan-determined attitude would be able to be willing to handle or control either the duck or the hunter or both, see. And actually this comes down into beingness: being willing to be the duck or the hunter or both simultaneously. That's pan-determinism.

Well, orders are intimately connected with determinism, aren't they? Other-

determinism simply is something else giving you orders or directions. Even though it is simply a wall standing in front of you telling you you can't go through it, it is still giving you an order, isn't it? It's saying, "You can't go through me. Stay back. Stay on this side of me." It's giving you an order.

And so an individual who is only partially determined, such as self-determined, would then find himself in the position of being stopped by barriers. But an individual who is not just self-determined, but is pan-determined, would not find himself stuck by any barrier anywhere.

And a barrier, of course, consists of matter, energy, space or time – in any one of those things are barriers, limitations or restrictions.

Now, as the total subject – the *total subject* – of aberration is the subject of restriction (see, nothing falls outside this restriction), and the total subject of sanity is summed under freedom. We have freedom versus restriction. So we have partial determinism, which is to say self-determinism, under restriction; and under pan-determinism you have an unimaginably total freedom of freedom. See, pan-determinism, freedom; self-determinism, restriction. I am "I" and therefore I have to fight.

Now, actually, the only way to win that fight is to be both sides. Any time a fellow walks up to you and sticks a gun in your stomach, the thing to do is not stand there and quiver and hope that he won't shoot. The thing to do is to be the other fellow too, and go away. That's very efficient, isn't it. Very effective.

However, man likes to fight in the lower scales, so that we find him slicing up his pan-determinism in such a way as to bring about a game. And when we talk about pan-determinism we're talking immediately about games. In order to have a game you have to have an opponent, don't you? So the minute you get an opponent, you want him to be as self-determined as possible, and not determining you, but you not determining him. You ever try to play chess by yourself? If you ever did, you will discover that you considered yourself a complete fraud as you slid around to the other side of the board and made the move. You didn't baffle yourself at all.

Now, you have to have a complete schism between you and you in order to be two players of the same game. You have to say that's a different identity, and so forth. And so you get individuation. This is the subject of individuation of pan-determinism.

But the road up through and past force is best followed by taking the route of pan-determinism and using those processes contained in Intensive Procedure which immediately and intimately process pan-determinism. There is a process in there that immediately processes it.

It's a wonderful process, but you start in on a preclear and you start to process him with this, he won't follow the auditing command in order to regain his pan-determinism. The only way you can absolutely be sure that that is occurring: if he goes around and touches the walls.

All right, now let's just take a good look at that and see that he could not run a process, then, which the auditor could not observe. So as an auditor, you want to be able to observe this process.

Now, another subject that comes up here is the subject of defenses. A body is very, very unhappy if it doesn't have any defenses. Now, let's take up the difference between the awareness of awareness unit – the thetan – and the body. The thetan without a body – the awareness of awareness unit not monitoring a body – is still the individual, is still his awareness, is still his alertness. But it doesn't happen to have much use for barriers, because it can go straight through them. It doesn't know they exist. It doesn't recognize a

barrier.

And the body, on the other hand, *has to* be able to recognize a barrier. So we get somebody around – and she says, "All is illusion. All is illusion. All is illusion." As long as she's talking about an awareness of awareness unit, yes, the awareness of awareness unit is perfectly willing to buy this "All is illusion. All is illusion," you see, "Nothing is solid. Matter is really not there."

Oh, but the body is a very unhappy thing over this. You ask somebody to spot some spots in space while he's in a body, and he gets sick at his stomach. The body gets unhappy about no restriction. The body desires restrictions. The slave loves his chains. You got that?

And it's all right to say, "All is illusion." Yes, as far as the awareness of awareness unit, that is true; all is illusion. But it's not true as far as the body is concerned. And if you convince a body that all is illusion and that nothing is solid, the immediate result of this is that the body is going to decay, fall to pieces and get very sick indeed.

They go mad. Because it's not true for a body that there are no barriers. The body has, loves, wants, needs barriers.

So here's this thing that knows it's all illusion up against and monitoring a thing which *knows* that there are barriers. And between these two things we get the most horrible muddle you ever heard of.

So 8-C cheers the body up to a point of where it'll stop dragging energy out of the awareness of awareness unit and will straighten itself up and start to fly right simply because you are telling it "Hey, look. Look, fellow. A barrier! Ah, boy. A barrier."

And after a while the fellow says, "You know, things are getting more real." You know? And he's feeling better, and so on. What's he getting there? He's becoming aware of the fact that there are barriers.

Now, I must tell you that a great many people believe there's no barriers under their feet – maybe an eighteenth of an inch; just as much as they can see of the top surface of the rug, but underneath the rug they do not think anything exists. So ask them to stamp once in a while when you have them find a spot on the floor – a little variation there. Ask them to test that floor and try to knock a hole in it. And they'll be very relieved to find out they can't knock a hole in it. They were pretty sure before that they had to sort of cat-foot along, you know, because there was nothing under them.

People who have acrophobia, fear of falling, and so forth, are much more numerous than you would believe. Many ways of handling this. Many, many ways of handling this. Best way of handling it is, offhand, just 8-C, Opening Procedure.

So this becomes a highly fascinating subject, doesn't it? It's a demonstration of barriers to the body. Well, you'd say, "Then the thetan sooner or later would also begin to believe there are barriers if you went on running this technique forever." No, the strange thing of it is, the body, slacking off and getting less worried and so forth, makes it possible for the awareness of awareness unit to back off. The body now is more secure.

Everything is looking for security, perhaps. If it's looking for security, it's looking for defenses. See that? So you're telling the fellow, "Look. You're not standing naked before all the winds of the world; there are some defenses." That's what you are saying every minute that you run this process.

So you don't have to add any significances, do you? Look what you're doing. You're working right straight up toward pan-determinism with this process, and you're convincing the body that there are some defenses and that it is protected, and showing it it won't die if it follows an order, which is under pan-determinism. And you are

demonstrating to it the existence of present time.

Now, let's not neglect this. Many, many years ago I was asking people to contact the environment instead of telling them to come up to present time. Long time ago. But "Come up to present time" was good enough. It's good enough so that you could walk through a sanitarium and go through its halls and say to every patient that you met in the halls, "Come up to present time," and you would get several spectacular, immediate returns to sanity.

Why? He's stuck on the time track. Now, we know all about the time track, if we know anything about Book One. And present time is what you're trying to attain.

Now, the way we used to attain present time is this way: We used to rub out, erase, desensitize the engramic commands in the bank so that the preclear no longer had to (quote) "stay there" or "go down there" or do other strange things, you see. Bouncers, deniers, groupers – you can look over the whole category of the thing. And you'll find out that it's very interesting material because it's right there in the bank; it can be found.

But the way we did it was to get the person to erase those commands and so come to present time. That's the reason we were erasing those commands. There was no other reason, see – so he could stay in present time.

Well, there's a more direct way of doing it, and that's simply analyze present time. What is present time? Present time consists of this space and these walls and this floor and that ceiling and that chair and your body. And that's present time. And it's a continuing persistency which goes along into the future.

And what baffles a person is that present time is continuously shifting forward, and that every moment in the bank is actually a present-time moment. It has been, at one time or another, hasn't it? So that if you tell a fellow to come to present time, he's liable to go to all parts of the bank, but not here.

So there was a frailty in returning people to present time which an auditor very often encountered while auditing. Well, instead of paying any attention to any auditing command in the bank, we show this individual that he can receive and can execute an order by telling him for fifteen hours to come to present time.

If you can produce this result sporadically in a sanitarium simply by saying to people, one after the other, "Come up to present time" and have many of these people turn sane, then it is certain that if you really got down and analyzed this and worked at it, you would be able to tell them convincingly enough so that they would *all* come up to present time. And so they do! Because psychosis – if you can get the guy in motion or in communication at all by two-way communication – will depart and disappear after an hour or two of Opening Procedure of 8-C.

Ah, magic is at work here, isn't it? Well, if this fellow – these people – are arduously stuck on the time track, or psychosomatically stuck on the time track ... If they got a psychosomatic ill, they're stuck on the time track, aren't they? All right, if they're in this condition, then what could be better than to simply give them a very, very convincing, continuous order which they finally could obey 100 percent: "Come up to present time."

What would be better than this? Well, we're ... In a twenty-hour intensive, we're going to tell that person for fifteen hours – almost as though we were sitting there saying, "Come up to present time. Come up to present time. Come up to present time". .. Fifteen hours!

But why put it into a symbol, because symbols themselves are what are misunderstood. So we just bypass symbol. So if we're bypassing symbols, then please don't introduce any further significance into this thing. Don't make the process significant,



because that's what the process is designed to do, is to bypass all these symbolic manifestations and bypass all possible meaning and simply reduce the order down to one of the most obvious things.

The only symbol in it is the auditor is saying, "Touch the wall."

Now, as an auditor I normally audit by pointing, myself. See? I say something, but I tell the preclear, pointing, "You see that spot over there? All right. You" (pointing at him) "go over and touch it." I use my hands as directors.

And the only thing he has to be alert to in the form of symbols is I'm making a noise, which means he's supposed to do something. And I'm showing him, almost graphically, on a mimicry basis. I point to the wall – the point on the wall – I point to the preclear, and then point to him going over to the wall. In other words, strip the symbols out of that line. Good trick, isn't it?

All right. For fifteen hours somebody is going to be coming up to present time. The funny part of it is that he comes up to present time all the way, unless he starts to dodge you again. But you will know it this time, because he can't dodge without introducing a communication lag in his physical action. And here we have the physical-action communication lag.

What do you look for? What do you expect when you run 8-C? What manifestations occur? Well, some of the weirdest things occur, actually. They're completely weird.

You'd say, "How on earth can he make this out of this? This is impossible," to yourself "What is the matter with that fellow?"

Don't worry about it. He's just got orders which have to go through this many bypasses and vias, you see – all these relay points – and they finally arrive him in the wrong jam.

You've told this person repeatedly, "Now, you see the right wall over there? Now walk over to it and touch a spot in the center of the wall."

And the person looks at it, and he discusses it with you.

You say, "No. Walk over and touch the point in the middle of the wall."

He'll discuss it with you.

You say, "You, with your body" – with hand signals you're making, you see – "with your body, walk over and touch the wall over there."

Now, with an insane patient one day ... This person was really gone. We're not talking about "everybody who is insane should have this run on them." This is not a psychotic technique. This is *not* a psychotic technique. It happens to be so rock-bottom it will even catch psychotics. That's the difference, see.

I finally walked over to this psycho, and I picked him up off the bed very gently, and I pushed him over to the wall, and I put his finger on the wall, and took his finger off of the wall. And turned him around to the opposite wall, and walked him across to the opposite wall, and touched his finger to the wall, and took his finger off the wall. And all of a sudden he kind of woke up. And there you were.

The next time he did it, I didn't have to give him any more than a little push on the shoulder, pointing at a spot. It was fabulous, but in about two or three minutes I had this fellow capable of following an auditing order. And then we went right ahead and we kept telling him "Spots on the wall," and he kept following them, and he was sort of in a trance. And he kept coming out of this trance a little bit more and up to present time a little bit more.

Well, don't expect for a moment that your preclear is going to simply do this without thinking any thoughts or anything of the sort. But the truth of the matter is he's not

supposed to think while he's doing this. But you don't have to tell him this.

But if you catch him doing too much communication lag or too much figure-figure, you know, tell him, "Don't think about it. Just do it."

Now, a lot of variations occur on this that auditors use every once in a while. They have an individual predict that the doorknob is going to be there for ten seconds, count off ten seconds, and then go over and check to see if the doorknob is still there. They use a present-time manifestation and put it into the future.

Most of your boys are not going to be capable of understanding or appreciating that. Just plain 8-C is best. That's a good gag, though, isn't it? The fellow is insecure, he doesn't think the world is going to be here in ten seconds. It's a good gag. It works on a lot of preclears.

Another one that would be apparently as workable – actually is not quite as workable – would be to ask somebody to touch the wall and then stand there and wait for something to happen. And he'll see after a while nothing is going to happen. But the funny part of it is, just plain 8-C is better. Plain 8-C is a better process. Because you're adding significance into the line.

Another thing is, you don't want the past auditing command to carry over. You've told him, "Walk over and put your finger on the wall." Now, the next time you might say, "All right. Now that spot over on that wall." Now, you are asking this fellow to remember your former auditing command and add to it. And that is *a big* auditor error. Even if I do it, it's an error. You see that? It's a big error to give him an understood part of the order. Give him the whole order newly each time.

"Walk over to that spot on the wall and put your finger on it." See? Now don't add "Now this spot." See, he has to remember. And you've put him into the past just to that degree, haven't you? Memory is always past.

See, you're saying, "Now that spot," and you expect him to walk over and touch that wall there. No, no, you wouldn't say, "Now that spot." You'll catch yourself doing this, and you have to think about this for a while to really get it. You have to say to him, "Now you," see, "walk over to that spot and put your finger on it." Never give him a carry-over – something he has to remember from the past to now perform in the present.

You simply give him the order freshly, newly every time. And the first thing you know, every second starts to be separate from every other second in this man's life, and the track straightens out and everything gets to be very, very smooth indeed.

Now, what are the manifestations you see? You see physical and verbal (with him) communication lags. And you see these things unfold and flatten out, and the world gets brighter and he gets better.

Doing it in a group – spotting spots on the wall – while sitting in the chair, is not 8-C. 8-C is essentially and intimately the operation of making the physical body contact the environment. Every time we say "Opening Procedure 8-C," we mean that included in that, really, was a physical contact of the body and the environment. You got that?

Now, your Instructor will show you exactly how this is done. When you know this, and when you know this much about this, you'll know an awful lot about the mind and about auditing. The mind is stuck in the past. The best way to treat it and the body, is to get it into the present.

And the easier and the smoother you do it, the better job of auditing you are going to do. And the more your preclears are going to benefit from your auditing. Okay.

# OPENING PROCEDURE BY DUPLICATION

*A lecture given on  
11 October 1954*

Okay. This is a talk on the Opening Procedure by Duplication. And this talk covers as well the formula of communication, ARC, and Must and Mustn't Happen Again.

All right, let's go immediately into the process known as Opening Procedure by Duplication. We will discover instantly that we are doing something that everybody is trying to keep from doing when we are making a preclear duplicate.

Way back along the line we discovered that people were not assimilating information in Dianetics and Scientology. This was so bad that today the people who were originally in Dianetics, who – I mean to say, the *original* people, before there was a Foundation – not one of them, not *one* of them, ever discovered that there was a science called Dianetics. And the fundamentals of that science were never assimilated by them – period. Never.

They blather around in publications, and they yap and they groan and they moan and they speculate, and they do all sorts of weird and peculiar and horrible things. But never at any time do they actually and really know that Dianetics has a series of precision Axioms, which precision Axioms are: "The dynamic principle of existence is Survive." It's not: "Well, I guess there is also a dynamic principle of existence, but probably we don't know whether or not it's survive, because, you see, it might be 'evolve,' because we don't know, because we don't know," because they don't know there was a science named Dianetics.

The auditors who could not produce results with a science called Dianetics, similar to those who could not produce results with the mother science of it, Scientology, were just right there at that point. They never, never, never discovered that there was a precision science right in front of their nose, and they went on speculating and speculating and speculating.

And here and there an auditor who was very sharp, who was in fairly good condition, would take Dianetics just as it is, just as it was there in Book One, they'd take Scientology just as it has been here for years; and people would start getting well, people would start getting well, people would start getting well. And here were all these other people, ostensibly pretending to use this science, and the people they used it on did not get well.

Well, you say "For heaven's sakes, there's some point here that if you just keep talking at a certain number of people then only one, two, three of twenty or thirty people would eventually be able to perform these processes."

So we were up against it, tight – against this problem called *training*. And the problem called *training* was actually the problem of getting somebody to use Dianetics and Scientology as they exist – not as they're speculated about – but as they exist. Because these are the result of twenty-five years of very arduous experimentation, research,

application and so forth. And where an auditor who knows these things and who uses these things uses them, people get well.

But here we would teach a class of, let us say, thirty people and three of these people would come up at the end of this class being fairly good auditors and twenty-seven of these people would come up being terrible auditors. I mean just *grim*, that shouldn't happen to a hound dog – even in Alabama.

And we actually went on like this for years. So there was some basic discovery that hadn't been made. This is what you can say. I'll just ... Being very ordinary, routine and normal myself, I'm perfectly willing to take the responsibility of not having made the discovery necessary to train people until a short time ago. Now, that discovery is under the heading *duplication*.

The twenty-seven people who could not assimilate or use these processes on a preclear had one factor in common: communication difficulty. And that communication difficulty summed into one thing: inability to duplicate.

You say, "red," they say, "blue"; you say, "as," they say, "for"; you say, "The dynamic principle of existence is survive," they say, "The dynamic principle of existence is evolve."

Why? It's not that "the dynamic principle of existence is survive," as an Axiom, is untrue. That is not why they do this. This has no bearing on it! Believe me, this has nothing to do with the problem. The truth of the Axiom, or the truth or cleverness of the missed reception of the communication, have nothing to do with this. It's a much more mechanical thing. It's just the inability to duplicate. And that's all there is to it.

It wouldn't matter if somebody told them their car license was X264.

They would say, "Well, my car license is X391."

And you'd say, "But that is not your car license."

"Oh-ho, yes, that's right. My car license is X149."

You say, "But look, X149 isn't your car license."

They'd say, "I know what my car license is. You trying to fight or something? It's QT62!"

Well, this, you see, is very unreasonable, isn't it? And you're looking at aberration itself. Aberration is the inability to duplicate, fear of duplicating, preventing duplicating, impossible to duplicate; and that can be summed up into aberration.

Now, we take a line of soldiers ... This is one of the oldest experiments known to armies. I'm sure that Julius Caesar's boys got a laugh out of this every once in a while. They'd take ten soldiers and they'd whisper to the first man, who was to whisper to the second man, who was to whisper to the third man, who, in his turn, was to whisper to the fourth man – you know, we were to relay this message down a line of ten soldiers. And we whispered to the first one "*pax vobiscum*"; and the next boy on the line had this message, received by the first one, whispered to him; and when it got all the way down the line we found out what the tenth soldier knew had started in at the beginning of the line: "twenty-three skidoo."

Any time you want to conduct this experiment, you're very, very welcome to do so. It's one of the oldest experiments there are. We whisper a message and it's relayed man to man over a large number of men. And it isn't that it will be incorrect as – in direct ratio to the number of men there are. This is not true. It gets incorrect after the second man. The second man will receive the message slightly altered. And he's just as likely as not to completely change the message. And he is as likely to not – the next man up – to completely change it again. I mean, it's not a gradual disintegration of the message we're

looking at. I mean, they just ... It's the exact ratio to another thing, though: It's the position on the Tone Scale of the person doing the relay of the communication. And there's a great deal of material devoted to this in *Science of Survival*. When you're studying the Chart of Human Evaluation be sure and look at that very closely.

The twist on communications in the column on communications is simply the degree that duplication is not undertaken by the individual – in other words, the degree to which he will cast aside duplication and will pervert rather than duplicate. And that's all that column means.

Now, duplication is a very simple thing but it can't be followed by most people. Very many things happen if they try to follow duplication. They think duplication is the most horrible thing that could ever occur to anybody. It actually hurts them – hurts them – to duplicate. It hurts them physically to duplicate.

Now, I'm not stressing this; it's actual pain, actual physical pain. They'll turn on somatics in their head and their back, and so forth, if they do the same thing twice.

Now, you want to know ... Let's just go wild in the field and apply this to another thing. Let's apply it to the second dynamic and find out why somebody can't – and just between us girls and guys here – why somebody cannot perform a sexual act. Well, of course, sex itself is duplication, isn't it? You see, a duplication goes to each one of the dynamics.

We look over that and we see that sex is very seriously devoted to duplications. It's duplication of the person in time up into the future, you see – very tricky type of duplication – but it's still just duplication.

And we discover, oddly enough, that when a person starts to deteriorate on this ability to duplicate, the first thing that happens is that he cannot – let us be frank here – he can not ejaculate more than once; see, only one orgasm. See, he couldn't right away have another ejaculation.

And you'll find many families are able to have one child, and after that they can't have any more children. See? Nothing has actually occurred here except that we mustn't duplicate, that's all.

Sometimes we'll find a family, they have a boy and then a girl. Well, that's not quite a duplication, see, so they'll say, "Well, that's what we really want; that's what we ought to have – just a boy and a girl and that's plenty for us."

How about some replacements? You need a few troops, you know, a few replacements. But this is a matter of no duplication. So we discover the second dynamic going to pieces to the degree that a person cannot duplicate. But what kind of duplication? This we're talking about is physical duplication, isn't it?

Well, if our awareness of awareness unit, the thetan, cannot himself countenance duplication, he will not permit the body to duplicate, and so there goes the second dynamic.

Let's look at sex in another quarter here; let's look at promiscuity. Why is it that this fellow has to chase all around and have one girl, and then another girl and then another girl and another girl, and never have the first girl twice? Hm? He just can't duplicate. There he can't duplicate the process of duplication. So, of course, Freud, looking at life in general, thought to him self; "Ah, my. It must be sex," because it is so *obvious* in sex. But sex is no more all of life than the dynamics are all devoted to sex. The dynamics are each one themselves from the first to the eighth, and each one of them is subject to this "can't duplicate.

Now, what did you think of the thetan that can't create another thetan, huh? What

would you think about this fellow? I mean, you could think some pretty snide things. This fellow, he's there three feet back of his head and he couldn't make himself, knowingly, another person, entirely new, three feet in front of his face, while he is still three feet in back of his head. Aw, that'd be – nobody's this bad off. Can't create his entire complete individuality at one fell swoop – *bang!* – by simply making a postulate? Somebody can get that bad off. Well, that's no-duplicate on the first dynamic, you see, when a person can't do this.

All right, let's go up to the third dynamic. And we find out that there can't be two Roman Catholic churches. The first person that'll say anything about this at all is the Roman Catholic church. There just mustn't be two churches. As a matter of fact, the Persian god Mithras was far better worshipped throughout the Roman Empire in the early days than Christ. Mithras was the god of the Roman soldier and Christianity swept in on Rome and borrowed a lot of facts from various quarters. But they discovered that there was only one religion which was very, very close to Christianity and that was the temples of Mithras.

And this was very close to Christianity-it promised life immortal; it had many tenets which were quite similar-and early Christianity could not rest until it had taken every temple to Mithras down. And they took the religion of the worship of Mithras to pieces, to such a thorough degree, that for a thousand years there was no slightest trace of a temple of Mithras. There was no trace of it. Every book, every frieze, every temple, was just knocked to pieces.

Well, now Christianity didn't do that to the worship of Zeus. They didn't do that to the worship of many, many gods. The Roman gods came forward so that even in universities today where they're majoring in mythology they know about them. I mean they just came right through to us-very obvious. The students today studying that sort of thing know all about them.

But what about Mithras? Well, he is still very much in a shadow. And yet, he was the most popular god of the-contemporary with Christ and had the most temples. Too close, wasn't it? Couldn't tolerate this duplication.

Now, here, though, is your "don't duplicate," "can't duplicate." "There can't be another group. There can just be us Christians. There can't be another group similar to us Christians." Of course, somebody who was wildly different, such as Zeus, temples of Hercules, and that sort of thing-wildly different, you see: "Let them live. Let them live." That's not close enough, you see? But anything real close-in they fight-won't let it duplicate. Now, that's third dynamic.

Fourth dynamic: What if some men showed up here on earth with a tail? Or with only two toes on each foot? Or, like Walt Disney's comic characters, three fingers on each hand? This race suddenly showed up, and began to walk around and do things and talk and relay communication? You and I would be issued hunting licenses for these people in very, very short order. I can assure you of that.

But let me assure you that a two-headed race that ran on all fours would probably be regarded as a scientific curiosity. We would not be called upon to immediately murder this race to the man. See? It's quite different. But if close in, then we really would go on a hunting expedition.

Let me give you an example of this: The American Civil War, variously known as the War Between the States and the War of the Rebellion, and other such things, depending on what state you happen to be talking to people about. The killed, by the way, in this war, was 385,000 young American boys. That is a fantastic figure, since it was only

38,000 for the greatest war we ever fought, World War I – up to World War II, when they went on a holiday in World War II and they really mowed things down. But up to World War I, and including World War I, the American Civil War was our heaviest-casualty war. More property was destroyed, more lives lost and more upset taken on the national scene. Why?

It was just too close for a Northerner and a Southerner. They had to really get down and work to get the difference between a boy in Virginia and a boy in Pennsylvania. There was a slight difference of accent, some slight difference of custom, but not very much. There was just enough so that they could say "mustn't duplicate," you see, and so the bitterness and savageness of the conflict became as great as "they mustn't duplicate" and were compelled to try to. There's the level of mankind.

Now, let's go up to animals, and we discover many animals who are quite insane. When animals are quite insane they destroy their young. They do destroy their young. They destroy their own kind.

We get up to the field of the physical universe, and the one thing which this universe cannot even vaguely tolerate is duplication. It can't even vaguely tolerate duplication. It's got to have things in a different position. Now, remember that a perfect duplicate is "same time, same location, same particle." Well, this universe is so *totally* devoted to having something at a distance – it means two things can't occupy the same space. That is the war cry of the physical universe: "Two things must not occupy the same space. There must be a difference."

And when you get two things occupying the same space, or when they try to, you get an explosion. This pressure which you feel when your hand touches a wall is the physical universe expression that there must not be a duplication. And the closer you press and the harder you press, the more resistance there is – not to anything else than duplication. It's simply a postulate: "Mustn't duplicate."

I don't think you have ever thought of pressure that way before, but that is it. And it is that very same pressure which besets some person who is thoroughly trapped in this universe when you start to ask him to duplicate anything.

Now, the communication formula is: cause, distance, effect, with duplication at effect of what emanates from cause, and duplication at the reversed point of what emanated from effect. In other words, to get the formula of two-way communication, you'd have to have a duplicate, and a duplicate back again. When you get any difference – when you have cause, distance, effect, where effect now has to duplicate cause; and when you get where effect was new cause, distance and a duplication of where the effect was before – when you get that kind of a situation, and there is any slightest difference in time or in space, you get time. There's time; time is a no-duplicate, you see.

So people get aberrated agreeing with this universe. And then they get aberrated on the subject of time, and then they've got a fine time track they have. See? I mean, it's just this one thing: it's just the anxiety that we mustn't duplicate. Harder and harder and harder they press into this – mustn't duplicate, mustn't duplicate, mustn't – mustn't-mustn't-mustn't – and all of a sudden, surrender, and they *do* duplicate. But now they're duplicating obsessively. So we get a habit. We get a habit.

A fellow starts in to take a drug, or something of the sort, and he can't live unless he takes it again. "It must happen again, it must happen again, it must happen again": this is an obsession. "It mustn't happen again, it mustn't again": that's no duplication – a resistance toward duplication. So these are the two postulates, by the way, which more or less make time.

People go around, they go into an operation; go down and get operated on. And this operation is painful or it's a lot of other explanations – who cares – but the common denominator of this is after the operation has happened, why, they go out of there saying, "It mustn't happen again. It *mustn't* happen again. I just mustn't get that sick again." You see? "And in order to keep myself from having it happen again, I will have a picture and an energy deposit here which will *hurt* me every time I think of trying to make it happen again. I will punish myself into preventing it from happening again." See?

And that's a facsimile; that's an engram. They keep that engram up to their chests, and this is why people keep them in restimulation. They keep an engram in restimulation willfully and knowingly so that they will never slip and get so stupid as to have that happen again. And the history of the time track is just the history of things which mustn't happen again. In other words, must happen only once. And out of this we get the computation of the "only one."

A fellow finally will get things to such a point – that it mustn't happen again – that he can't be anywhere else but right where he is. See? And it just mustn't happen again. He mustn't be anyplace else; he mustn't do it again; then the next thing you know there mustn't be anybody else. See? He's gotten to a point of where – no duplicate, and you get Hitler. Mustn't be anybody else. He mustn't be anybody anywhere. He's going to make the whole German race commit suicide one way or the other – mad-dog them on in order to impale themselves upon the bayonets of their enemies, as just the finest goal that a German soldier could have.

And before that, we had a fellow by the name of Julius Caesar and he had this same goofball computation. And after he got through with Roman troops at one part or another of the world – he did quite a bit of conquest – why, everybody looked around, and you know, they didn't have any more troops.

And we get a fellow like Napoleon. He was forced into an "only one" classification at the French military academy. He was a Corsican, he was poor, he was pretty freaky, the boys made a lot of trouble for him, and so forth. And by golly, he came out of that fully convinced that there could only be one person left on earth – Napoleon.

Fortunately, he didn't have the cannon and so forth to effect this (obviously to him) desirable goal: There must only be one person left on earth – Napoleon.

And whatever he said to the French people, he did succeed in one thing which we can measure even today. He reduced the stature of the Frenchman by one inch. This was ... The goal of Napoleon was to wipe him out, of course, but he did manage to reduce his stature one inch. So we know Napoleon has been present because the Frenchmen are one inch shorter.

Here is "mustn't happen again" going into the "only one," you see. On the first dynamic he can't duplicate, and therefore there must only be himself. And all the people around him, he thinks, are convincing him all the time, and are convinced, that he mustn't exist. So he's just got to make this thing where he is, right there, survive, and that identity survive and his own importance survive and all these things have got to survive. But nothing else can survive.

And if you can show me any way by which only one thing in this entire universe can be alive, I am sure a lot of nuclear physicists who are now working for the government would be awfully interested.

Of course, I won't go so far as to say that the nuclear physicist, as portrayed in various cartoons, and so forth, is nuts. But I will say that he himself recognizes that he's not quite right in the head. He himself recognizes this in such institutions as Cal Tech. Cal Tech



one time had on its bulletin board a gorgeous cartoon whereby a scientist is standing in front of a huge mob of a conclave of scientists and he says, "Gentlemen, we have at last achieved the highest goal in science." And he's holding up something between his thumb and forefinger, and he says, "Here in my hand I have an explosive which, merely by squeezing, will destroy the entire universe." The goal of science, reached.

You'd think so, with what they're doing, and so on. And you get ahold of most of these boys and they are running the "only one" madly.

Now, Russia, for instance – because it's snowed in most of the time, and so forth – gets to thinking of itself as the "only one." And it gets this destructive attitude. Anytime anybody gets this destructive attitude, it is born out of the fact that he mustn't duplicate.

Now, you see, if he started duplicating other people, he wouldn't be in a complete individuality, would he? Not a complete, utter, absolute individuality. He would have to change his individuality somewhat. He'd have to change his ideas somewhat. He'd have to keep his ideas fluid. He would have to be willing to meet the world as he saw it, in order to duplicate what he sees.

A thetan can be what he can see. He can see what he can be. And when his beingness is fluid, when he's totally capable of looking out here at a rose garden and feeling like a rose garden, when he's totally capable of looking at a garbage can and feeling like a garbage can, just at will, why, he of course is getting along pretty well. He can *be* various things.

We get the whole subject of beingness out of this subject of duplication. We look at something and then we're willing to be it – if we see it. But if we're not willing to be it, believe me, we'll see it very dimly, because that is just the formula of communication. Here we are duplicating what we see. You follow me?

Now, here we have beingness in duplication. Now, we had "it mustn't happen again" in duplication, didn't we? And all of this comes out of the basic communication formula which is, actually, cause, distance, effect, with intention at cause and duplication at effect.

There's nothing wrong with duplication. What gets wrong is inability to duplicate. That gets very wrong. And people go off to the degree that they are unwilling to duplicate. And in view of the fact that it's all chimerical anyhow, it is simply one's consideration that he doesn't want to duplicate that prevents him from being, prevents him from seeing, from hearing, and so forth – just. unwillingness to duplicate, and that's the end of it.

Now, let's take up ARC here in a sudden rush, and let's look it over. We find that affinity, reality and communication are a triangle; that this triangle is interlocked, and that when you drop any corner of this three-way triangle, you drop the other two corners. In other words, if we depress communication we will depress reality and affinity. If we completely depress communication, reality and affinity would cease entirely, cease utterly. That does not exist, with which you do not communicate.

Now, as we raise communication, we find that we raise also, at the same time, reality and affinity. Similarly, if we could raise reality, we'd also raise affinity and communication. If we could raise affinity, we would also raise reality and communication. An auditor knowing this is totally capable, then, of monitoring the activities of a preclear.

Now, what is perfect affinity? According to definition, a perfect affinity would not be a distance thing. There would be no distance involved – neither the prevention nor the creation of distance – and therefore there would be no space involved of any kind whatsoever, and you'd have perfect affinity. But if this were the condition, then reality would be no space and no distance involved, and no problem to duplication, and communication would be instantaneous, absolute and on the same point, wouldn't it? And

we get the definition of theta: No time, no space, no mass, no wavelength. And that would be theta.

And so we get the most complete affinity there would be – a matter of no distance, and so forth.

But down at the other end of the scale, we would get distance attempted but crushed back in. You see, here we've got an obsessive, compulsive, *unknowing* collision, near-merging of particles, and we get a solid matter. You know, matter does not quite occupy, particle to particle, the same space. But it's nevertheless crushed space. It's *almost* collapsed.

And the difference between these two ends of the scale is that matter, at the bottom of the scale, does not know, has no knowingness; and matter would cease to exist somewhere up the scale and we'd finally get the top of the scale where we would get total knowingness. That's the difference between the top and the bottom of this ARC scale.

You must understand that "trying to understand," just as a concept, run on a preclear would produce some interesting results – not recommended as a process, but just "trying to understand."

For instance, people go around trying to understand, trying to crush themselves closer to an understanding. And the bottom end of that is *MEST*. You don't try to understand; you relax and you'll know. That's a difference between these two things.

All right. Now, let's look over the process which, of all processes attempted, has been that one best delivering to our hands, good results. Now, this doesn't say it's the best process that would ever be invented. But it does say that practically every process that you could list off here on the subject of duplication – well, they've all been tried and they've been found not to produce as good an effect – not to produce as good an effect as this process: Opening Procedure by Duplication.

Therefore, because of the vitalness of duplication itself, we have to have, then, a process which concentrates on duplication and which, in itself, delivers into our hands the ability to resolve this question of inability to duplicate in a preclear. We must solve the fact that a preclear cannot duplicate.

All right, this preclear has a psychosomatic illness. Why does he have a psychosomatic illness? He was hurt once, or he lost something once, and he's unwilling to duplicate it again and he's reminding himself – this is one of the things that you could say about this – he's reminding himself with this engram that it mustn't happen again.

He's got it there; now how are you going to make him let go of it? Well, your best way to make him let go of it is to bring up his capability to duplicate and to improve the body's capability of duplicating. It would be the best way to do this, wouldn't it? Because if it mustn't happen again, and it mustn't happen again, and it mustn't happen again ... He also has some that *must* happen again – you know, there are a few that must happen again. But oddly enough, "mustn't happen again" is the keynote here, not "must happen again." There are some things that must happen again: you must eat again. See? You must sleep again. These things must happen again. But "mustn't happen again" is what occupies the stage.

All right, we have a process that does this, and this process is called Opening Procedure by Duplication. Now, we keep calling these processes Opening Procedure. That's merely because we're saddled with them. It isn't because you open a case with them. It just happens to be the name of the process, like its name also might be John Jones.

Opening Procedure by Duplication was the first thing it was called. And it was step

one of what we called Procedure 30 – "Dirty 30." Somebody watched this cutting people to ribbons and decided the proper name of this was Dirty 30. And so, Opening Procedure by Duplication was the opening procedure of Dirty 30. So we have it as a name which doesn't mean you open cases with it. It's just a name: Opening Procedure by Duplication. There's another process known as Perfect Duplication.

But we have this process, then, and we had certainly better know this process. Now, as we say, there's just a few processes that we have to be absolutely expert at. This is one of them. And this is one of the roughest processes that an auditor ever tried to do on a preclear if it hasn't been run on himself – so beware.

Furthermore, out in the public, a person can simply *read* about this process and practically go into a spin. Such a person was an electrician that we know, out in California. And this electrician simply read about this and he flew into such a state of upset that he started writing everybody whose name and address he could lay his hands on that it was a foul, filthy technique which was simply used to induce an hypnotic trance in people. That was Opening Procedure by Duplication. Oh, it was a horrible thing which was simply used ...

But he and some cultists of one kind or another got together and improved it so that you'd put a mock-up – you have the preclear hold a mock-up in each hand – and put his attention on one and the other of these mock-ups, and do things with these mock-ups repetitively, one after the other. And I don't know how they got over to that, except, of course, it was because they themselves couldn't duplicate.

So everybody will condemn this if you don't watch it. So just don't tell people about it. Simply run it on them. They'll revolt; they'll kick your teeth in; they'll leave sessions, and so forth, if you haven't run enough Opening Procedure of 8-C on them first. If you've gotten them pretty flat with Opening Procedure of 8-C, then you can run Opening Procedure by Duplication. If they do kick back on you by reason of Opening Procedure by Duplication, it is because you didn't run enough 8-C. So that would be, actually, an auditor error, wouldn't it? But it's an auditor error which you will occasionally make, so we won't consider it a very major error.

So they leave the auditing room, so they walk out, so they slam the door, so they tell you, "You're just trying to get me under your control," and so forth – supposing they do all these things; so what. Go back. You get them by the scruff of the neck, pull them back into the auditing room and complete the process.

You might occasionally find somebody so bad off that you had to return and run 8-C without going on with this other, but it'd be best if you run them on Opening Procedure by Duplication.

Well, why do they think it's an hypnotic process? They think it's an hypnotic process because this process runs out hypnotism. What is "hypnotism" but a superfixation on obsession. You know, they have to look at something which they now must obsessively duplicate. And you just start, vaguely, to run Opening Procedure by Duplication on somebody and off will come an hypnotic feeling – only it runs off! It disappears and they become more alert. But while it is going off, they can really feel woozy. See, they really feel fixed.

Opening Procedure by Duplication runs out hypnosis. And because it will run out hypnosis, it then restimulates hypnosis and occasionally makes people feel like they are being hypnotized. So they feel this way; so what. That's their hard luck. They had no business letting themselves be hypnotized in the first place.

All right. It is not an hypnotic technique but produces, if run long enough, alertness.

Now, what do we mean by "long enough"? Let me tell you that one hour of this process is almost never sufficient. In other words, you'd start at the least-imaginable time to run Opening Procedure by Duplication, and that would be one hour. That's the least time which you could imagine running this. And that would not be an effective length of time. Two hours and a half would be a practical consideration – not as long as it should have been run, but you'll get away with it – and five hours would be a nice, neat time.

And when you think of Opening Procedure by Duplication, you should think about it that "Well, I wouldn't even really be able to start it unless I could at least run him an hour. It wouldn't be practical to run it unless I could run him two and one half hours. And it wouldn't do anything unless I can run it five." And when you think of Opening Procedure by Duplication, think of five hours of auditing.

Now, that seems to be an awful thing to consign you, an auditor, to – to an arduous hammering and pounding on this. But what do you know, it's very therapeutic for the auditor, just as 8-C's Opening Procedure is very therapeutic for the auditor. He never in his life has had the opportunity to order people around to the degree that you have to order them around to get them to run Opening Procedure of 8-C. And so this is therapeutic for the auditor.

And Opening Procedure by Duplication – to repeat these auditing commands over and over and over ... ? Look, I won't teach anybody the remainder of Intensive Procedure or even involve myself with trying to communicate to them, to the degree that in the Code of a Scientologist today, we say, "We won't engage in discussions – unseemly discussions – on the subject of Scientology." We mean by that we won't talk about Scientology with anybody who has not had five hours of Opening Procedure by Duplication. That's really what that means, that clause in the Code of a Scientologist. It means "If he hasn't had Opening Procedure by Duplication run on him, then he probably would not be able to hear what I am saying, so why talk?" You see? It is as simple, as open-and-shut as that.

Now, let's get back to all of those boys and girls that we were trying to teach to audit, and let's take the twenty-seven students. Three, you see, did learn and the twenty-seven didn't. What was the essential difference? Well, the three could duplicate. They were in pretty good shape. Well, what about the twenty-seven? Well, we can train them now. It isn't because we put them into an hypnotic trance; it's because we run them out of one. We make them alert and alive enough to be able to duplicate without feeling endangered with the processes of Scientology, and they can then use them and they can then get away with it very nicely.

Well, how do you do this process? What are the essential auditing commands?

Well, let me give you the design of the process first. You simply take two items. You acquaint the preclear with them. You know, you've got a book and an ashtray, and they're in two different places in the room – we don't care where – near together or far apart, we don't care, as long as he has to walk between them. He's got to take two or three steps between these two objects.

And with these two objects, and with some acquaintance with these objects – that is to say, "You see that book over there?" We get acquainted with these objects; introduce them, you know. "See that book over there? Well, pick it up. Is it real to you? Can you own it? What's it like?" Anything you wanted to ask him, just make him pick it up. And then make him go over to the second object and say, "Well now, how real is that to you? Does that really exist?" Juggle it around a little while. Get him acquainted with it. And then groove him right on into Opening Procedure by Duplication, which has the most precise commands you ever heard of.

"Look at it."

"Pick it up."

"What color is it?"

"What's its temperature?"

"What's its weight?"

"Put it down in exactly the same place."

"Walk over to that other object."

"Look at it."

"Pick it up."

"What's its color?"

"What's its temperature?"

"What's its weight?"

"Put it down in exactly the same place."

"Walk over to the first object."

"Look at it."

"Pick it up."

"What's its color?"

Each time making the preclear *state* his answer – back and forth, back and forth, back and forth, object to object, object to object, back and forth, with the auditor never varying his auditing command, you see. Never vary that auditing command.

Now, there is nothing magical in the arrangement of those perceptics. See, it's nothing magical – so that you could have several other perceptics. You could say, "Smell it." You could say, "Taste it." But once you've used it you're honor-bound to duplicate the command. So you have to settle on what you're going to call your series of commands, and rather than get into a big argument amongst auditors and preclears, we simply lay down what they are. It's not that they're the most optimum commands or the worst or the best or anything else. It's just what we use, that's all. And these are what we use, and the Instructor will tell you exactly what those commands are.

But the essence of this whole process is repetition with no dependency upon any past moment. Now, let me get awfully clear on that: *No dependency on memory or anything of a past moment! Every moment is a new moment!*

And when you think of Opening Procedure by Duplication, think of this – if you are tempted to go off sideways in running it or using it, think of this: *It's got to be that every moment is a brand-new moment, and you cannot, for one instant, depend upon the memory of the preclear.*

You're not going to give him an understood command. In other words, you're not going to tell him now, because we've all settled into it – back and forth, back and forth – you're not going to tell him in such a way that you're going to depend upon your having told him before.

For instance, you've said to him many times, "What is the color?" so this time we're going to shorten it all down, we're going to just say "Color?" You know, "he knows." Oh, does he?

Well, we're going to run a dependency on the past in on this, are we? – a dependency on a past command. Why not just wreck the process? Because that will wreck the process. You've got to ask him every time!

"Do you see that book over there?"

"Well, walk over to it."

"Look at it."

"Pick it up."

"What is its color?"

Have you got that? When he answers, when he acks, you act just as though it had never happened before. You see, you never pay any attention to the fact that you've been at this for some time. It's always a new auditing command, even though it's exactly the same one.

And his moments on the time track will kind of go creak, creak, pop! And they'll start to spread apart, because "no duplication" is the downscale effort to become closer and closer between cause and effect, closer and closer proximity, until they are practically merged, but not quite. If they were totally merged you would have freedom, but they never totally merged at the bottom of the scale.

So we get affinity, actually, as the distance between cause and effect. And as this distance lessens, we get the Know to Mystery Scale. All that is, is cause and effect, closer and closer together. In other words, these two terminals, cause and effect, are closer and closer together until they finally get a completely solid merger. And you will have people going around who claim that every effect they see, they're afraid they caused it. See, that's just a merger between cause and effect, which means the affinity has gone out of the line. See that? All right.

This is Opening Procedure by Duplication. It is always new. Every command is newly given, even though it is exactly the same. And he'll first start to fight this, the preclear will, and he'll try to fight it and fight it and he'll fuss, because "it mustn't happen again," you see. You're asking him to do the same answer the same questions time after time after time. And for a long time he's going to conceive that they are the same questions as he [you I asked before. In other words, he has got what? *Obsessive memory*. Obsessive memory is occurring here. He knows that these are the same questions. It's all right for him to know it, but it's not all right for him to be bothered with it.

Why do they have all of these new motion pictures down here all the time? They made a motion picture once. There isn't any reason why we couldn't all go back and see it again and again and again, like the British use their jokes.

Nobody in Great Britain would ever invent a new joke; they don't need a new joke; they've got one. A fellow tells it and it's a joke and everybody laughs. All right. All right. They made a picture.

Now, why each year do we have to have a newer, fancier car? Well, actually, up to the time when cars become extremely workable – until they do – there is a reason to change them. But when cars become extremely workable and they go on running and they perform well and the problems of the cars are solved, there is no reason to go on having new models.

And as far as I'm concerned – and as long as we have an internal-combustion engine – why, we had good ones back in 1936. And they're still forming and changing these engines. They haven't made a better engine – honest, they haven't.

The new ... Not to give anybody any advertising plugs, but the new Chrysler – that super opposed-cylinder job, and so forth – you run that thing at a high rate of speed for an hour, something like that, and boy, there's enough comes off the cylinder walls, in terms of metal, to make it eat oil for the rest of its life. You have to have an oil truck running along behind you, pumping enough oil in to keep that motor going.

Well, they've got to make it newer; they've got to make it hotter; they've got to make it faster; they've got to make it better. Well, that's just fine. Nothing wrong with this. But if they're dealing with an internal-combustion engine, they should become aware of the

fact that they had a real good one in 1936, and that the improvements after 1946, and so forth ... Ever since they had that pump (mechanical-pump carburetor) – as soon as they started getting those on, those engines have not been better; they have been worse.

You say, that's an extreme statement to make, but it's not. Anytime that you drive up in a Chevrolet and tell me that you are getting eleven miles to the gallon and tell me that's a better car than when Chevrolets were getting eighteen miles to the gallon ... What's it doing? It's taking you places, isn't it? And you're only going to get eleven miles to the gallon now. In other words, you're going to have to work like mad to make enough money to pump gasoline into that thing.

Well, that's because it now has an automatic shift. Who wants an automatic shift with a light motor? The only reason you have a gearshift is so a light motor can be shifted into enough gears to make it perform like a powered motor, you know – so that a light motor with an automatic shift on it is going to make a very dead and relatively dangerous car. You'll never be able to get off the intersection in time. If you have any wrecks you've probably run into an automatic transmission on a light motor. The guy tramps down on it and the car goes no place.

The reason he has got a gearshift there is so he could flip it into low, shoot his foot to the throttle and be off the intersection, you see; go around the corner, flip her into second gear.

A race driver would not know what to do with one of these automatic transmissions. They're just a mess. They eat up about 25 percent of the horsepower of the motor, so forth.

Well, where did we get this stuff? We are improving motors now, or are we just selling new ones? Now, that's about the time somebody should ask, "But, this is no-duplicate, isn't it?" Supposing they'd had a wonderful, performing, economical motor in 1936, and they'd stopped building it because they had to have something new. You'd say the automotive industry had improved up to a point where it was sane and then started to go potty. Well, that's where pottyness sets in. It's when they no longer duplicate a good product.

I'm not stuck on the time track with that motor, by the way, but I can take that motor and go out and beat most modern cars. The Buick Fireball, 1936 – a wonderful motor. It was a Hudson motor at that time. It was a fine motor, so forth. And these motors, by the way, were built on different principles than the modern motor.

Now, where do we get this business about ... What do we have to change this for all the time? Why do we have to change, change, change? Because every time you alter, the error persists under conditions of existence. You will learn that. So it's all right to alter, as long as you've got an error. But as soon as you run out of errors, let's not alter. Hm? Let's at least, at that time, be willing to duplicate.

Well, your preclear with a body never does this. What happens? He grows up; boy, he has got this big charge in there. He wants to be big enough so that he, if he meets any big animals, will be able to hit them once and have them fold up. That's the goal of a Caucasian body, is to get to a point where one blow will fell the ox or the reindeer or the deer or something of the sort. And it works real hard, see, and it gets up there at about the time it's eighteen, you know: a senior (high school), about ready to go in for eight ... Is it fifteen or twenty years they now have to go to a university in order to get out of the freshman class?

Well, about eighteen, the body is getting up pretty close there to a high level of efficiency. It's getting pretty good. It isn't yet able to carry on much endurance but it's

getting up there pretty good. Twenty-one, twenty-two, it's picking up even the endurance factors that it ought to have. And it's about twenty-five, twenty-six, the guy is in there real strong now, you see? That body is in, usually, real good shape.

But look what it did to get up there. It altered, altered, altered, altered, overcoming these weaknesses, improving, improving, improving, improving. And it gets twenty-six, and it goes on: change, change, change, change, change, change. What's it changing? It obsessively changes up to its peak of efficiency and then goes on changing, and that is old age. That's how it gets into old age. It goes on obsessively changing from the peak of its efficiency. And it has just never learned to quit that. See, it just ought to hit its peak of efficiency and roll. See how simple that would be? Wouldn't be anything to that, would there?

No, you say a body wears out. Why does a body wear out? Well, one of the reasons it wears out is because it no longer replaces its cells. Its cells get smaller and smaller. Did you know that? The cells of the body – get smaller. Old people's cells are smaller than young people's cells. What is this, then a cellular unwillingness to duplicate – in other words, duplicate new cells. Hm? That's all it is.

So this body that is getting old is simply getting less and less willing to duplicate and is getting more and more changing, more and more radical – and will finally get so radical that it'll build cancer cells, or it builds wrinkles or it does all sorts of weird and incredible things, you see. But that's the way it goes on the time track, and so it goes over that peak and then ages. But it spends, today, far more years aging than it does growing. Hmm, this is way out of balance, isn't it?

Your modern society is geared to that. TV – grind-grind-grind-grind-grind: new program, new program, new program, new program, see. It's got to change-change-change, alter-alter-alter-alter. See? No reason why it ought to alter, at all. In fact, there's no reason for TV.

And, by the way, TV would be one of the more interesting ways to break down a society – one of the much more interesting ways to break down a society. Make everybody face only MEST and never face another living thing. See, because TV isn't a living thing; it's just MEST shadows. So you see the social life of a country busting up, and so forth, under the impact of this sort of thing.

People do not know, by the way, that when sitting in front of a TV set they are being bombarded with enough gamma rays to cause a Geiger counter to go hysterical. They let their little kids sit in front of these TV sets. Why don't they let them sit in the middle of Hiroshima? I mean, it's just the same.

There's a desert out here that the government bombed and left it green glass, all radioactive. They carefully told everybody it isn't radioactive, but then I don't know why some of that sand, just a little handful of that sand, put in with a couple of dental plates and a key will make a perfect print today on the dental plates – X-ray plates.

But here people sit in front of this terrific bombardment of gamma rays, you see, just because they can be absolutely sure that thing isn't going to duplicate – isn't going to duplicate. It's sitting there all the time. It's perfectly motionless, actually. But their interests can change, wander and so forth. But there they are, facing MEST.

Well, that's because they've had such bad experiences with other people. You know, "Social life is a bad experience. It really shouldn't be duplicated. You know, you go to parties, and you get drunk, and your husband makes a pass at some girl, you know. Bad things happen, and we just better not duplicate those parties anymore, and so on. Why be sociable anyway? It's much better to sit here and look at a piece of MEST with a glass



face on it which changes shadows – much better than to be social."

What do you think is going to happen to a country? Just what's happening to it, of course.

Now, the essence of all of this sort of thing, of a constant change, constant newness, thirst for newness, is of course going to run out the bottom of the barrel because there is no state attainable which is going to bring you 100 percent constant newness – can't. And it's not a necessary state, and it's not a sane state.

You should be able to be perfectly overjoyed with each new moment with the same things in it. And if a person cannot experience happiness and cannot experience joy, it's because he cannot face new moments which are the same as old moments. And that's what opening Procedure by Duplication teaches him to do: to face new moments which are the same as old moments. And when he's finally got that down, he could be happy, he could be well and he won't age. And that's important to all of us, and very important to the auditor. And that's why this is *a terrific* process and one which you have to know *thoroughly* across the boards.

Okay.

# REMEDY OF HAVINGNESS

*A lecture given on  
12 October 1954*

All right. I want to talk to you about the Remedy of Havingness. Remedy of Havingness is one of the more important subjects which you will have to cope with in a preclear.

It could be said that if all we knew about the human mind was the Remedy of Havingness, and that's *all* we knew about the human mind, and that's all we knew how to process, we would know more than the Vedics, the Aesculapians, the faith healers of Christianity, the demon exorcists of the Middle Ages, Freudian analysis, psychologists, psychiatrists or medicine.

Now, I just want to give you the slight stress – I didn't want to overrate this, you see – I wanted to give you the slight stress on this particular process.

Now, just because some new process comes along, you know, or because I happen to write something saying this and this happens with a preclear, does not mean that the Remedy of Havingness disappears as a process. In fact, I can tell you very, very bluntly and very frankly that there are seven things that are not going to disappear as a process.

And these seven are: two-way communication, Elementary Straightwire, Opening Procedure of 8-C, Opening Procedure by Duplication, Remedy of Havingness, Spotting Spots in Space and the Chart of Human Evaluation. And these are not going to vanish. These aren't something you're just looking at for a minute, and then going to be out of communication with at some time in the future. Every single process there evolves one way or the other from these seven things.

Now, that's a very, very important thing, then, for you to know all of these processes. But amongst these is Remedy of Havingness. One of the reasons you have to know the Remedy of Havingness is to understand human behavior. That's just one reason you have to know it. Another reason you have to know the Remedy of Havingness is to be able to tell, in Scientology, why and what the awareness of awareness unit – the thetan – is trying to do or is doing, or how he feels when he's trying to exteriorize.

And havingness, as a subject, is the key to exteriorization. And havingness itself, as a subject, is a major key, if not *the* major key, to psychosomatic illness. Havingness, of course, is part of the scale Be, Do, Have.

Beingness is space. Doingness is energy. Havingness is matter. And we're here living on earth, which is a very solid planet. And we're associated with bodies, which are quite solid. And we deal every day with tools and vehicles and houses and other things which are quite solid, don't we?

Well now, how exactly do these things influence human behavior? Well, they influence it very, very intimately indeed. You are under a stress, by reason of havingness, of which you are very unaware consciously. You have been under this stress for so long that you pay no further attention to it. That's gravity.

Gravity is a manifestation of havingness. When you have a solidity, such as a planet, it

itself is in continuous and continual terminal exchange with a body or another mass. And people get that on an unconscious level. They're not conscious of this at all. And they begin to dramatize it by having to have and wantingness. It's a flow, a terminal manifestation. And that is gravity.

So much mass is there that the mass itself attracts to it other masses – that's gravity. And that's also wantingness. That's appetite. That's why here on earth people eat people, animals eat people, people eat animals, all other kinds of manifestations.

I know three or four of those you don't think of as routine or ordinary. But that's merely because you live in a civilized part of earth where it is frowned upon – people eating people.

Sex, by the way, is simply a substitute for eatingness. It's the lower-scale substitute for eatingness. Oh, you wonder about that? Well, I advise you sometime to run a preclear on the basis of men eating women and women eating men. And he will have more ridge manifestations than any other technique I can call to mind right offhand.

So after a while they decided they would have something to put out which would continue into the future, and a big figure-figure took place and they got sex. But eatingness and gravity and havingness, and all of these other manifestations are very, very closely intimated, very intimate, one with another. They are very closely associated, and the manifestation which you normally see in a preclear is that of havingness.

Now, let's take up one of the manifestations of havingness, and we call it loss. You know, when somebody loses something he feels so very bad. You want to know what degradation is: Degradation is nothing more nor less than loss.

If you were to take somebody who was very accustomed to and subjected to gravity and put him out there in the sky a hundred-thousand miles, you would discover that he would be suffering from such tremendous degradation that he would be unable to remember where he was or to what body he belonged. Now, we're talking now about the awareness of awareness unit, the thetan. If you were to put him hundred-thousand feet up in the *sky – bing!* – he would be so degraded he would not really know what body he belonged to or anything else. He would have no recall on the basis, unless you remedied his havingness with mock-ups, something of the sort, and then he would remember.

Well now, what would happen if you put a person in a rocket ship? He's in a body and he's in a rocket ship, and here he is, subjected to all this gravity, and he has this big mass of earth – this big planet – and you lit the fire to the rocket and he went out there at many G's acceleration and got way out into outer space. What do you suppose would happen to him, hm?

Very much the same thing as though you suddenly exteriorize somebody a hundred-thousand miles away from earth. See? Loss of mass would bring about a feeling of degradation.

Now, what would happen to a sailor who was fighting a war and he was on a battleship? And he was on this battleship, and a great many torpedoes hit it and it sank? Boom! He'd have immediate feeling of great degradation.

Now, what would happen if he were on a destroyer? Ah, it goes by ratio. He would not feel quite so degraded. And if he only lost a rowboat he would probably merely swear.

Now, what rationale is there behind this? What possible rationale lies behind this? There is no rationale behind this. There are no reasons why.

But a thetan can add a lot of reasons why to havingness. You see, he can add a lot of them. But the fact of the matter is, it is a problem in havingness.

Now, havingness works the reverse. We take somebody who is a hundred-thousand miles outside earth, and we take him and we just shove him down on earth, you see, and

here he's subjected to all this gravity, and so forth. Very many things could happen to him. One of the things that could happen to him: he'd get a tremendous resurgence and he'd feel awfully good. But at the same time he could also feel awfully degraded.

Not the same feeling of degradation, however. He would feel gluttoned. Have you ever eaten too much? Feel torpid, stupid, sort of hypnotized? You ever felt that way from eating too much? Be the same thing if you took somebody out here, a hundred-thousand miles out, and you suddenly and immediately put him on the surface of a planet.

Now, havingness originally was the simple matter of mock-ups, and so forth, but this went into a further consideration, and havingness and impacts became very intimately connected. And so we have havingness and impacts being, to all intents and purposes, the same thing.

You go up and hit the wall and you will have some havingness. The havingness is the impact itself. Now, basically, the awareness of awareness unit does not need this impact and really does not want this impact. But after it's been given a few impacts then it has to have. See?

What's happened is its resistance has been overcome, so that when it tries to outflow, it inflows. That's an inversion, and that's what's meant by inversion: The person tries to outflow, he inflows. In other words, he exactly reverses his consideration on the thing.

Then, somebody has to have an impact. You say it's idiotic that somebody's driving out the road out here who just absolutely ... Did you ever see anybody who was real hungry, or ... you know, real hungry? If he saw a piece of food he would slaver at the mouth? There are people driving on this highway out here who are so hungry for impacts that they're actually quiveringly eager to smash something. It's just eager. Yeah, that's insane.

Well, they might be insane, but they're still licensed by state police all over the United States. They walked in; they give them a license to have impacts.

You see, at first they don't want impacts. They don't want them, don't want them, don't want them, don't want them. They'll start outflowing against them – rigid, rigid – and then that screen will get in closer and closer. They mustn't have this impact. They mustn't have this impact. They ... *oowwwmmm* – *apathy*. "Well, I guess I'll have the impact."

Now, at the same time the person starts to desire to have an impact, you get a shift of valence. Now, you know what a shift of valence is from Book One. That merely means taking on the identity of another mass. Taking on the identity of another mass is an inversion.

Here's an awareness of awareness unit, it is caught in a mass of energy. It's in a large mass of energy. After a little while it will begin to think of itself as energy. You run Beingness Processing on this person as an experimental process, and *you will* discover something quite curious. You will discover that the person believes himself to be the mass of energy. He believes it so implicitly and so thoroughly that no argument on your part could ever convince him otherwise.

Now, we ask him, "Be yourself. Be the energy mass. Be yourself. Be the energy mass. Be yourself. Be the energy mass." He is one thing after the other.

And the first thing you know, the most *horrible* feeling of apathy and degradation, and so forth, will come over him. He's just now gotten onto the Tone Scale! Just that moment got onto the Tone Scale, you see?

You're actually causing him to lose that mass of that trap, or that body or that energy mass, you see? But the manifestation is that he *was* the energy mass. Now, as we start to ask him to "Be the mass. Be yourself. Be the mass. Be yourself. Be the mass. Be yourself," the first thing you know, he's aware of it.

One of the curious things is as you start that process – as an experimental process – if you start that process, you get into this kind of a manifestation with the person: He will tell you, if you are processing him with Scientology, "You know, there's a thetan in here someplace? There is a thetan in here someplace. I just know that."

And similarly, individuals who fight this idea of being an energy-space production unit – an awareness of awareness unit; a thetan, rather than a body – these people who fight the idea and say, "I am a body. I am a body," actually, if you processed them a little while, would start to tell you about some demon or something of this sort that was chasing them or that haunted them, or they had a thetan in the front of their forehead or in their stomach, or something like that. They're talking about themselves.

And if you were to run them on this process or other processes saying, "Be a body. Be yourself. Be a body. Be yourself. Be a body. Be yourself," the fellow would just say, "Well, I am being a body, so I'll be myself," and so on. He'll gradually start to differentiate.

First thing you know – wham! He becomes this demon or something or other that he claims has been haunting him, and boy, will he feel degraded.

Well, actually it's loss of mass that causes the degradation. You see? He shifted his identity, and he will go back – if you don't run it very long afterwards and run that on up the line – he will just suffer to go back and be that body, rather than to have that horrible feeling of degradation. Oh, he will suffer. That's a horrible feeling – degradation.

Until a person has been run through something like that they wouldn't have any idea of how degraded maybe some tramp or general or bum might possibly feel. By the way, just take a general, for instance. You take a general and detach him from his army. See? Loss of havingness, he immediately feels degraded.

This is so much the case, that we expect it as a normal course of human events that a great loss will immediately result in the person feeling he has failed – so that if you were to take something away from somebody suddenly, he would then tell you he had failed. He hadn't failed at all. He'd merely detached himself from a mass.

Now, he could go back and attach himself to that mass again, you see, and then he would not have failed.

Most thetans have the motto "Anything," in terms of havingness, "is better than nothing. *Anything* is better than nothing." As a result, you get such manifestations as the Freudian hoarding of excreta. You know, people will actually cache this stuff, and so forth. You get people who are terribly constipated. You get the fellow who cannot possibly empty his desk. You get the electrician whose entire workshop is completely littered with old, burned-out tubes and busted transformers and completely unworkable pieces of junk. But boy, it's there. It's mass, you see?

And we get a woman and her purse. Ever look into a woman's purse? Well, you'll see some interesting things.

Now, as a person starts to deteriorate, they begin to attach great importance to any havingness there is. And they will save little slips of paper, and get masses and masses and masses of paper. You know, they get as psychotic as General Electric. I imagine General Electric has files that go back to ten years before they began. And they save these little pieces of paper.

Now, one poor psychotic lady went so far one time to give to somebody a very precious dispatch, which this other person trustingly sent on to me. "Well, this was for Ron," you see. And it was sent registered, special delivery. And it was insured for a very large sum, and when I got it out, it was old grocery receipts that had been scribbled all over-years old, you know. But it was this terribly valuable package, these pieces of paper, see, awfully valuable.

Just a piece of mass.

Well now, what can a person have? This is the first question you ask of a preclear when you're processing him on havingness. You ask him, now, what could he really have? By the way, that isn't the process. I mean, the auditor simply looks at the preclear, you see, and he asks himself, "What could this person have?" Or he could even ask the preclear as a Straightwire question, "Now, what could you really have?" And the preclear will flounder along. And, by the way, a five-hour comm lag would not be extraordinary on this, and the individual will finally get down to realizing that he could have the shadow of an old inner tube. He couldn't have the inner tube. He could have the shadow of an inner tube.

And an auditor doesn't realize or recognize when he's processing most preclears that he's dealing with this sort of thing. He sees them sitting there. He's looking at all their social responses. He believes they can have a body. He believes that they can have possessions. Because they're wearing clothes, why, he thinks immediately they can have clothes, they can have shoes. Because they drive a car, he thinks they can have a car.

Well, the funny part of it is, they can't have a car quite ordinarily. The car is going to pieces under them, and strange things are getting wrong with it. As far as their shoes are concerned, well, this is just social. We wear shoes. They would actually not either be happier or unhappier if they were suddenly to lose their shoes, but they might not be anywhere near as concerned as you would think, because they're not their shoes. Everything they have, every identity that they possess, all their possessions, and so forth, are really kind of foggily somebody else's.

Now, the police, by the way, are always trying to take possession of people's bodies. As any race of demons operating in a civilization will do, they're always body hungry. And they try to find reasons why they can take people's bodies and do things with them, you see.

And you think, by the way, there's a big rationale to the operation of police – there isn't. There isn't. They go according to certain laws and people frown on them if they step too wide. But they want to put bodies into closed cubicles or into electric chairs, or something. But they want to possess or own these bodies. And it's just a matter of mass.

Now, speaking of the less respected strata of society – here we have an admiral. Here we have an admiral, and we set him up, and we do the unfortunate thing of appointing him to head a naval base. This naval base was getting along all right. It was doing all right. Maybe the country was at war, and something of the sort, and this admiral gets in charge of this naval base.

Now honest, he won't send any ships out of there. Every ship that comes in *stays* there, you see. You say in the war this couldn't happen; not when they need ships on the high seas to fight submarines and all that sort of thing.

No. No. They will accumulate ships, for instance, like little yachts from private yachtsmen – this admiral will. And he'll accumulate those, and he'll rig them up, you know, and put a naval flag on them which means they're owned. And then they sit there in the harbor. And they're heavily manned – men, you know, mass. And the next thing you know, why, you start transferring drafts and they're for retransfers to ships. And you find out that you just can't get them retransferred to ships.

And you can't get ships dispatched out of that area. In other words, it's getting a bigger and bigger lump. Well, you'll discover after a while that this naval base has to have additional land in this direction and additional docks in that direction, and additional anchorages out that way and more warehouses down that way to house more things in there that won't be issued either.

Now, trying to get something out of the admiral's supply officer becomes almost

impossible. So, it is the routine thing that combat ships coming into that area – they recognize this – they have to bribe or steal what they need to go on and fight the war.

I have seen an admiral seated in this capacity accumulate to himself a thousand seamen first class, when there was such a scarcity of ships at sea fighting a war, that it was hardly possible to find anybody to steer. Now, a seaman first class is able to steer. They'd send you apprentice seamen, or something of this sort, or seamen second class. But you say, "Where are all of the seamen first class?"

And I saw an example of this one time. Seamen first class had been ordered to this base, you see, with this admiral in charge, and he, of course, had accumulated them. And then he couldn't let them go.

And he had them there sweeping a dry dock. There was one dry dock, and he used a thousand seamen first class to keep it swept. It had to be swept every couple, three weeks when new ships went in, you see. Very important.

Look at their offices. First they hire somebody to expedite their despatches, and then this person has to have a secretary, and then that secretary has to have secretaries, and then there have to be other departments. And now there are more departments and havingness, havingness, havingness, accumulative. And the more mass there is, the less outflow.

Now, how many ships, airplanes, space wagons, bodies, and so forth, do you suppose have left the surface of earth in the last ten days and gone out into outer space? Hm? Well, there just haven't been any, have there?

This is called gravity. When it gets that big it gets a dignified name called gravity. When it's a little kid wanting a sucker, it's called selfishness or greediness. No essential difference between these two things.

All right. Our psycho sits there on the couch. You want this psycho to discharge the charge out of one lock, see? Their husband brought them in, you see. and there they sit. And you say, "Well, this ... get the idea of your husband bringing you in this morning."

Oh, no you don't! Nope! That lock won't discharge. They can remember it, but it's *solid*. Their memory is solid. They can't have anything else, so they can have engrams, so they can have blackness, so they can have locks. And these things are held to them by this same manifestation which you might call gravity. They have become very solid.

And you try to get them, by straight recall and Elementary Straightwire, to release one lock – "a time that you really wouldn't mind forgetting" – and this person is just ... They can remember it. But it doesn't release. And this is what used to drive Dianeticists mad.

This fellow could run an engram and he could run it and he could run it and he could run it, but it never desensitized. The answer to that was *havingness*. *His* havingness was very low. He had lost too much in life, and he couldn't give up a memory.

Worse than that, there sits that psycho and you ask the psycho, "Would you hand me your ..." Let's be very unsmart, and say, "Well, hand me your purse."

"Hm-mm." Right straight up to her chest, clutch, clutch, clutch, see. There's an old Kleenex in it. So you as an auditor say to her, "Well, how about giving me that old, used, secondhand Kleenex?"

"Ho-oh, no!"

I've seen an auditor work at this for an hour, and finally get the person to trust the purse – which was being clutched in this fashion – to trust the purse down alongside of the couch; in other words, let it out of her hands so that she could snatch it. But no further distance than that.

Well, all right. There is acquisitiveness. There is havingness. There is a person compulsively and completely holding on to engrams, locks, black masses, screens, all these

other manifestations that we know about through auditing in Dianetics. Here's this person holding on to it. And you think you are going to get this person to give up an aberration or an idea or a psychosis or anything of the sort? Oh, no. They're just going to grip-grip-grip-grip-grip tighter and tighter and tighter.

Now, they will *invert* – *you* think that's bad – they will *invert so* that they obsessively cannot have anything near them. You get the inversion and a reinversion and a reinversion. When they pull out to reach, they actually pull in.

Well, that will invert to a point where they obsessively push away. And you will find somebody who is quite mad throwing ... You'll find these lighter manifestations of the bank in sane people, but in mad people it's quite obvious. This person, if you dressed him, would throw his clothes away from him. You see, he'd throw everything away from him.

Now, this person also is liable to obsessively exteriorize. And because the psychiatrist has seen this occur, he knows exteriorization is an insanity. It's a manifestation of "psychiatric paranoia schizaboola."

Actually, the person isn't exteriorizing at all. The person is just obsessively fighting away from the body and doesn't want any contact with it – really is not outside with perception, which is what we call exteriorization. Well, in Dianetics you will see somebody, then, doing this trick to you as an auditor. This is the other side of the picture. This is unhavingness, see. And you sit down to audit them, and they just start throwing engrams at you – zoom-zoom-zoom-zoom.

You start to run an engram and you get at the beginning of birth, you know, and "All right. Now, let's take up what the doctor said." But they're running an incident two years old. "Well? No, let's take up birth." Now it's a prenatal. Now, we start in to run birth again. Now it's a sixteen-year-old incident they're running. See what they're doing?

Now, watch that other manifestation. This is the "throwaway" case. They're just all over the bank, just obsessively "I've got to get rid of this. I've got to get rid of that. I've got to shove this off. I've got to get rid of the other one."

Now, you'll get cases that have these two things in sort of combination. They will shift. At one time they've got to grab everything to their chest, and the next time, you do anything about it, they're going to throw everything at you, see.

They will even go so far as to pick up things and throw them at you in the auditing room. The other person will take things of yours with them when they leave the auditing session.

Now, to a person whose havingness is in poor condition, a word becomes a precious object – a word is an object; a symbol is solid. When a person does not have sufficient havingness and has a craving for havingness, symbols become solid. That's why engramic commands have such a terrific force upon such people. They're preserving and holding every word that comes their way.

Somebody walks down the street to them and says, "How are you?" Well now, as you know about as-ness, as-ising things erases them. This person, then, in order to possess this thing, can't look at the salutation "How are you?" They have to do this.

They hold "How are you?" to their bosom, and then they don't look at this. They look beyond it, under it, on the back side of it, something of the sort. "What did he mean when he said 'How are you?'"

In Latin countries, and amongst Californians where you have *very* hot sun, it wouldn't matter what you did – if you picked up a fork alongside of your plate and put something in your mouth, there would be somebody in the restaurant wondering what was the deep significance of this. See, their obsessive havingness is such that they just can't *look* at



anything. Because if they *looked* at something directly and straightly, it would erase, you understand, and then they wouldn't have it. So, their way of keeping these things and holding them and not letting them erase is to always say they are something else.

Now, you say to this person "How are you?" And this person, then, has something else as his primary motive in dealing with you. You say, "How are you?" and he will want to know why you were asking him that. You see, what deep motive is there?

Now, let's tack this onto cause and effect and discover that all he's really trying to do is find basic, original cause (which is never attainable), or find basic, last effect (which, again, is never attainable).

And so when he goes to deal in researches in the field of the mind, he wants to know the reason why all of this universe came into existence. He wants to know from what it stems.

He's not interested in getting well or anything of the sort. All he does is inquire as to what was the expression on God's face when he first made Manhattan – it's beside the point. You'll see these people around. They're doing this with everything. Nothing is as it is. There is no as-iness to existence at all.

Now, you ask this person in Opening Procedure of 8-C, "Touch that wall. " and his concept of the wall is that there's something else there, really. And you ask him to touch a wall and finally after he's done this many times and many hours, he finally discovers, by touching various walls and objects, that it is what it *is* – a wall. That's all you are trying to teach him.

You're getting him over this idea of trying to avoid as-ising everything. This person is low on havingness. Almost any human being there is will get into this sort of a condition. Sooner or later, he will lose something, he will feel that something is irreparable to him, and after that he feels he can't have things of that order but can have things of a lower order.

This is acceptance level I give you. In one of the PABs – acceptance level. They're a very, very good thing for an auditor to know. His acceptance level deteriorates. He can't have the better things, he can have the worse things. And then amongst these worse things, he can't have the better of the worse things, you see. And he only can have worse things than that, and so we get a dwindling spiral to where somebody will actually associate with the lowest dregs of humanity and would not associate with somebody who was in pretty good shape.

Now, they see something beautiful, they try to make nothing out of it. That's because they can't have it, you see? They say, "Oh, no, I don't know. That's...uh...mm... Something wrong with it."

Now, if you were to go down, and you were to buy the best-looking suit and the best-looking tie and the finest-looking car – you were to dress yourself up looking *real* good – you would drive most of the people you ran into immediately afterwards into a sort of a shuddering fit, because you've confronted them with things they can't have.

But their expression is *not* a conscious expression. Their expression is simply, "I've got to get rid of this somehow. See, I've got to cut this down somehow." And they'll find something wrong with your haircut, your suit and your car.

Now, if you were to drive up to these same people in an old, broken-down jalopy, wearing old, stained clothes with your hair shaggy, and so forth, they'd say, "My friend!" You're *acceptable* to them.

Now, to Daddy and Mama, who never gave any interest to the healthy child, but always hovered over the sick one, we have a child convinced that he cannot have good health. The only thing he can have is ill health. So that interest actually lies as a background music to this.

All right. Let's take up some of the factors involved in this, and we find the Scale of Substitutes. When a person loses something he can only have a substitute for it. I'm not going to read you this Scale of Substitutes now, because it is lying right in front of you in the printed edition of the *Auditor's Handbook*, and toward the end of the processing section there, under "loss," you discover the Scale of Substitutes. And it's a very interesting scale. It's not terribly important to you, but it just demonstrates to you what are these different kinds of cases you're looking at.

Well, the kind of case is what the person is substituting for. That's just what he's using as a substitute.

All right. There's the Hide to Curiosity Scale. Now, this is one of the more important discoveries of Scientology. And this is quite, quite vital that you know. The Scale of Substitutes, that's merely interesting. But this one you've got to know.

Did you ever hear of the DEI Scale? Desire, enforce, inhibit. It goes, actually: curiosity; a person is curious about something, and then he desires that something, and then his desire is enforced and then his desire for it is inhibited. You see that?

In other words, he desires it, he has to have it, he can't have it – desire, enforce, inhibit. That scale continues downward, and these two scales, which were previously considered two scales, are actually only one scale. There is another scale, and it goes (bottom up) hide, protect, own. Now, you know that scale. That's the subzero Tone Scale.

The DEI Scale joins the subzero Tone Scale so that you get a scale that goes like this: Hide, Protect, Own, Inhibit, Enforce, Desire, Curious About. And that is the scale.

Now, it's an odd thing that these two scales that stood independently so long actually belong together, one below the other. And I'll repeat that scale for you again. It's Hide at the bottom, then Protect, then Own, then Inhibit, and then Enforce, and then Desire, and of course at the top of that we would have Curious About. And this is the Scale of Havingness.

Curious about what? Curious about an object. Enforcing what? Enforcing an object, in havingness. Could be a flow, too. That would be in the doingness part of this. And we're studying havingness right now as the more important manifestation. And then, we would have Inhibit – can't have it.

In other words, anytime you enforce somebody into having something – you force him to have this thing – he sooner or later will find that he or you will inhibit his havingness.

And after that we have to have ownership. That's "decide who owns it." You see, now we have to have ownership. Up to that time ownership was not vital. But now, we can lay deed of title to these things. We could say, "That's *your* shirt, and these are *my* shoes," you see. And then we don't get into this desire, enforce, inhibit. You don't have to wear *my* shoes and I'm not inhibited from wearing *your* shirt. We've just settled the whole thing: You own your shirt and I own my shoes.

And now, after a person no longer can own, he has to start protecting. Now, wait a minute. Below Own you get Protect? You certainly do. You don't really protect something that you really own. You just have it, it's yours to use.

But then you become *worried* about it. And you own it, but now you've got "protect it," too. And so you've got a tie that you like real well and here is what happens, eventually, to that tie. You like this tie and then your father or somebody takes it out of the closet and wears it. And you come up to him and you say, "Look, that's *my* tie. Now, I ... That's *my* tie," you see?

You've gone out of just hinting that he shouldn't wear it, you see, and into "That's *my* tie. I own that tie, and you're not to wear it."

Okay. You're at a party. You're at a party and a girl spills some wine on it or something

of the sort, you know. So you decide "I'll kind of wear it like this, you know, and stick it back into the shirt." You're protecting that tie now, and now you find out, when you put it in the closet – just so your father won't get it and wear it again, you see ... You've failed to really establish any of your points all the way down the line. This is the clue of this. You never do establish any of these points. You put it at the back of the closet, not with the rest of your ties – that's to protect it. The motive was to protect it. But you have *hid* it.

It is now *hidden*. And the first thing you know, you don't wear that tie at all. You'll protect it to the degree that you have hidden it utterly. And it'll do nothing but stay in the closet. And twenty-five years later, when they're assembling your effects to send them home to your fifth wife, somebody'll run across this tie.

And he'll say, "What do you know? A tie!" Curious, you know, "What's that thing? Well, I guess I'll keep it. I'll wear it. I'll wear the tie." And the fellow wears the tie, and then somebody says, "You know, that is a lousy looking tie." and so on.

"Well. I am going to wear this tie whether you like it or not!"

See, he wears it anyhow. And his wife doesn't like it or something. And she keeps nagging at him, you know. Finally, he says, "Now, look. It's *my* tie and if *I* want to wear it, *I* will." And somehow or other, inexplicably, this tie gets lost for a week. She loses it for him. So, it's protected now. And the next person who got the tie put it in the drawer and it's hidden again.

Twenty-five years after that, when somebody is sending his effects home to his eighth wife, why, somebody finds this tie.

We can assume that this was a cast-iron tie to have lasted this long, but that's the way things go. And that is the history of an object. And that is therefore the history of havingness. And this is the dwindling spiral of havingness. We look over this and we will understand an awful lot about what people are doing.

All right. Let's get into Expanded Gita. You've got that in the printed edition of your *Auditor's Handbook* under SOP 8, Step IV. You should know that step; you know that step real well.

But there's more today, to Expanded Gita. We apply this whole scale that I've just told you about, to Expanded Gita. And we will *specialize* – specialize on most people when they're having a difficult time with something – to find *hidden* manifestations of it. And when their communication lag comes off on this ... You know, they're lacking in cars, let's say – they can't have cars: "Point out, find some hidden cars." You know, point them out, point them out, point them out. Pretty soon their communication lag will get flat.

All right. "Now let's look over some protected cars," you know. And they point these out and point these out and point these out and point these out.

And their comm lag comes off of that.

"Let's look over some owned cars." Point these out, point these out, point these out. Communication lag comes off of that. Now we'll have to get into some inhibited cars. And we point those out and point those out and point those out and point those out; the comm lag comes off of that.

Now, some enforced cars; and we point those out, until the comm lag comes off of that. Some desired cars – well, it really isn't necessary to run it then; he'll want a car. But you could run it further, and he would even run out his curiosity about cars.

What we are doing is improving his consideration. Any process which does this, by the way, is a process known as Improving One's Consideration. That is the name of that type of processing. You merely have him point out things or remember things, each time better than the last, until he's as-ised from the bottom up to the top, and his consideration is free. That's

how you get out of a trap: You better your consideration about the trap.

All right. Mock-ups and engrams are also a problem of havingness. And when you take the Scientology edition of *Self Analysis*, or take the old Dianetics edition of *Self Analysis*, and convert it. by telling people to mock these things up called for on the list ... See, rather than ask them to recall it, just every time you find the word *recall* in *Self Analysis – the Dianetics* edition, you see – anytime you find the word *recall* in those lists, just substitute the word *mock up* and you've converted the whole edition. There's no further trick than that.

And you just ask him to mock these things up and mock these things up – some interesting things will occur if you just did that. But there would be a better way to go about it. You ask him to mock this thing up which is called for there, and then pull it in on himself. Mock them up and pull them in, and mock them up and pull them in, and mock them up and pull them in, and mock them up and pull them in, and mock them up and pull them in, and mock them up and pull them in.

And what do you think flies off the case? *Engrams!* Well, how could engrams fly off if you simply pulled in mock-ups? It's because it's a problem in mass. It's not a problem in consideration; it's a problem in mass! Now, get that straight? It's a problem in mass.

Any time you think in terms of havingness, for heaven's sakes, think of it as a problem in mass, not a problem in reasons. The guy's got reasons to justify the fact that he has or doesn't have. But the main thing is the mass. And reasons or no reasons, there's the mass.

So, we get this process, then, supplanting actually the held-in-suspension engrams. Why are these engrams in suspension? It's because they are pictures taken of the environment by putting out a flood of energy against the environment and getting a print at moments of loss. A fellow outflows at the environment. The cells, you know – they admire; they try to surrender; they say, "Look, I'll be good." And they take a picture of their assailant. You know, they're trying to resist it and they put up that much energy, and so forth, and they get a picture. They get a motion picture. And this, you could say, gets filed.

Now, that is a protest against havingness. Every time you get one of these things, which is a protest against loss or a protest against havingness – either way ... Protest against loss, by the way, is a tractor effect. They take pictures backwards. You see that? They try to pull things back to them, and they get a print of the other side. They'll hold on to these things, because each one of them was held on to at the moment of loss or acquisition of something undesirable. And so here these things are.

And that's an engram in its basic fundamentals. The cells still keep on taking pictures after the analytical mind goes out. And you get these masses of pictures, and havingness itself encysts. You see, the fellow begins to believe he wants. And he actually pulls in upon himself the most undesirable considerations, simply because he has to have that mass.

And he pulls that mass in on himself and he holds it to himself, and so he gets Fac Ones and he gets anything you can think of in restimulation there, because he's pulled these masses in on him.

Now, if you want to run out somebody's havingness, let's exhaust engrams, exhaust engrams, exhaust engrams off a case. Don't be surprised if they're getting harder and harder to exhaust. Because you're reducing somebody's havingness by exhausting those engrams, you see? You're erasing them.

And therefore, the erasure of engrams is limited as a process. What limits it? It's because you run out of the bank just so much energy, and the individual will then begin to *seize* large masses of energy and hold them in.

And he'll hold them stronger and he'll hold more of them. That's why, obviously, every

time that we have done a lot of erasure on somebody in the current lifetime, we would get past-life engrams. Inevitable, wasn't it? See, he had to remedy his havingness somehow. So the easy way to do it was not to create anything, but was simply to pull in the old stuff on himself – not to get new pictures, but to pull in the old pictures. And so he started doing this.

And he *was* doing that. He was using this set of pictures. But the basic *use* of all this, if you want to understand a service facsimile, is simply to *hate*. And that's the total explanation.

Now, you run Remedy of Havingness on this individual and we get the most interesting release of engrams you've ever wanted to see in your life.

Honest, it's quite remarkable to see somebody who has been audited for a long time suddenly have engrams that are half or all erased (he thinks) flying away from him, caving in, disappearing. You're remedying the havingness.

How do you remedy havingness? You could remedy it two ways. If a person had too much, you could have them throw things away. You know, the dispersal characters? Well, you just have him mock up things and throw them away and mock them up and throw them away, and the first thing you know, he'll stabilize. He no longer does it obsessively.

That's remedying havingness. That's why we don't call it "grabbing on to havingness" or "pulling in energy" or "pulling in masses" or "adding mass."

We don't call it any of those things. We call it "remedying havingness."

One of the remedies of havingness is throw something away. And the other side is to pull something in. So you'll get a preclear on either side of this.

You would ask him to mock up something and throw it away, and mock up something and throw it away. Or you would ask him to mock up something and pull it in on himself.

What do we mean by himself? His body, of course, at first, and then as a thetan, something else.

Now, he very often, if he's one of these "reason why" fellows, has to have a big reason why. So he has to have substance and reason and meaning in the mock-ups he makes. He'll get over that after a short time.

Another manifestation of Remedy of Havingness is simply this: the starting of avalanches. And you must know something about this. You have the fellow mock up a small planet, or something of the sort, or a grain of dust, and he pulls it in on himself. See? He mocks it up and pulls it in. "And mock up another one. Pull it in. Mock up another one. Pull it in. Mock up another one. Pull it in."

"Now, can you mock up a pebble? Mock up a pebble. Pull it in. Pebble. Pull it in. Can you mock up a rock?"

"Yeah."

"Rock, and pull it in. Is it good and dense?"

"Well, it's fair."

"Mock up a rock and pull it in. Mock up a rock and pull it in. Now do you suppose you could mock up a small satellite?"

"Oh, yes, there's one."

"All right. Why don't you mock up a couple of those at a time and pull them in. You do that?"

"Sure. Sure."

"Now, let's start mocking up a planet."

Black planets, by the way, work wonderfully well. Boy, when you run into a black planet, you really know it. You see, the reason a black star or a black planet is black, is because the energy which it is emanating goes out just so far and then its own gravity pulls

it back in on itself. So, of course, the light doesn't escape, so you don't see it. If photons hit it they'd stay there. That's a black planet.

All right, you'd have him pull some of these in. You pull a ... "Mock up another black planet and pull it in. And mock up another black planet and pull it in."

Don't be surprised if all of a sudden, with a tremendous roar, the whole heavens start to fall in on this fellow. Planets, stars, moons – anything you could think of – just start coming in with a roar.

What do you do in a case like that? Just have him add to the mass coming in. Have him add to it, as he can. You know, just add to it and bring it in faster and add to it and bring it in faster. An avalanche may last an hour – may not happen at all. It may last an hour; it may last three days – just *roar*.

Well, what will happen while that avalanche is roaring? You've broken through some kind of a resistance, and the resistance now is being drunk up by the inflow. And engrams will appear – the time his mother slapped him, and so forth, will appear. If you were to stop while you were running a Remedy of Havingness on somebody to treat an engram, oh, you've just missed the *whole* point of havingness. See?

All right, all of a sudden you've got this avalanche started on this preclear, and boy, those engrams are flying off like mad in all directions. And suddenly here's this big facsimile of his big brother about to choke him. The facsimile is right in front of his face, and maybe it's the first one he ever saw and is he upset about this, you see?

The auditor who would process that would be in direct disobedience to the Auditor's Code, where it says: Just because the preclear changed the auditor shouldn't change.

Pull in some more planets and you'll see that whole facsimile blow. It will actually *disintegrate*. It's mass will no longer be so precious that it will be held to the preclear. See that?

Now, there can be an outflowing avalanche, too, and those things'll sometimes start going obsessively. And they'll just run and run and run and run and run. Let them run. Only have the preclear add to them, add to them, add to them.

The general law back of all auditing – now get this – general law back of all auditing: *Make the preclear do what is happening. Whatever's happening, make the preclear do it.*

You know, he's got a whirling dervish dancing in front of his face. Make him put another whirling dervish there, or make the same one dance.

And you say, "But I can't control it at all." Well, every once in a while, every few ticks, make his left leg jerk while he's dancing. And the first thing you know, he'll make both legs jerk. And the next thing you know, he's got the whole dervish under his control.

Getting something under control, then, is merely accomplished by having the preclear do it. It's a very important piece of auditing.

All right. So we avalanche, you have the preclear do it. See, an avalanche starts – inward or outward – you have the preclear do it.

Nor, the basic auditing commands of the Remedy of Havingness are simply this: "Put something out in front of you." "Get a mock-up of something." Now, you don't care how thin it is, how unsubstantial, how unreal. Certainty has no place in the Remedy of Havingness. Remember that. This is one place where it has no place.

Because things get real and unreal and back and forth while you're remedying havingness on a preclear – no certainty involved in it at all. You say, "Get a mock-up out in front of you. Get some kind of an energy mass. Mock up one" – any command of that character. "All right. Now take that and pull it in on yourself. You say you can't do that? Well, can you take that and throw it away? Oh, you can? Well, mock up another one and

throw it away. Mock up another one and throw it away. Mock up another one and throw it away. Mock up another one, and another one, and another one, another one, another one, another one, another one."

The guy says, "You know, I'm feeling better." He's gotten rid of some of them. Or, if it went in on him, mock up something . . . It didn't matter what, see. He may want to mock up something very significant. You as an auditor know that it doesn't matter *a damn* what he mocks up. Density and mass are the only thing you want.

But, in order to make life more palatable for him or something of the sort, you will permit him to add significance to it. So you will permit him to mock up his mother or a cash register or something, and pull it in on himself. Pull it in the other way, you know – pull it in, pull it in, pull it in, pull it in, pull it in. Mock it up. Pull it in. Mock it up. Pull it in. You don't care whether it flies in automatically or not. Don't depend on an automaticity in auditing anyway. Have him mock it up and pull it in, mock it up and pull it in. Now have him mock up two and pull them in, two and pull them in, or two and throw them away – see, whichever one he was doing, outflow or inflow – two.

Now, let's see if he can get real hot. Make it four. Now, if you're going to make it four, make him put it up in the corners, in the shape of the corners of a box. Because now you've got space starting there, see. So, the top corners of the box would be the first four, and you want him to get those other four in there, too, so that you get eight corners to this box. And preferably, you want these eight corners, each one equidistant from him, so he's in the center of the box. And having mocked them up, you pull them in. Have him mock them up and pull them in. Mock them up and pull them in. Mock them up and pull them in.

And that is really the only way you remedy havingness on somebody when he's exteriorized. You simply have him put up . . . Build him up to a point where he can put up eight anchor points – eight masses, eight black planets, eight anything – and pull them in. Put them up and pull them in. Put them up and pull them in. And your thetan, when he does not have any havingness at all, gets very unhappy indeed. He gets unhappy. So you remedy that unhappiness and you'll be all set.

Now, very often, some of the cases you will audit will become cheerless, unhappy, upset and so forth. If they *do* get upset, *you* as the auditor – one way or the other, or no matter how unwittingly – have upset their havingness. So remedy some havingness.

Now, you use this step anytime – anytime, any place. Doesn't matter where. But it goes along with the next one you have, which is Spotting Spots in Space.

Now, Elementary Straightwire or any kind of Straightwire is actually remedying havingness to some slight degree. By remembering these things he frees energy masses. You see that?

Your talking to him remedies his havingness. You're there, aren't you? You're in communication with him, aren't you? Well, therefore, you're a part of his havingness at the moment you are talking to him.

The reason people won't talk to other people is because they don't want to unlatch that much havingness – you know, get rid of that word. A word would be a very valuable thing.

Now, the difference is scarcity and abundance. There is a scarcity of things. there's an abundance of things. But how does something get *Valuable*? The mechanics of something becoming valuable are the mechanics of it getting scarce. When you see something that is valuable, you will have to assume immediately that it is scarce; that it *got* valuable because it *became* scarce. The way to make it unvaluable would be to remedy the havingness about it.

Supposing this fellow was in love, he was desperately in love – just unconquerably,

horribly "bashed in the head" on the subject. "The only girl in the world," he will tell you. That makes her real scarce, doesn't it? Have him mock this girl up and remedy his havingness with her. You know? Mock her up. Remedy his havingness. Mock her up. Remedy his havingness. Mock her up. Remedy his havingness.

He'd say, "Yeah, she's a nice girl. I've always had nice girls." Mock her up. Remedy his havingness. Mock her up. Remedy his havingness. Mock up eight of her. Remedy his havingness with her. See? The next thing you know, he can take her or leave her alone.

"Oh," you say, "we mustn't do such things as completely upset love affairs and families." Well, whether you know it or not, you *will*. In the wake of Dianetics and Scientology there are a lot of broken marriages, which never should have been consummated in the first place.

We bring people up the line to a point where they can fight, and then they get divorced. Okay. I don't say that divorce is an inevitable consequence of being processed. As a matter of fact, twice as many people have settled into a happy married state through processing as have blown up the other way.

But marriage is an unstable situation. You take dynamite like Dianetics or Scientology and throw it at it and God knows what is going to occur.

All right. We look this over and we find out there's one other fact that you have to know about this, and that's overt acts and motivators. When a person does something, he puts some energy out, he expects the energy back. So when he does something bad, he expects something bad to happen to him, doesn't he? That's simply under the heading of Remedy of Havingness. See that? Overt-act-motivator sequence.

Now, we have flows and terminals. When you set up two terminals, they will discharge one against the other. We already have mentioned that. And we have this process, "Two things can't occupy the same space."

"What wouldn't you mind occupying your same space – the same space you are occupying?" is a *tremendous* process, and actually boosts a person out of having to have havingness. Very important process. It's in the printed edition of your *Handbook*. A very, very important process, because this is the background of havingness.

Havingness can only exist as long as two things can't occupy the same space. Havingness is the *antithesis* of affinity. You see where affinity is? Now, we already talked about affinity. Let's fit that into havingness.

Significance and problems, of course, are secondary, really, to havingness – really are. But there can get such a scarcity of problems that your preclear, who can only have problems and can't have objects – look at your Scale of Substitutes – your preclear who can only have problems and can't have objects or even mock-ups or engrams, and so forth, won't let go of a problem unless his havingness in terms of problems is remedied. So this goes into havingness, too, doesn't it?

Now, this is a big subject. It's a big process. It doesn't matter how real or unreal the objects are that you use to remedy havingness. I have done some very fantastic and wonderful things with this process. And every auditor around here has done some wonderful things with this process.

Some of the strangest and goofiest things have happened to people on the Remedy of Havingness. And what do you think is happening to somebody who's just got to have a body, who's just got to have a body, and so forth? He's just got a scarcity of bodies, that's all. The person that won't exteriorize has too great a scarcity of bodies. Okay? Well, I hope you know all about it now.



# SPOTTING SPOTS

*A lecture given on  
13 October 1954*

All right, today I would like very much to talk to you about Spotting Spots as one of the basic techniques which you must know if you are going to know what there is to know about auditing.

*You* understand that we are covering here the six basic processes and the one piece of information, seven in all, which an auditor simply has to have. We have to have these things. And if he has these things down, if he knows these things well, then he can take any process there is and go at it and function with it.

Now, out of these six, there is one notable piece of technology missing – that technology which immediately addresses engrams and runs them to erasure as covered in Book One. But we are not covering that. Do you notice this? In the six items that we're training you with, we do not cover that.

Why don't we cover it? Because in Perfect Duplication, one of the Route 2 processes, we can make an engram vanish in a very short space of time.

These six steps which you're getting are superior to the running of engrams – any day of the *week* – *superior* to the running of engrams.

Why? Well, I gave that to you yesterday, didn't I? Remedy of Havingness. And if you wanted, really, to run engrams, all you would have to do would be to remedy enough havingness and you would have run out all the engrams which are in restimulation. Why are they in restimulation? Because the person's havingness is low, so he brings in these masses of energy upon himself – you see, brings in the masses of energy upon himself in lieu of other energy deposits – and so gets engrams into restimulation. Now, you must realize that and know why, then, we aren't teaching or working with the running of engrams.

Now, you could run engrams and remedy havingness, and run engrams and remedy havingness, and very possibly it would be a technique which had some value. It takes a long time to run an engram. It takes longer to run an engram than we care to spend on a preclear today.

So although engrams can be run, remember that when they are run, we run into the liability that havingness is reduced in the preclear and, therefore, must be remedied. It's the mass of energy. In the opinion of a thetan, anything is better than nothing, and so he will accumulate this mass.

So you understand, now, very clearly that we are studying the six techniques, and the one piece of knowledge which is absolutely essential to an auditor. We go on from there to learn many other things, but these are still the basics that we are dealing with. And those basics are, of course: two-way communication, Elementary Straightwire, the Opening Procedure of 8-C, the Opening Procedure by Duplication, the Remedy of Havingness and Spotting Spots in Space, and the one piece of information we have to have is the Chart of Human Evaluation.

Now, if we know these items, then, we're in good order and we can do all these things. Now, I pointed out that the one thing that you might find missing in this lineup would be the running of engrams. But it is not missing. It is under Remedy of Havingness. Remedy enough havingness (in other words, have a person bring in masses and throw away masses and, you know, create masses and pull them in on himself, and so forth), and he'll run out every engram in the bank.

There's another way of running engrams. Perfect Duplication, which I just mentioned to you. You put him back down the track, have him take a look at it, make a perfect duplicate of it, and *poof!* it's gone.

All right, what do you think *that* does to havingness – just a sudden, sweeping disappearance of these huge ridges and masses. Oh, man.

Here's a typical case history on this – typical case history. I'm going over this very carefully because it's very germane to Spotting Spots in Space. Everything I'm saying here has to do with Spotting Spots in Space.

All right. We have had this happen several times, but to give you one particular example of this, there were three people who were retread in Unit 7 – that is to say, they were holdover. And they came up here, and I had released Perfect Duplication to them, you see, and told them all about Perfect Duplication. And they were the most wildly excited people you ever saw in your life. These people were trained, basically, in running of engrams, and they suddenly had realized after I told them about Perfect Duplication that they could get the goal of Book One – which was to say, run out every single engram in the bank from A to Izzard, *zoom!* That's all the body's composed of, is engrams; solids.

Well, they came up here the first day and were they excited! Oh, they were just thrilled to death. Why, all they'd have to do was look at birth, you know, and make a perfect duplicate of it, *pfft*, gone. Look at Fac One, *pfft*, perfect duplicate, gone, you see. Gone! Gone! This one missing. That one missing.

First day: Oh, they were excited!

Second day: It was still working and they didn't quite understand why I wasn't insisting that everybody in the 7th Unit do this as the exclusive technique.

And the third day, one of them was out here on the porch, and he had had enough havingness run out of him to where the whole physical universe, you see, was dimming out and getting thin, and doing other interesting things. Boy, that havingness was really shot.

Well, that's why we don't make perfect duplicates of the whole bank, engram after engram, until we have a Clear.

See, there was a bug in clearing. You see Book One did not reach down into those people who could not create energy anymore. You know, people who were no longer able to create energy, and who didn't create energy at will – Book One didn't touch them.

Now, what was the bug there? This was the tough case. This person was no longer creating energy. So you'd run a few engrams and he would never mock up the difference. He would just go down into this havingness factor. So we've actually reached far south, then, of running engrams when we've gotten into Remedy of Havingness, haven't we? See, far south.

All right. We're way down to rock bottom now with these techniques, because we're talking about techniques that will take people who are practically dead, you know, and they'll do something with them. And none of these techniques – none of these techniques – have a big liability connected with them. That's quite important. None of these techniques have a big liability, but on the other side of the picture, they have an enormous

lot of benefit that go along with them so they're the basic techniques.

But I talked to you yesterday about Remedy of Havingness, and I talked to you about Remedy of Havingness before I'm talking to you about Spotting Spots in Space for the excellent reason that you cannot have a preclear spot spots in space unless you know about the Remedy of Havingness. Do you follow me?

Now, you would not go out here and take somebody you were teaching how to audit, or something of the sort, and show this individual how to spot spots in space without teaching about Remedy of Havingness. What would happen? The same thing would happen if you started spotting spots in space as would happen if you started making perfect duplicates. You'd just run all the person's havingness right on down. Boom! Gone.

All right. So therefore, Spotting Spots in Space is actually a joint technique. It runs right in there with Remedy of Havingness. These two things belong right together, and they're quite important. And with these two things – with these two things (Remedy of Havingness, Spotting Spots in Space) – you can do any trick that could have been done with Book One or in the processing section of *Science of Survival* – just these two things.

Somebody wrote me in here yesterday – the other day – very excited, extremely excited, because they'd found out that by doing nothing but remedy havingness for the preclear for eight hours that his sonic and visio and everything else had turned on. In other words, this person had finally – this person finished, I believe, in Unit 5 or 6 – this person had learned that the Remedy of Havingness worked. But they omitted Spotting Spots in Space, and yet, they turned on this person's sonic and visio. Between these two processes, you would think, offhand, that the Remedy of Havingness was the more important process, wouldn't you? Therefore, if you did it for eight hours you'd think it was the more important process.

No, it's not really, because it only refers to matter, and you're trying to get the preclear up to where he can get space. You want this preclear to have space.

All right. So we've got to play these things one against the other. He's either got to have a remedy of havingness, or he's got to have his space remedied. And every time you try to remedy some preclear's space, you're going to tear his havingness up, and every time you try to remedy his havingness, you're going to tear his space up. So we have to play these things one against the other until he gets up to a point where he can actually create space and create havingness.

So, these two techniques – the most important for a low-level case is the Remedy of Havingness, certainly. But, once you've remedied havingness, remember we still have another factor, the remedy of space. And when we take the remedy of space we get into spotting spots.

All right, let's get into this whole technique of spotting spots, and let's discover that the first thing there is to know about spotting spots is the theory of space.

Space is viewpoint of dimension. Argue with it if you want to, but it happens to be a workable definition. And space, being a viewpoint of dimension, is the first definition of space.

There has not been, prior to Scientology, a definition of space. There was space, and space is a manifestation of energy and time, but we don't quite know how this works. Einstein – his last paper, I think – dabbles with this and fools around with it, and all he does is relate space to energy and time. It does not relate space to humanity, and space is a human or life experience. In the absence of life, there wouldn't be any.

It's Descartes' old idea, "If a tree fell in the forest, there was nobody there to hear it, why, would there have been a sound?" Yeah. Trees can hear. Trees are alive. But let's take

nothing but no life and no evidence or manifestation of life – take no life and *no* evidence or manifestation of life – and you wouldn't have had a sound. You wouldn't have space. That's the truth of the matter.

Now, in the ... I think the eleventh edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, it says that physics must begin with the research of the psychological phenomena of space, energy and time, and unless it does so begin, then it will not have a definition of space.

This, by the way, was first written about 1890. Nobody in psychology ever paid any attention to it, and nobody in physics ever paid any attention to it. I came along and all of a sudden paid attention to it.

I was asked to study the physical universe. I was being asked to study nuclear physics, atomic and molecular phenomena, all sorts of odds and ends and incomprehensibles, and they had not basically resolved the most fundamental things they had to resolve, which are: space, energy and time – what are these things?

They're psychological phenomena. That's *all* they are. And the whole science of physics, then, is entirely dependent upon the mind. You want to know why, then, did a nuclear physicist ever go into the field of the mind? Why did we ever get Dianetics and Scientology? Why did I become interested in it?

Well, I became definitely interested in it because the smallest unit of energy I could find must be a mental unit of energy. That must be the smallest unit of energy there was – because of memory. Here's this little tiny brain, it's supposed to be able to store some *tremendous* number of memories, therefore, it must be a very tiny unit of energy. Hm?

Well, that's where I came in. And then I noticed way later, this, about the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* and other speculations upon this particular line, and I became, of course, interested in the field of the mind.

Well, because nobody else had made this bridge, nobody else had stepped out of physics and gotten into psychology, because people in psychology ... We've left that for a moment of prayer.

You go around and you ask a psychologist to add up a column of twos. He says, "Huh?".

And you say, "Well now," you tell the psychologist, "you know the Einstein theory." And he says, "Huh?"

And you say to him, "Now, you take scientific methodology." He says, "Huh?"

He doesn't know what he's talking about. He's not trained in mathematics. He's not trained in physics, chemistry or any of these other things. He has no discipline. A psychologist is *incapable* ... And I say this without any reservation whatsoever or selecting out any psychologist. I mean, I don't make exceptions here at all. They are utterly, completely incapable of a scientific experiment.

The wildest things you ever beheld in your life are in psychological textbooks – mostly because the psychologist has never had a course in discipline where scientific methodology is concerned.

And similarly, a physicist is so ingrained in the idea that the physical universe is fine, and that a computing machine gives you the right answers, and the human brain is full of errors, that he would not spit on the human mind. The human mind? Huh! That's nothing. Human beings? Boo! They're no good.

Do you know that's why a physicist does not even vaguely consult his conscience when he builds an atom bomb to blow cities out of existence? It's just that type of training and thought in physics classes, amongst physicists and engineering schools, you see?: The human mind's no good, it's full of errors, and so on.

In other words, these two groups, psychology and physics, have dragged themselves so far apart that they've forgotten one of the basic things that was discovered in this field, and that is that space, energy and time had to be resolved in the field of life experience before they could be solved in the field of physics. And it said that in 1890 in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. You wouldn't say, then, that the datum was completely unknown, would you?

And why was it that it took (1932) an indifferent student in physics – who was not terribly interested in physics but who was in engineering school because Papa was certain that if his son became an engineer, why, his own lifelong ambition would be fulfilled. His son at that time was, by the way, a very good mystic and had no feeling for this physical universe here at all. Indoctrinated wholly in the Orient on the basis of "Leave it alone. Back off. Go away."

I had to sit in classes and learn mathematics. I had to learn physics and chemistry and atomic and molecular phenomena, and so forth. My grade sheet is the disgrace of that university. It is. But I got through. They had to pass me through. Mostly because they knew very well that I would never really disgrace their school by entering into the field, since I was already a successful writer. And that was, by the way, what the dean said: "You know, the only reason we're letting you through here at all is because you'll probably never practice engineering, so we're going to fix you up to pass you through, all right. *Ha!*"

The only reason he did that is because I taught him how to fly gliders.

I was also an associate editor on the university paper and said nasty things about departments that didn't pass me. But my grade sheet even then was a terrible disgrace.

But in spite of that fact, I had been seated in classes where they were throwing every imaginable kind of mathematics at me and all kinds of physical sciences, and I had to absorb them and study them and know them.

And so we've got an unwilling marriage between mental phenomena and physical phenomena. Quite similarly, I'd been trained in mental phenomena already in the East. And when they trained me in physical phenomena – practically over my dead body – I was forced to add up the two to keep my own sanity. Because by that time I felt fairly groggy because these fields did not agree.

Actually, I did not get a definition for space until just a few years ago – only a couple of years ago. It first appears in *Scientology 8-8008*. That is what makes *Scientology 8-8008* a noteworthy piece of work. It is an examination and a final conclusion. And those conclusions, by the way, have not been improved upon later. I mean, I have not revised them.

Nineteen thirty-two to nineteen fifty-three, that's how long it took to get some kind of a thing and really sit down and conclude this relationship. And this relationship starts with this definition: Space is a viewpoint of dimension. Space is a viewpoint of dimension. Know that! Hm? Because it'll be on all your examination papers. It'll be something you have to demand of your students, and so forth. Space is a viewpoint of dimension. That's all space is.

You can go back into the ancient philosophers and you can dig up other material, but you find no definite, positive definition of space.

This definition of space is so workable in the field of atomic science that when it was given to an engineer – a nuclear physicist working on a government project – the guy turned kind of white, turned around, grabbed the phone, called up the plant and told them to shut down boiler seven. He all of a sudden integrated this definition, see, and he says,

"Oh no! That'll go sky high, sooner or later." See, space is a viewpoint of dimension.

Okay. It makes sense in further mathematics.

All right, if space is a viewpoint of dimension, then we discover that you have to have something viewing from the viewpoint in order to have the phenomenon of space. That's true, too. So, that your preclear, sitting where he is ... Oh, well, this just works right straight on down the line. I mean, this is one of the smoothest workouts you ever saw for the mind. The preclear who hasn't a point from which to view doesn't have space. And a preclear who has had to move off of point, after point, after point, after point ... In life, you see – he's had to desert his viewpoints; desert his orientation points, in other words. Desert them. Desert them. All of a sudden he doesn't know where he is. He's lost and he doesn't have any space.

Now, you can test this out. You can go out and find people who have been moved all over earth by an army-officer father or something like that. You can find this fellow and he's been changed around an awful lot, and you can ask him to close his eyes and find out what kind of a concept of space he's got. And he'll feel his space is right up here, even closer to him than his own nose. There is no space.

And you watch this fellow; you watch how he works: In order to have an office that he can really function in, he'll have to have *his* desk in it; it'll have to be a small office, he'll have to have *his* desk in it and the place will be absolutely crammed full of machines, gadgets, files and so forth. He'll have to pull everything in on him. He's got to get that heavy mass around him. See this?

Now, we take somebody who has been fancy free, who has stayed in an area – let's say somebody, for instance, who might have been raised in Arizona. And he's just got ... You know, there is just no dearth of this space anyplace, and he hasn't been moved around a great deal. He's right there, and so forth. We find out where he throws his hat, and how he would organize an office.

In the first place you probably wouldn't find him in an office. If he had an office, it probably would have been built for him, or put together for him by the boss, or something of the sort. But he wouldn't have anything in it.

His briefcase would be his files, and it would be in his car, and some of his material would be out at the house, you know, and he'd probably carry everything in his head anyhow. You know, he would have no compulsion to pull in, and he'd have space.

And you ask him to close his eyes and ask him how much space he's conscious of. And he would say, "Oh well, well, there's lots of space. What do you mean how much space am I conscious of? Just as far as you can see, of course."

You say, "With your eyes closed?"

He'd say, "Yeah, sure, sure, sure. What's closing your eyes and opening your eyes got to do with seeing?"

And you say, "Be three feet back of your head."

And he says, "Well, all right, what's so strange about this?"

Now, as a test of this, someday I'm going to take one of these units and

I'm going to send them up to the Apache reservation and to have them process some Apaches. It's an astonishing experience.

The Apache has never known lack of space. *Space!* See, I mean, it's everything, you know. There's just space in all directions. You tell an Apache to be three feet back of his head, that would be nonsense. He's usually – unless he's an old man that's been pounded around by the U.S. Government – he's usually already exteriorized.

And there are Apaches around here which have straight recall on the last four lives.

And they remember being cut to pieces by General Miles, and cutting to pieces various wagon trains, and that sort of thing – have clear, definite recalls on it. They can tell you the names of every officer who was out here at Fort McDowell, and so forth – some twenty-year-old Apache. See, we've already seen this phenomena. Now, I'm not talking to you about wild guesses. I'm talking to you about things that are in the real universe.

Well, if they didn't know the definition of space, then nobody, then, would've concentrated on this phenomenon of space at all, would they have? Well, they just sort of passed it over and said, "Well, we know that," without knowing it. And that's true of too much in scientific investigation. So we get right there to space – space is a viewpoint of dimension.

Now, why does the space become less for the individual? Now, we're right on the line of spotting spots. And boy, is this important stuff! Spotting spots puts space out there. Whatever significance you put into it, it puts space out there for the guy. I don't care what else you do, how many things we add up to this, it puts space out there.

Well now, an individual who has been moved around a great deal has gone through a dwindling spiral of space. So the space of his childhood is fairly large, and the space of his adulthood is quite compressed. But the space of his babyhood is *very* compressed.

Babies don't have much space. You know, they put them in small bunks with bars, and they crawl around the floor. They're not allowed to leave the house, and they can't go out with girls. And they don't have much space.

All right. So we go through a person's life and we find the various times when he had space are not much in restimulation, but the times when he didn't have space, boy, are they in restimulation. They're just havingness, you see.

When space is taken away from somebody or compressed in upon somebody, he will eventually have to have. Where does havingness come from? By compression of space.

Now, if you were to take a criminal and you were to put him – he just had slight criminal tendencies; juvenile delinquent, something like that – you put him in jail, and you find out he comes out of jail and he now has *a craving* to steal things. It would be the finest thing in the world, to make a criminal, to put somebody in a closed space, because you'd convince him that he had to have. You'd just *convince* him now that he had to have.

Now, if we go back a few planets, we will discover – as we did in the last days of research, definitely, on the whole track in Dianetics – you go back a few planets, you find out the punishment which they used to administer was to put a cone of electronic fire above and below the person and let them both smack, *boom!* Boy, that sure made him have to have. Anytime he'd get in a body after that he'd interiorize; he'd stay there because he had to have a body. You know, this is a punishment. They used to do this to criminals. They dramatize it here on earth. They dramatize that incident by putting them in cells, small cells. But the more you crush an individual in, the more he'll have to have. You see that?

Now, if that is the case, then this process is aimed at stretching him, see. Let's have him spot spots out there. The most elementary process of Spotting Spots in Space would simply be – not Spotting Spots in Space, but just Spotting Spots. There are two things here, by the way. You spot spots by hitting the wall, touching walls and things like that, touching MEST. That does not require the remedy of havingness. And there's spotting spots in space, you know. Nothing's holding the space for you; you're just reaching out there and spotting these spots – and boy, does *that* require a remedy of havingness. That's why 8-C doesn't require a remedy of havingness. You see you're touching walls all the time. You got havingness, you've got the barriers. They're right there.

All right. And then the other one, you're spotting spots in space, why, you don't have barriers. All right – it tears havingness to pieces; you try to *put* a piece of barrier out there.

All right. The most elementary process would be simply to get him to spot the spot furthest from him that he would be absolutely sure created space. See, I mean you just ask him to get a spot he could be sure of out in front of him someplace, and get another spot he could be sure of, and sure that he had space between himself and that spot.

Now, that is not an advised technique. I'm just telling you the most elementary form of this. You know, you just have to ask, "Well, how far away from you could you get a spot that would make a space for you?" You know, "How much space could you actually have?" Now we just merely try to extend that.

By the way, I see you look a little puzzled. Well, how would we do that? We would do that very easily. We would just say, "Shut your eyes. All right. Now how much space do you have? Well, let's spot a little spot further than that – just a quarter of an inch further than that, and a little spot a little bit further than that, see. One out to the side of you, out here. And one out to the other side, and one behind you, and so forth." And we'd just gradually enlarge the fellow's space just by making him *sneak up* on it on a gradient scale, you see. That's not an advised process, that's just an elementary process.

All right. Let's take the phenomena of distance and time, and let's discover that in this universe it's nothing for a beam of light emanating from a star to be one million years in transit and to arrive at you one million years after it has departed from a star. That's nothing.

Well, therefore, distance or space and time become associated in this universe. Time is actually a consideration, but there is the experience of time. There is a distance; there is a velocity of particle travel. And the movement of that particle in relationship to its starting point and in relationship to its ending point, itself, is the consideration of time. You are merely considering that it takes time for it to do it, so therefore, you have the phenomena of time.

Time is entirely a consideration. It's nothing else. So is space – entirely a consideration. It's too easy for somebody to look over the field of mechanics and get so bogged in mechanics they think, "Well, space is really there, but space is a viewpoint of dimension, so I'm just making sure that the space which is really there is now there."

That's not what we're doing. You're actually making the fellow make space. There wouldn't be any space here at all unless we were all making space all the time, and we agreed that it was made and that we are this far apart.

Now, the process which you will be using will be to spot distant places, and spot a spot in the room; and spot that distant place again, and spot a spot in the room; and spot the distant place again, and spot a spot in the room – always spotting it in the physical universe, because it will appear to be a moving image that will change its distance.

Now, here's an example – we have no further significance to this than this: you say to somebody, "All right, spot Los Angeles. Okay. Spot a spot in this room. Spot Los Angeles."

He says, "It's ... I got it."

You say, "No, which direction is it?"

"Oh, it's over that way."

"How far does it seem to you?"

"Oh, it's – *heh-heh!* – several hundred yards."

You say, "Well now, look, it's at least five hundred miles. Now, let's spot Los Angeles. Now, *point* to it. How far does it seem to you? We're talking about the physical



universe now. Point to Los Angeles. Got it?"

He does, you see. He physically raises his hand and he points in that direction and he says, "Well, it ... I know it is really about five hundred or six hundred or eight hundred miles over that way, but it actually seems to be about two hundred yards out there when I do that."

And you say, "That's fine. Spot a spot in this room. Now, spot Los Angeles." And he'll point to it this time, and he'll tell you how far away.

And you say, "Spot a spot in this room," and he'll be perfectly content to *look* at a spot in the room, something like this.

You say, "Well, now spot that spot in this room. Put your finger on it. Size it up. Where is it?" He will.

You know, see, it's a kind of an 8-C process, only you're spotting spots in thin air. And by the way, if he's in bad shape and you have given just that many commands, he will all of a sudden start to say, "*uuuh*." He'll start to get sick at his stomach. You've reduced his havingness just that much.

It didn't matter, you see, what mass you told him to mock up. You say, "Well, mock up Los Angeles and pull it in, and mock up Los Angeles and pull it in." It's just anything that seems to be on the subject, you see. You want him to mock up a mass – create a mass, in other words – pull it in on himself. "*Create* a mass and pull it in. Create a mass and pull it in. Create a mass and pull it in. All right. Now, spot Los Angeles."

Now, he'll get this mixed up sometimes and if he's on the verge of exteriorizing, he'll try to *be* over Los Angeles. Now, this is not the process. You want him to spot Los Angeles from where he is, sitting right there in the auditing room. You don't want him to move out of his body and go over to Los Angeles. Because, take a Five, and he'll try to do this and, boy, he *will* get sick.

You want him to be right there in the room, see, and he spots Los Angeles and then he spots a spot in the room. Well, you make him point to Los Angeles. You make him give you how many miles he thinks it is and where it seems to be to him and how far he *knows* it is and then make him spot a spot in the room. And then get him to spot this spot in the room.

And you say put his finger on it. A good hooker is sometimes to say to him, "What color is the spot in the room?"

"Oh, it's blue."

You say, "I said spot a spot in the room. You're spotting a mass of energy in the room. We don't want a mass of energy in the room, we just want a spot, a location. No mass, no energy; just a location in the room. That's all we want. Now, got one?"

"Yeah, it's blue."

"How big is it?"

"Oh, it's about four feet across."

"No, we want a pinpoint location right there in the room."

Now, finally he'd get this, see. And you say, "All right, now spot Los Angeles. How far is it?"

And he'll say, "All the way..."

He'll probably by that time be tired and he won't want to point. And you, if you're very polite – socially auditing, you know – you won't make him. But if you're really auditing, you will say, "Point to it. How far is it? Point to it."

And you will notice a funny thing takes place as you do this. You just go over this, see, back and forth, back and forth. What are you doing? What is happening? There's a

funny thing that's going on. He's generally pointing a horizontal line to Los Angeles. Actually, Los Angeles is on no horizontal line from where he is. Los Angeles would be more like straight through the corner of the far point of the room, because you've got to point through the curvature of earth.

You tell somebody to point to China. He's liable to point out here horizontally and say eight thousand miles or twenty thousand miles or something like that. Where, as a matter of fact, the actual location of China is straight down. The spot you're asking him to spot is damn near straight down. You get the idea?

Well, you don't tell him this. He'll finally get wise to it. He'll finally say, "You know, I'm spotting through the earth when I spot Los Angeles."

You say, "That's right. There's an awful big hill you'd have to go over in order to get to Los Angeles. That's all right."

Well, he'll tell you, "You know there's sort of a black ridge out there. Every time I point to Los Angeles, I get a black ridge. That's funny." No, it isn't funny. That much overburden of earth would be awful black, wouldn't it? And pointing through that much of a chunk of earth, he's naturally got to go through a black hill because the inside of earth is not lighted. If you were down there the last time, the lighting system is disconnected. And so, you'll just have him spot this.

Well, you don't care what phenomena turns up. You just have him keep on spotting Los Angeles and spotting a spot in the room and spotting Los Angeles, spotting a spot in the room – making sure that he does it both ways.

What are you doing? You are bringing Los Angeles into present time. Why is Los Angeles out of present time? Los Angeles is out of present time because of a problem in havingness. This individual does not *have* enough, and he *lost* enough so that when he gets a picture of Los Angeles, he pulls it in on himself.

Well, of course, it was a ready-made facsimile that he pulled in on himself, wasn't it?

Now, let me give you a little test. What time is the place in where you had breakfast? Is it in the time when you were eating breakfast?

Now, if we looked this over, most people would have this true, you see. They've got time and distance so associated that when they start to go far away from them – even a few blocks or a few miles or a few thousand miles or a few light years, some other planet – they just go out of present time to that distance.

And you could draw a sort of a circus-tent effect, you know, a paramental tent. And here in the center is the preclear. He's in present time. But everything out of his line of sight is in past time. And the further it is away from him, the further it is out of time.

And Los Angeles is back out of time as far as he's concerned. Maybe he was in the town once, you know. And you're spotting the spot where he was in that period in time. And Los Angeles is sitting there at, let's say, 1939 – Los Angeles, 1939.

Now, he has to spot this room. But he spots the spot *in* this room, with his eyes open or closed. Do this process eyes open or closed, it doesn't matter. Yes, it does matter a little bit. It's much more savage to do it with the eyes closed, but it'll still produce results.

Now, you spot Los Angeles, 1939. Now you're spotting this room, this year and moment, you see. Now you spot 1939, Los Angeles. Only you're not asking him to spot this. You don't give him any directions about this. You just want him to spot Los Angeles.

First thing you know, you're kind of a *kurrrrr-fup!* Something happens with relationship to Los Angeles; it's sitting over there, the proper distance, and it's in present time. *Bzzz!* This is a weird one. Los Angeles is now in present time.

The goal of the auditor is to get the preclear into present time. Right? Supposing you

got him in present time throughout the entire universe. He'd really be in present time.

Then we have a gradient scale of present time, don't we? We have the present time right where the preclear is, sitting inside his own skull; the present time of the room in which his body is in; the present time of the rest of the building (which is now out of present time); the present time of the rest of the town (but that's way out of present time, see); the present time of other cities (way in the past). And so here we go.

Supposing we brought that all up to actual present time, this instant. Now, we get the picture of a ray coming down here from the sun. It takes some minutes for a beam of light to get here from the sun. And you say there's a steady stream of them, and those that are arriving now departed from the sun in the past. Well, supposing we just stop every particle in the universe. Do you know that you would have the present time for the whole universe, which would be the position of each particle in the universe, you see. We just had a simultaneous look at the whole universe and we'd stopped every particle in it and we took a simultaneous look at *it* – *bang!* That would be present time for the physical universe.

That particles have to travel from one part of the universe to the other part of the universe has no bearing on the situation at all. Every particle is in present time all the time. But somebody viewing them has to wait for them to arrive where he is. It's going to take a certain length of time for them to arrive where he is, and so he gets the idea that they must be in past time or he's in past time, and he gets a fouled-up idea of this, you see – whereas the straight idea is that the whole universe could be in present time all the time.

But where a preclear is concerned, he is sort of very much in present time, right here. And now the room is more or less in present time, and as we go out, they slide out, out, further out of present time. Well, we go up to some other planets, and that sort of thing, boy, are they out of time, you see. They're way in the past.

When we have him spot spots, what we do is get him to discharge the old energy deposits which are hanging around areas in which he has been and with which he is connected – old spots which he is now avoiding. And these are all out of time. So we're bringing the whole universe into present time.

We could have the preclear simply sit in a chair and spot various spots a block away or a mile away or a thousand miles away, it wouldn't matter, but as long as we had him spot a spot and then spot a spot in the room; and then spot a spot out there (same spot), then spot a spot in the room; then spot a spot out there (same spot again), and spot in the room; and that same spot again, and a spot in the room; that same spot out there, and a spot in the room – and all of a sudden, why, that spot out there would be in present time, see. And so would the room be in present time.

Now, we've got two more locations in present time. When you're asking an awareness of awareness unit to be elsewhere than running the reactive mind or the somatic mind of the body – when you're asking it to do this – you certainly had better not ask it to go away if it can't go away into another present time. You get the idea?

Most people who don't exteriorize have past time three feet back of their heads. Instead of going three feet back of their heads, they go about a thousand years back, see. They try to exteriorize in time – not in present time.

Unless they can exteriorize in present time, they can't see, they can't hear, can't do anything.

All right. We've got to have present time all over, then. We want a case of present time all over the place. Everything in present time. The case you're looking at probably is out of present time where he's sitting; he's way out of present time out in the front yard;

he's a thousand years back ten blocks away. See, steep case.

Now, we at least get him into present time where he's sitting, in the room. Get that room into present time. We do this with 8-C. We get him perfectly willing to receive effects with Opening Procedure by Duplication and along about now, why, we better get the rest of the universe into present time a little bit.

Well, as you spot spots, you have to remedy havingness. Why? Because he's held on to old energy deposits which he made in the past and which are still in the past. He's holding on to those merely because they're mass. He has no other reason to hold on to them. And they tell him, these energy masses, that a spot is out of present time.

The spot actually is not out of present time – let me give you that very clearly – it's not out of present time. The spot you're trying to spot is in present time, but the spot he keeps getting is an old energy mass which isn't the physical-universe spot at all.

See, he gets this old energy mass and he spots that. That's way out of present time. Then he spots a spot in the room. He spots this other spot out there, way out of present time, and eventually he's going to shred to pieces or duplicate or look at or knock out that old energy deposit. And he's then going to be free to spot the spot out there. This very clear?

If everything was in present time all over, he wouldn't have any difficulty spotting any spot in space.

Now, why spots? This comes under the whole subject of location. And we get one of the next most important things in Dianetics and Scientology today, which is location.

Now, we have a Prelogic and this Prelogic simply says that theta can locate things in space and time – locate objects, items, particles, in space and time. And it can create space simply by looking, and create objects so as to locate them in the space and time created. See, you can create the space and then locate things in it. But location is quite important.

One of the most important things about our whole science, and subject, is location – precise location. This is the Prelogics. You get that? Location is more important than a mass. Location is far more important than mass. And so we get a preclear pointing things out.

Why is it he started avoiding location? What's some proof of this? Well, I'll give you the old story about the little dog. The little dog gets hit on the road and after that he doesn't avoid the car that hit him or the person that was driving the car that hit him, he doesn't avoid grass, he doesn't avoid any of the masses around there at all, but every time he comes near that location he cringes and goes wide from the location. He's afraid of that spot.

Well, do you know that people, after they have had a quarrel and divorce and something like that, cannot think of anything else, usually, but sell all the possessions or something, and they start on that scale – they sell some of their possessions, they get rid of some of them. Then the next thing you know, they'll be getting rid of the house. They've got to get rid of that location.

Now we'll take the French. Why did the French pull out of this continent? They were some of the early people here, you see. I mean, a lot of the early work was done here, particularly down around New Orleans, and so forth – French, all this was. And then it was taken over by the Spanish and the English got some of it and then Spain got some of it back again. Finally, why, it got all sold out. What occasioned this?

Do you know the French never went back around their old settlements at all? Never even made a bid for them. Nothing like that. It's because it was a nice, great big spot called danger. Too many people had died.

Did you ever hear of John Law and the Mississippi Bubble? The Mississippi Bubble, the area around New Orleans being promoted by a Scotchman, John Law, brought France into bankruptcy and was the primary factor in destroying the royal line and government of France. There wasn't anybody with money in all of France who didn't get turned up on his face by the Mississippi Bubble.

This was a location then, you see. It became a dangerous location. They had no slightest argument with anybody who wanted to take this location. They'd given up the spot in space, is all we're getting around to. They had given this up as an empire. They didn't even think of it anymore or want it.

All right. We wonder why a lot of soldiers, and so forth, don't immediately want to go back to battlegrounds, and so forth. They don't want to see them again. Spots in space is what they're avoiding.

But they get so bad off they don't even know about a spot in space. You take somebody who was shot up in a destroyer, you know, in the Battle of Jutland, World War I, and we find out that he can't stand the sea.

Look, there's only one dangerous spot. That's the spot where the Battle of Jutland was fought. And we start spotting spots in space, and we all of a sudden discover this spot, see. The preclear says, "You know, let's see ... Mm-mm, I don't like that." Facsimile – there's an engram here, of some sort or another. He'll tell you all about this. Have him remedy some havingness and have him spot that spot again, have him spot it again, have him spot it again, take all comm lag out and get that spot into present time. You know what will happen? He'll suddenly like the sea again.

There is association. First they start to avoid the spot. Then they start – *then* they start to avoid the objects associated with the spot. It's the spot first.

What happens to the individual's own universe? It has coincided with the physical universe to such a marked degree, and he has lost so often, that he's avoiding all the spots in the physical universe – which brings him down to a pinpoint; which makes him smaller and smaller and smaller and smaller, and makes his own universe cave in on him tighter and tighter and tighter and tighter and tighter, until he is simply a dense mass.

And there you get the preclear in a theta body, you know. I mean, guys who have large energy masses around their faces – there you actually get the anatomy of an engram itself. What's the engram doing there? Well, the engram is the incident and it's now missing from the spot. If it were returned to its proper spot and time and place, and so forth, or if you could contact that original place, you'd find out, *bang!* this fellow's bank would straighten out with regard to the subject of this engram which is out of location.

In other words, it's off the spot and location. As long as it's off the spot and location, it won't entirely disappear. Hence, we avoid running engrams – we spot spots and remedy havingness.

Now, we have him reach out, spot these various spots; the next thing you know he'll come up with an automobile accident. He's had some big impact, or something of the sort.

Well, that automobile accident will look like it's right here in front of his face. And here he's sitting two thousand miles away from the place where he had the automobile accident. And yet the automobile accident appears to be right here. He's got the mass because he wants the mass, but he's avoiding the spot in space where the accident occurred. So even this mass is avoiding this spot in space where the accident occurred.

And that's how an engram comes in on him. He avoids the spot where it belongs and he gets the mass and brings it in here. Now, you just start spotting these spots around and you'll eventually start spotting this darn spot up here where he had this accident two

thousand miles away. He'll call your attention to it, something like that.

You could go on and simply ask him to spot that spot – wouldn't particularly be good auditing. You just want him to spot spots; any spot, see. But he'll call your attention to this spot. And he's liable to get somatics about this spot, and so on. Well, let him spot it. Let him have some fun. It'd do just as much good if you went on and spotted the exact center of Canada.

Spot the center of Canada; the center of this room; center of Canada; center of the room. Nothing ever happened to him in the center of Canada. Well, you're at least letting him spot one spot, aren't you? See, you're spotting a spot.

What we're restoring to him is his ability to spot locations at a distance without fear and without the destruction of havingness, and making it possible for him to make space. And he, of course, thinks we're trying to remedy all of his errors in the past. And we're just trying to make it possible for him to get stretched out there and spot spots without feeling he's going to cave in. And we don't even want particular spots. But you could eradicate the entire past of an individual just by spotting spots, you see.

He'll want to get specific. You'd better stay fairly general, because, boy, it gets to be an endless task if you spotted every spot where he's had an impact for seventy-four trillion years.

Now, the very funny thing about these spots is that the individual has spotted them because he was interested in them, he had an impact or an accident in the area and became disinterested in them, and without disconnecting the energy mass from them, withdrew his interest. So there we have him hung up out there, disinterested in this spot, but an energy mass connected to it. Now, that's an interesting frame of affairs. Because every time he gets around this spot, he starts to feel bored or nervous, or when he thinks about it he feels bored. That's because there's no interest in it, but there's a large mass of disinterest.

What is a solid? A solid is disinterest. Yet this spot will be very important. What is importance? Importance is a solid. Solid is importance. A disinterest is importance. How disinteresting can you get? Get important.

All right. This then is the condition of our preclear. Now, as you spot these spots, he of course will look at them. As he looks at them, if he were to make a perfect duplicate of the masses which he saw out there, the entire energy mass would disappear.

But what are you trying to do? Wipe out the whole MEST universe? Because that's the end product of duplication – perfect duplication – it'd just be to wipe out the whole universe. I don't know – leave it here for someone else to run into; you've had fun. You know, don't worry about this particularly.

But what you're doing by remedying havingness is you're getting him over his anxiety of havingness which brings in all of these old masses and leaves the location out there. The location is still there. It's there because he knows it's there. But it's there and he is avoiding its being there. And by avoiding its being there, he's pulling himself down to a pinpoint, you see.

They're all out of present time, all these old spots. What you're trying to do is bring them into present time. But you do that by being entirely unspecific about the spots. You could get just as much processing by making a fellow spot a spot at a distance out here – let us say, making him spot Albuquerque (*nothing* ever happens in Albuquerque) – making him spot a spot in Albuquerque, spot a spot in this room; spot a spot in Albuquerque, this room; until he was very sure that he could spot with considerable accuracy a spot in Albuquerque.

Did anything ever happen to him in Albuquerque? No! Nothing ever happened to

him. We don't care what happened to people. We're not processing their past. We're not interested in a fellow's past. He is not the product of his past. He's the product of his own damn foolishness. It's only a consideration that he's the product of his past. It's not a truth.

Now, this business of separateness runs automatically along with spotting spots. You could ask an individual simply to go around the environment – as one of the R2 processes are – and simply get the fact of things he's separate from. Get him certain that he's separate from this, and certain he's separate from that, and certain he's separate from someplace else. And if we just kept this up as a process, we would, of course, get him eventually localized. Because he's buttered all over the place.

Now, separateness would go along with spotting spots, wouldn't it? We're actually asking him to spot spots when we're saying "Are you separate from that spot? Are you separate from another spot?" Because the funny part of it is, he believes he's connected to every spot in the whole universe where he's had an accident, an upset, an emotional wingding; he thinks he's connected to all these spots.

And we get some preclear, we say be three feet back of your head, we might as well say be three feet back of the MEST universe; he's buttered all over it. He's connected up in all directions. He's connected with all these spots and all the connecting links lead into the past. We're not interested in processing his past. We're merely interested in getting the universe into present time. We'd simply do that by asking him to spot spots and remedy havingness. See that?

Why do you have to remedy havingness? Well, if you start spotting spots without remedying havingness, you're going to have a picnic. Because he's going to find an awfully lot of beautiful energy masses that he's overlooked pulling in on himself before. For instance, there's the time he got beat up by the big bully. You know, there were an awful lot of nice impacts in that.

And you ask him to spot a spot somewhere around this – you know, "Let's spot a spot around the childhood home. Let's spot the room. Spot a spot around the childhood home." All of a sudden he starts to feel real bad. But it's not remedy of havingness, particularly, that you become immediately alert to. He's sitting there with this great big picture of this bully beating him up. Well, how did he get that? Well, it happened at the childhood home, and of course he's got an engram about the childhood home. Now let's be a real bad auditor and do something about this incident. Let's do something specific about being beaten up. This would be a lousy auditor.

Now, let's be an efficient auditor. Let's just spot the childhood home again, and spot the room. And he says, "This big facsimile, you see, is here. I mean, I got this picture, and the bully ... and his fist is arrested right there in front of my nose." You would simply say – just not to let him run the session; *you* still running the session – you have him spot his childhood home, spot a spot in the middle of the room. "All right. Now, mock up a planet, mock up a bully, mock up anything you want" – a cop, see; but you tell him something specific. You say, "Well, mock up your childhood home and pull it in on you. Mock it up and pull it in. And mock it up and pull it in. And mock it up and pull it in. Mock it up and pull it in." Get a lot of them in. "Now mock one up and throw it away; and mock up another one and throw it away; mock up one, pull it in" – either way to, see, just as long as you get them to accept them and reject them.

And you know what will happen? That facsimile and that bully will disappear. Why did it get there in the first place? It's because by spotting spots you stretched out his space. And by stretching out his space, you robbed him of some of his havingness. And having robbed him of some of his havingness, he had to get it from someplace, so he picks up this

nice big gob of energy where he got the dickens beaten out of him and he brings it in and pulls it in on the body. And that's how he got it there. And that's what facsimile restimulation is. And that is the study of facsimiles and engrams, and that's how they get there.

You ask somebody to just look five feet in front of his body sometimes. Take somebody who has these eighteen-inch thick glasses; they look like they're wearing a turret over their head or something of some sort, you know. And they go around and you say, "Take off your glasses. Now spot a spot out there in front of your face." They're liable to throw up right in your lap. I mean, you just ask them to spot a spot, see, and the universe is so dangerous. What are they wearing glasses for? So as to inhibit them from spotting spots, of course.

Glasses, by the way, reduce, reduce, reduce, reduce the image, you see, and so it can appear to be further away and less dangerous. It can make these spots much less dangerous – so that things can be really very close to them and appear very undangerous to them.

Well, you just have them spot spots back and forth, one way or the other, and you'll tear up their havingness, but you'll also permit them to make space. You'll permit them to make space; you will permit them to remedy havingness; you will also get them over a whole bunch of ideas about the past.

Now, these are *extremely*, I would say *extremely simple* processes – the Remedy of Havingness and Spotting Spots in Space.

How could you err? You could actually err a little bit on this one line: You could get very specific or terribly interested every time he had a facsimile show up. You see that? And you'd process the facsimile.

You could err by having him spot spots, spot spots, spots in space, all around the place, and not remedy his havingness.

And those are the ways you can err; and there really are no other ways.

These are very basic, very interesting, very easy-to-do processes. They don't work where you don't hound your preclear into actually spotting the spot. We don't want masses of energy, we simply want locations in space. And that's what we're interested in.



# AXIOMS OF DIANETICS

*A lecture given on  
19 October 1954*

Today I want to talk to you about the Axioms of Dianetics – just as simple as this, the Axioms of Dianetics. Very many people have in the past been enthusiastically using this word *Dianetics*, bombastically using it, doing various strange and peculiar things connected with the word *Dianetics*. And yet, if you were to walk up to the bulk of these people and said, "Give me the first Axiom of Dianetics," he would look at you and his jaw would drop, and he would say, "What is Dianetics? Isn't that a speculative science? Well, you know, like psychology, you know? It's like psychology, isn't it?"

You'd say, "No, Dianetics is a science of a different type." There are two types of science, and one is what they laughingly called, in the old days, the science of the humanities. And these were speculative philosophies. You see this? Speculative. It's, "Well, we don't know, and all we know is, really, that nobody knew, and nobody knows, and we don't know. But we can figure, and our figuring tells us that nobody ... we don't, of course – we realize the human mind ..." By the way, this is a direct quote from one of the leading psychology textbooks of modern times: "We realize that the mind is so complex that it can never be resolved."

Then what is he pretending to do? He is there, he's supposed to know something about the mind and he opens his book up by saying it's so complex it can't be solved.

Well, having said this, having uttered this ponderous pomposity and this utter stupidity, this person then starts out and starts to write about a science? You don't start to write about something by saying the problem isn't solved and can't be solved, and then go and write for a hundred thousand words – only an idiot would. Well, so that's been this field of humanities.

Now, there's a different type of science. There's another type of science, the type of science that an engineer is very used to, that a mathematician wouldn't be able to get along without, and that is the science which precisely integrates itself after proceeding from an original assumption.

It makes an assumption – starts somewhere – and then it proceeds from that assumption in a thoroughly reasonable, logical line which could be equated mathematically, and proceeds to resolve a certain body of human experience. Now, we might say physics is not a body of human experience, but actually it is. And it starts out with the assumption that the universe is here and that it's real. That's its first assumption. And then it starts out from that and continues along the line by assuming that certain laws in the universe are constant.

And the first thing it tells you in physics textbooks, ordinarily, is the laws of balances, starting out from that ancient Greek that said if he could have a fulcrum long enough, and something to rest it on, he could move earth personally.

It starts out from this assumption, goes on in fulcrums and balances – the discovery of this ancient Greek – it proceeds on, but it never loses sight of its central motif or the point

from which it started. And even though we are today into the field of nuclear physics and quantum mechanics, we still have never lost sight of the basic laws of physics.

One of the basic laws of physics, rightly or wrongly, is the conservation of energy. That applies to the real universe. If you handle the real universe with the real universe, the conservation of energy is a law, and it's an immutable law – if you handle the physical universe with the physical universe. Only then is conservation of energy correct as a law.

But it started from a certain assumption, didn't it? Carried on through logically, it invades various fields – motion, kinetics, statics – and is able to serve man.

The field of chemistry, while not as precise, nevertheless is based upon the fact that a man can isolate – or a person can isolate – certain compounds and can recombine them and obtain other compounds, and that he can combine certain elements and combine them with other elements and achieve compounds.

It starts ... Its basic assumption is, really, that there are certain different elements in the real universe, and that these can be computed and predicted and found, and that they are combined into various molecular structures. From atomic structure they are combined into molecular structure, and the molecular structure is combined into compounds. And we go on from there.

But we have never departed from the reasonable assumption that something can be done with these various elements, you see. We've never departed from that fact. Therefore, it's a constant. It is rational. It is a sane science, then, you see. It's not a speculation. People don't come around in the field of chemistry and speculate and wonder whether or not there are ninety-six elements, or something of the sort. They've already spotted them.

They don't speculate very much about the whole line. They are there to act, and these are sciences of action. These are the sciences which build motorcars and airplanes. And these are the sciences by which, actually, men live, and women live, too – although women are rather unreasonable about it; they don't assume as often as men that they have to live by the rules and laws of physics.

Yet if a woman drops an electric iron on her toe, it will drop, and the transfers of heat, and so forth, will burn her toe. And she will suffer from the laws of physics whether she's agreed with them or not, rationally, right where she is.

In other words, it's a science which is discoverable whether you believe in it or not. Now get the difference. You know, it doesn't matter whether you believe in this science or not or whether you have been educated or not. If you're alive, and if you're part of the track of agreements which brought this universe into beingness, then you can be the effect of this science – not so, psychology; not so, social science; not so, economics, or any of these other speculations. They don't start from an agreed-upon assumption. There are *many* schools of psychology as there are psychologists; just as there are as where they start economics as there are economists. And they've never agreed where they start.

Now, those people who wish to go on speculating endlessly in the field of Dianetics are in the wrong field. They're in the wrong field entirely. They belong over in the field of psychology, and they should go back to psychology.

People are perfectly at liberty to speculate on anything under the sun, moon and stars. But after you've demonstrated the constancy of a phenomenon, after a constancy has been demonstrated, and demonstrated again and again and again and again and again – and we've gotten person after person after person after person; and we've hauled them all in and demonstrated the phenomenon continued to occur – it doesn't look to me like we're in a speculative science anymore. It doesn't even vaguely appear to be a speculative science.

Does it to you, if this could happen?

We can show you the overt-act-motivator sequence. This is a very advanced part of Dianetics. We take an overt-act-motivator sequence – you can plot it out. People do not know that they are being subjected to this particular phenomenon; it's noumena, now. They don't know. But this lady goes out, she punishes her child, see. Overt act. She doesn't know anything about overt-act phenomena, overt-act-motivator sequence. You can absolutely count on the fact that in the next few minutes or in the next few hours or in the next few years – sometime in the future – she is all of a sudden going to feel very sorry about it and, without knowing why, feel guilty because of this child.

Why? She used the facsimile outbound. She doesn't get one inbound. It doesn't balance. The kid can't defend himself, he can't protect himself, he doesn't strike back. The debt is never cancelled out; therefore, the overt-act-motivator phenomenon will hang fire.

I processed a man one time who had been through an entire war and he had been shot down. And many horrible things had happened to this fellow. And he was having a lot of trouble with his mind. He'd gotten so he couldn't remember, he couldn't think, he couldn't do anything of the sort.

And finally, in plowing around, I discovered that he had struck his father when his father was seventy. He'd come back from the war, this boy had, and his father had come to live with him, and his father had gotten drunk. And he had many, many, many tallies against his father – you know, he figured his father had always been mean to him one way or the other. But this was what he was telling me. And he had struck his father violently and had broken his jaw. And the old man was in pretty bad state for quite a while.

I ran this simply as an overt-act-motivator sequence. He knew this had nothing to do with his case. He knew this, this preclear did. That had nothing to do with his case at all. He'd forgotten it. He knew that was, well, what happened but that the old man had done a lot of things to him, and that was balanced out. Actually, it was that terrible treatment he got in that prison camp in the war.

Well, listen, the terrible treatment in the prison camp at the war might have softened him up, but it was actually balanced out. How about the terrible treatment he gave an awful lot of enemy pilots, huh? However, that overt-act-motivator sequence was balanced out as far as the war was concerned – give and take.

So he'd finally caught it. So what! This was of no great moment, one way or the other. But when he struck his father, he then dreamed up a great many overt acts that his father had done to him when he was a child. He dreamed them up out of whole cloth. His old man treated him very, very well.

Why, this preclear sat there and driveled and blathered about actual sexual attacks from his father against himself. It's no wonder Freud went into the field of sex, because when they want to get anybody really in Dutch in this society, sex being *verboden*, why, they just simply use sex, you see, as ... The darnedest line of stuff you ever listened to. I simply ran him through old-time Effort Processing. I ran him through the efforts of striking his father.

And we just kept at it, and we looked in vain for his father striking him. It was a one-way flow. This man had been sick ever since, and he could never compute this out. It just didn't make sense one way or the other.

There was phenomena, but it was a demonstrable phenomenon. We found that the one place in his life where he had committed a sin without any reason for it – see, no good reason – he then tried to fill in the breach with hallucination. His whole life became full of hallucination.

He was trying madly to justify this action which had no justification at all. And it finally turned out that he had come home and his father had tried to help him to bed because he was drunk. And he had all of a sudden turned on his father and beaten him. And the cops had come up and arrested him, and so forth.

This had made him think of the prison camp, and had gotten things into restimulation, and so forth. But let's just take overt-act-motivator phenomena. You think this is single and individual to people? You've got a hundred people, and every fifth one you're going to find something of this phenomenon? Oh, no. That is not what you're going to do. This is Dianetics. If there is such a phenomenon, and it's carried in the body and field of Dianetics, you are going to discover it in one hundred people – just like that.

Even the most calloused, hardened sinner is himself a chaos of committed overts with no motivators. You know? Or some fellow goes on and can be very bad toward the whole society. Why? It has given him so many motivators.

One time he was perfectly innocent. He was a kid; they accused him of stealing apples from the fruit stand; they branded him a juvenile delinquent and threw him in the clink – he was innocent.

He went out the next time, he got to running with a gang of kids, and this whole gang got rounded up. And he had not taken any part in the service-station robbery, but they threw him in the clink too.

And he went to school, and he had this big, tough teacher in this detention home. And this big, tough teacher one day accused him of doing something or other, and beat him over the head with a club and knocked him senseless.

Oh, huh! Our whole basic training here has all done what? This person hasn't done anything to the society, but the society has been doing things to him, hasn't it?

And what do you think he is licensed to do now? He considers himself to be in receipt of sufficient motivators to be able, now, to commit any number of overt acts against the society with no feeling of guilt. And that is the state of mind in which you find most criminals. And it is the overt-act-motivator sequence delivered in that direction which makes the criminal.

It is the underprivileged child who is abused by society: tried to get along, tried to be social, and kept getting kicked in, knocked down, kicked in – for years and years and years. And all of a sudden he has all the right in the world to kill a man. He has all the right in the world.

It's "all the society out there," in a combined unit, has been victimizing him. And now, without any conscience or anything of the sort, he can turn around against that society and do whatever he likes to it.

Any time you get an imbalanced situation on the overt-motivator sequence ... You've got to have as many motivators as you have overts, as many overts as you have motivators. And if it doesn't balance, the preclear will try to balance it out, one way or the other, by considering himself licensed to fight. What is an unbalanced overt-act-motivator sequence? It's a license to fight.

All right. Now, many people have talked about this very learnedly. This is nothing brand-new. It's out of an observation of "We guess, but it's awfully complex," you know, sort of a frame of mind. And it is over into the field of: We get a preclear, and this preclear tells us, "And my papa beat me and my mama beat me, and they were very mean to me, and they did this to me and they did that to me. And they did this to me and they did that to me." And you say, "Brother, you poor guy. You mean you could never get these parents of yours to do a thing to you? Is that what you're trying to tell me?"

That's actually what that preclear is trying to tell his auditor – if his auditor knows Dianetics.

If he knows psychology, I don't know what would be the conclusion. But I'll tell you what it means in Freudian analysis. They let that patient sit there. Understand this: They let him sit there for two to ten years, four hours a week, blathering this stuff.

Now, the basic law which underlies all this guilt and recrimination is the overt-act-motivator sequence, and it is found in the Axioms of Dianetics.

When somebody is talking to you about being terribly wronged – if he seems to be able to pull in on himself all kinds of engrams of punishment; if this is all he can talk to you about – you can be dead sure that this person has delivered far more overts than he has motivators for. They have never been motivated – his overt acts. He has been a mean boy.

He has just mocked up all kinds of defenseless people. His parents were probably good to him. The ones he complains about are the ones that he did the overt acts to. Just bing-bing! Just like that.

These people were good to him. They did what they could for him in their circumstances of life. They were extremely pleasant to him; they made sure that he got a lot of things in life.

And one day, in a mistaken fit of zeal or reaction or accident, or something of this sort, why, he did something to one of his parents. He did something mean – real mean. If he's talking about both his father and his mother, he's done something real mean to both of them – probably several times.

And he could stand doing it once. He didn't feel too good about it, see. But the next time ... It isn't that they get hardened and calloused, actually. The chips start balancing; they very precisely balance. The number of acts is a finite quantity. And it's the more acts, the more situation it develops in the preclear.

So he's then repeatedly – it wasn't because he got used to doing it, you know – he then started to say, "Well, I have a perfect right to hurt my parents. People are no good. This thing about society and social life, and so forth, is just a lot of bunk. And I had a perfect right to do this." And he did something else to his parents, and he did something else, and he did something else. And then one fine day, he all of a sudden felt like he was caving in. He didn't know what was wrong with him. He's just unbalanced the combination to such a point that he is left with a complete overbalance.

And you know what happens to him then? He's got to pick up hallucinatory or imaginary overt acts. He's got to make up mock-ups and claim that he didn't make them up, and pull them in on himself, or reach back on the whole track and pull in mock-ups of people being mean to him.

And the next thing you know, this preclear is all beaten up by engrams and facsimiles. He's got birth in restimulation, and Fac One. And he's got electronics and all the times he was under arrest. He's got these things in restimulation.

What's the mechanism behind all this? It's simply: He's been ornerier than people have been ornery to him – to be very technical in our use of words. Nevertheless, that's a very, very precise thing.

That's *noumena* to us – can be classed as noumena, not phenomena. It's not speculative. It's only speculative while you are examining it, and it's speculative to yourself, you see? You're speculating, "I wonder whether or not this is a law" – the same way you would study physics.

You go out and you get an inclined plane and apply the formula of inclined planes to

the rolling little wooden ball, or something of the sort, you know. And you speculate, "I wonder whether or not that's true or false." You do it a few times and you say all of a sudden, "Hey! What do you know? That's true!"

Well, so therefore, speculation would be admissible in the field of physics as long as we were examining it. And anybody teaching you physics would try very hard to get you to make sufficient experiments, you see, to give yourself an insight into whether or not these laws were true. If he didn't, he would never teach you physics.

But after you found out that something drops at 32.2 feet per second here on earth, acceleration of gravity – if it accelerates at 32.2 – you don't, every time you put that in an equation, speculate some more, do you? If you did you'd be crazy. You can go out, and if you've dropped so many weights of such and such sizes in vacuums, and you've discovered that's always 32.2, you could assume that it would continue to be 32.2. And you could relax about the whole thing, couldn't you?

And after that you'd say, "Thirty-two point two. That's just what it is."

All right. Overt-act-motivator sequence. That's all right, nobody is saying, "Now, look. You have to take this on belief," or you haven't got to swallow this, you know. It's all perfectly all right. You can question it all you want to, as long as you look and examine and see whether or not this is true; and look, and decide if you find this out to be true, you're dealing with a law. It seems to hold true person to person to person to person – so true, that you as an auditor can actually, from the two-way communication of your preclear, know very quickly who he's been mean to. Because he's giving you all the sad tale of how mean this person is to him. This person isn't mean to him. You can just set that down as a law. You've got this overbalanced overt-act-motivator sequence.

All right. And there's this fellow who's going around saying, "Boy, I'd just like to cut their throats and slit their gullets, and torture 'em. And if I just had a chance ..." or he's actually doing it! You can just count on the fact that this boy has received enough motivators. He's heavy on motivators.

He was kicked around for a long time with no provocation, and now he has a license to do what he pleases.

Will he really be able to put these into action though? The trick in it is he can never completely duplicate the action that was done to him. See, it can't be the perfect duplicate. He's trying to make a perfect duplicate, and that would wipe it all out. And instead of making a perfect duplicate, he keeps on making these imperfect duplicates, and so keeps unbalancing it from life to life, over and over, one way and then the other way, back and forth. You see how life goes, then?

So we're dealing with a law. Nobody wants you to believe this law. All anyone wants you to do is look and find out whether or not the law is true. If you find out it's true, then we're out of the field of a speculative science, aren't we? Right away.

So there are two different kinds of sciences. One is speculative, and the other is what you might call an exact science. Now, I'm not telling you Dianetics is an exact science simply because I invented it. I'm telling you it's an exact science because it is. There's a difference there, isn't there?

You see, I've been agreed with, now, by practically anybody who has really studied Dianetics. Even the chair of physics of Columbia University came close to a left-handed sort of praise one day when he said to a bunch of his students, "The diabolical accuracy of the predicted behavior by Hubbard is going to undo, someday, the entire field of psychology. And then where will you be?"

He was mad. He didn't even know he wasn't making sense. Nobody is trying to undo

psychology. We're not playing in the same league.

Therefore, you get somebody oriented in the field of psychology and try to treat him with Dianetics, why, you'd ... About the only way you'll exteriorize him, by the way, is by R2-45.

All right. He's speculating all the time. The main problem he's trying to solve is "Am I alive or am I not alive?"

Well, so much for that. Let's look at the most elementary Axioms of Dianetics – the most elementary. We discover these Axioms are put together on a level of simplicity, not just to make people happier, you know, with it; not just to get people to agree, and so forth; not to pat them on the back, or something of the sort. These Axioms we put together as the most elementary Axioms of Dianetics are actually quite immutable. Horrible.

Dianetics, you see, is the study of man, more than anything else. It is the study of man. It's a study of his behavior and the motivations of behavior of man – not just life, but of man; a very specialized kind of life. And, as far as man is concerned, he is obeying very, very definite laws and rules – and which can be set forward in axioms.

And the first and most fundamental of these, which we mustn't lose sight of (and it's even in the R2 list; way advanced in the R2 list): The dynamic principle of existence is *survive*. That's the basic Axiom of Dianetics.

You can talk about ideals if you want to, and you can talk about a lot of other things. You can *say nobility*, and you can say this and you can say that, and say these are motivating causes of existence, and all that sort of thing; but none of that is substantiative. You can't substantiate that. You can substantiate the fact that man is trying to survive or – as later on in *Science of Survival* you will discover – he inverts, and he's trying to succumb.

But then he is not man very long, is he? I mean, after he decides to succumb you see, he's walked out of the human race. So again, when we're talking about man, the dynamic principle of existence is survive – that which we know as man.

Now, a person gets down below 2.0 on the Tone Scale and he sort of leaves the human race. He leaves it in more ways than one. He tries to part company with all of his fellows. He tries to push his fellows off. He becomes antisocial.

He considers it a crime to survive, by the way. It is evil to survive. He really believes it's evil to survive. He believes something that is surviving over a long period of time would be evil. It's like a beautiful statue that was ... I think the thing was built to Arsinoe, one of Cleopatra's relatives. Anyhow, this thing was on the coast of North Africa, and it was just a gorgeous piece of stuff. And it has excited the ire of successive lines of kings in that particular area, hardly without exception, since the day it was first left unprotected by Cleopatra's immediate family.

Now, ages ago this thing was built and it's still there – it's still there. It's almost indestructible. And it has driven some of the lower orders, dynasties, and so forth, of the North African coast, into complete frenzies.

In the last war, they were busy shooting machine-gun bullets at it, and so forth, trying to knock it to pieces, and they couldn't even make a dent in it.

Monarchs have had teams of oxen hitched to it to try to pull it over and destroy it, and so on. And it just goes on standing there.

This is an interesting thing. Practically every man, however, who has tried to destroy it is trying to destroy a great many other things, you see. He's off on a destruction bent. He is what we call insane, and the human race elects out those who are insane, or uses them for their political and military leaders. One or the other.

The human race will also use them for their witch doctors – such a case as the shaman's call. They wait for somebody to go mad in the tribe, and froth at the mouth. And after that, why, he has visions, dreams, hallucinations. They believe what he says. He is then their witch doctor. We've carried that forward into the field of psychiatry.

Anyway, our whole basis here, where we're talking about the human race – what is the human race, and so forth – we're talking about survival. Because when we talk about succumb we're merely talking about an objection to surviving, aren't we?

So it's still survival. The guy is objecting to survival. So we could say more clearly, if we wanted to clarify this further, the dynamic principle of existence is survive. And this is countered by the second principle, succumb, but we're getting too involved.

Actually, on the Tone Scale below 2.0, *succumb* is the goal. And above 2.0 on the Tone Scale, *survive* is the goal of man. And this is an adequate statement. Perfectly adequate. Nothing else falls outside of that. You see, mankind is very thoroughly in agreement with conservation of energy, and survival is actually simply persistence. He creates to persist. He destroys to persist.

All of his actions are monitored by persistence, you see. He creates to persist, he destroys to persist, he acts to persist, he teaches bank tellers to be honest, so they can persist – so the banks can persist – and this is the central goal. I inspected this goal for five years and found it to be uniformly workable – so workable, that today, when we have a process which simply, intimately addresses this (survival, you know), it's a very workable process.

And where we have a process which doesn't take survival into its conclusions, we don't have a workable process. It's not workable. As soon as we let go of that one as the primary motive in existence, why, we just shotgun all over the place.

Now, processes, then, which enhance survival, are considered to be good processes. Even processing, you see, is monitored by this dynamic principle of existence. And processes which reduce survival are considered to be bad processes.

What is a bad process? One which reduces survival. What is a good process? One which enhances survival. Life becomes very simple if you know this.

If you isolate this as an immutable law, it is then very easy to understand what man is doing and what various classes of men are doing.

Okay. In order to understand survival, as you will learn in *Science of Survival*, and as you have probably already read in *Science of Survival*, you discover that the factor, survive, as a drive or a thrust, is itself subdivisible. If you were to put a magnifying glass on its vector arrow, you would find that there were eight major subdivisions, eight thrusts toward survival, eight thrusts for survival.

And in *Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health*, we only treat four of these, because Dianetics is the science of man. And the first of those is the thrust for the survival of self as self, for self. That's first. What man considers self is himself. Well, it's actually thetan plus machines plus body plus reactive bank, and that is what we call the first dynamic, where man is concerned. Actually, that isn't the first dynamic. The awareness of awareness unit is the real first dynamic. But man, when he thinks of himself, is himself. So we can take even the first vector to pieces, can't we?

See, we put a fairly good magnifying glass on this survival-vector arrow, and we got out eight lines, really. But if we were to put just a mediumly good, you know, rather poor magnifying glass on the survival arrow, we'd only see four dynamics, if we were a man. And self would simply mean a conglomerate. See, it's awareness of awareness unit, plus the machinery which serves the awareness of awareness unit (the computers and so forth),



plus the body, plus the reactive bank. But we'd have to have a much better magnifying glass trained on that one little vector to see all this.

All right. So, we look over this and we say, well, dynamic one, then, covers self. In Scientology it means the awareness of awareness unit. In Dianetics it means something else. It means the body plus the thetan plus the reactive bank plus the machinery. It means four things. And that is self. The actual first dynamic – pardon me, in Scientology it simply means the awareness of awareness unit, see; in Dianetics it means all these other things – the real, actual first dynamic is the awareness of awareness unit all by itself. And for that reason, nobody's ever really processed, until Scientology, the actual first dynamic. They were always processing a third dynamic. Well, that's one thing they can learn out of this immediately.

Now, let's look at the second dynamic. And we say, what's this second dynamic? In Dianetics, Scientology, it's the same thing. The dynamic two is the urge of the individual toward survival through procreation. It includes both the sex acts and the raising of progeny – the care of children and their symbiotes. What symbiote means: it means dependencies. It means their dogs and their cats and their dolls – their tokens.

In Freudian work we discover this was the end – all of existence. Freud discovered that people had gone down what we now know in Scientology as the Know down to Mystery Scale – first known as the Know to Sex Scale, now known as the Know to Mystery Scale.

Most people that he would discover having trouble, were stuck at the condensation we call sex. This is because they had decided that they could not survive in the body in which they found themselves, but would have to procreate in order to have another body up the time track, and maybe that could survive.

This is so much the case that a biologist writing – with indifferent knowledge of humanity and life, and certainly with no knowledge of Dianetics and Scientology – would uniformly attribute the totality, the total purpose of existence, was simply to procreate and keep the unending line of protoplasm going, on a racial line. They think that's the total of life.

Well, they didn't solve the problem either, any more than somebody who would come along and say, "You all live for self. You live for yourself. Every man lives for himself, and that is all he lives for." Actually, any man living for himself is not going to live.

All right. The second dynamic is quite startling, in that it connects two things which were hitherto really not connected, even in Freudian analysis, and which are very definitely connected – and that is the sexual act on the one hand, and the care and raising of children on the other hand. If you say sex, you're talking about the sexual act *and* children, aren't you?

So we discover all sorts of weirdities in this society whereby people are engaging in the sexual act, but making sure that they do not have any children. Well, we'd say that these people then are below 2.0 on the Tone Scale, and must be going in the direction of succumb. Hm? The act is okay, but the children aren't okay. Well, you say this doesn't equate? That's right. It doesn't equate. Those people are nuts. They're daffy.

Of course, we get up on the third dynamic, we can find out that there can be an overpopulation problem for such people as the Polynesians. They have only so many fish around the island. They have only so much ground on the island to live on. There are no other islands in the world. So they cut back their population by inhibiting sex. And this is the way they do it. They practice birth control to keep the population ... They now practically don't exist as races, either. So you see, it's perfectly all right to sit down on the

second dynamic. You'll survive always – for a while.

Well, as a case of nonsurvival, take the attitude toward sex of a New Yorker. I don't think I need to go on describing it any further, in level of survival. New York depends exclusively for its forward driving population on kids from the farms, kids from the small towns, other cities – exclusively. It can't continue on its home product.

You go through the ranks of New Yorkers, and you discover that the executive of this and the hot brains behind that, and so forth – well, this guy is from Peoria and that guy is from Keokuk and so forth. Where is the native New Yorker? He is working for them – janitor.

Anyway, this all has to do with the fact that New York, being so terrifically compressed and suppressed, of course has a pretty bad foul-up on the second dynamic.

Well, that's just one dynamic that they've cut out. And you see, they could cut out just half of this. They could believe in the sexual act and omit children from the computation of sex, and you would have only 50 percent of the second dynamic operative.

And if these fellows started to live for self and for the sexual act, you would have only one and one-half dynamics out of eight dynamics functioning. *Uuuh!* This fellow would not be very alive, believe me. He's not, either. He has a horrible time in life.

I'm not necessarily being hard on New Yorkers. I like New Yorkers. Actually, if I had followed my natural bent – I'm being more covert today than usual – I would have discussed, in these same terms, and put in the name *Hollywood*. But I don't like dirty words, to utter them in class. So I don't say the words like that. We are talking about something clean and noble like sex. We don't want to introduce Hollywood into it.

Anyway, the second dynamic is only, really, from a Scientologist's viewpoint, only one-eighth of the picture. You don't have to equate that mathematically, but it's really about only one-eighth of the picture.

You could theoretically have somebody who would believe in the sexual act, and be very fine in the sexual act, and who could be good to and raise children as *a totality* of function in existence. There are such people. They don't think of themselves, and they don't really think of the third dynamic at all. They certainly don't think of the fourth dynamic. There are some women like this. There were some in the Middle West. But actually they're only one-eighth alive. You see, theoretically you could get somebody "manic'd," you might say, on one of these dynamics at a time. You could get any kind of a combination.

Now, the only reason I'm mentioning that is it's combinations of these emphases on these various dynamics which make these combinations of personalities which appear so complex. One person is only partly there on the first dynamic, and he's very much there on the second dynamic, and boy, he's certainly all out on the fifth dynamic – the rest of them, zero.

Well, boy, he'd be quite a man. He would really be quite a man – I mean, if he had even that much combination. You're probably talking about some headliner like Clyde Beatty, or something, when you're talking about that. He probably is very fine on the second dynamic. He is very darned good on the first dynamic. People like him. He evidently can associate very well, and he's sure hell on wheels on the fifth dynamic, animals, and any kind of life form.

But I can tell you from my own conversations with him, he's a complete dead loss on the remaining dynamics. But here's an awful lot of dynamics to be in force. Give you an idea of the normal Homo sap. That's *a lot* of dynamics to be in force.

All right. The next dynamic that we talk about in Dianetics is of course the third

dynamic, and by that we mean groups. We mean any group of selves – whatever we call the first dynamic, you see – any group composed of first dynamics. And the family is a specialized group. And it belongs partly between the third and the second dynamic, because it has a purpose and a mission as a group to raise families. But then all third dynamic functions actually impinge slightly into the second dynamic. You can always go down here to the Kiwanis Club and get a big cheer about all these poor kids, see. They always go slightly over there on the third dynamic a little bit. But by a third dynamic we mean a group of selves.

All right. This group of selves, accumulating together, actually develops a personality of its own. You'll get a sort of a colonial aggregation. And you'll just get an aggregation. Somebody asked me one time, "Why you say, 'colonial aggregation?' "

"I don't know, myself. I read it in the Encyclopaedia Britannica."

And they say, "A colony, you see, that means a group. And then an aggregation, that means a group. So that's actually redundant."

That's all they know about groups. They go down here to the Kiwanis Club, they will find clique A and clique B and the voters. And clique A is a colony sitting in the middle of the entire aggregation called the Kiwanis Club. Right? And clique B is another colony, a bunch of pals that kind of run things when they get their hands on the reins, and they're sitting there in the aggregation known as the Kiwanis Club.

But what do you know? The Phoenix Kiwanis Club and probably the London Kiwanis Club are probably quite divergent, one to the other, but they probably have something or other in common, if the London Kiwanis Club exists at all – may very well, because they say Kiwanis International. They probably have something in London.

And we would have, then, a colony, you might say, called Phoenix, a colony called London, which are part of the aggregation known as Kiwanis Clubs. You see how this thing builds up?

It's like a German schema. If you have ever studied the horrible ponderousness of German mathematics, you will realize they can make lines and precisions and plans and charts for things that nobody ever dreamed of before, not even themselves.

Well, here you have, you see, small groups, bigger groups, integrating bigger groups. It doesn't mean that this is its progress. You could get a huge group and it breaks down into an individuation, or you could get a terrific number of individuals and they integrate into a group. You see, it can go both ways. Well, that's what we mean by a third dynamic.

Now, when we say mankind – which is the fourth dynamic – we say then, the total of a species known as mankind. We say the total, the whole thing.

Now, if there are men as such that are recognizable to us as men on some other planet, they would probably also be part of the fourth dynamic. But if they had three hands or two heads they would certainly fall into another category.

What we mean by mankind ordinarily, with the short-circuited, introverted view of earth, is the denizen who has one head, two arms, two legs, walks upright, wears shirts, pants, coats, belongs to clubs, votes, eats, gets married, buried, and rolls along.

This fellow has a certain cohesion to himself as a species. For instance, you would have far more feeling for a Russian than you would have for a gorilla. You see that? I mean, you'd recognize a Russian had some vague connection with the human race. And a gorilla, you would recognize, wouldn't have. And if it came to shooting the two of them, you would probably have much less compunction at shooting the gorilla than shooting the Russian. Do you follow me? Because the Russian – you have a kinship with the Russian.

Now, actually, only when some violent politician can break down this knowledge that

we all have amongst ourselves that we are all human beings – only when somebody can break down and segment out of the human race, a whole race, such as the Russians try to do to the U.S. with their propaganda, and so forth – can you get anybody to fire a gun.

All wars have to start with the assumption that is given to the basic populace that they are not fighting the human race. And all wars stop when they realize at length that they're fighting the human race.

It's curious, isn't it? Their fourth dynamics come to life. Do you know that they had the awfulest time trying to keep World War I going? One particular Christmas they started singing the same hymns on both sides of no man's land, you know. And the next thing you know, why, people were walking around in no man's land. The next thing you know there wasn't a machine gun going for hundreds of miles. And the war almost stopped.

And this was the most regrettable thing. Well, look at all the generals that would have been reduced to businessmen again. Look at that. Would have been the most horrible crime ever happened.

World War I educated soldiers pretty thoroughly. It educated them pretty thoroughly. You can't get anybody stampeded today – any civilized nation, European or American – you can't get them stampeded on the subject of fighting for the good of mankind. They saw too many dead Germans with "*Gott mit uns*" on their buckles. They said, "Gee! These guys are men.

„*Hmpf!*“

Too many prisoners were taken into German prison camps and given decent medical care, see. And we took too many of them. Now, there was a little bit of a breakdown in World War II. But that was because we were fighting the Oriental nations. And we had never fought them before, particularly, and we were not used to their ideas of warfare.

And the Japanese had never really been sufficiently civilized to recognize *their* likeness. But here you had a difference of skin, so you could say immediately, "Well, it's a different race." You know? So you had this breakdown come.

The Korean War also had some of this in it. You say, "Well, it's a different race, and therefore they're not human." Truth of the matter is, this is awfully hard to swallow for anybody who has had to associate with them for long.

Now, you take occupation troops – make very, very, very bad soldiers. Oh, they make terrible soldiers. You can't convince these people that they're fighting something else than the human race. They've lived with them. They know these people eat, breathe, procreate, like food, like entertainment, they can tell the same jokes, see? And you can't get a war going.

It's only a cut communication line which permits man – segments of man, colonies of man – to believe that they are entirely different than the aggregation called *man*, that permits an international incident.

It's only by thoroughly cutting the communication line that you can bring about a decay of the fourth dynamic. It's a horribly hard thing to do. They have staffs that work on it day and night – McCarthy, and so forth. They just have a terrible time.

I was quite curious about the iron curtain because I thought, "Gee, you know, they must be a great industrial nation to have that much iron." I was very curious about this iron curtain. And the only thing I found was that the Russian soldier had been held so far out of communication – been held so thoroughly out of communication with Europe and with America – and he'd been told so many lies on an organized basis, that he had ceased to consider the European or the American as a member of the same race as himself.

And having been educated in this direction, he of course could get into quite a state of affairs. Now, we get back to something I mentioned earlier, the overt-act-motivator sequence. This is how we break down and individuate in one of these dynamics.

The Russian soldier has been thoroughly educated to believe that Russia has suffered the most terrible indignities at the hands of the democratic nations of earth. He's been so educated to believe this, that he then feels entirely free, in the name of Russia, to lash out and do weird things.

But the things he does are not very weird. After he's been occupying Austria for awhile or Germany for a while or something, oh, do his officers start to have trouble with him.

He starts to settle down, and the *Frauleins*, they look very appetizing, and they look very pleasant, and he thinks more and more of these people as human beings. He begins to get into communication with them. He begins to pick up some oddities and interest in some of the customs. And the next thing you know, why, Slobovich – or whoever happens to be in charge of the local political bureau – issues an order to the occupation troops of Austria saying, "You will at this moment immediately attack and utterly disintegrate such and such towns."

And the officers issue these orders, and the Russian troops would ... Well, they'd have to go around, you know, and get their friends out first, you know. And then they'd have to see that everything was transported properly, and so on. They'd go right on conducting themselves like civilized human beings. Because they are themselves basically civilized human beings – a little less well educated than the Western world, but they've been thoroughly educated into believing that they have received so many motivators that they are now capable of God-knows-what overt act. The second that they begin to realize that they are members of the human race, you can't get them to fight the human race.

The only way we could ever have a war with Russia is to have an iron curtain. The only way we could ever have an iron curtain is, ourselves, keep talking about it. The Russians know they haven't got one. Any populace which they have tried to take over and control and pen in borders, and so forth, leaves them like water going through a handkerchief. I mean, it's not made out of iron. I found out there was not that much iron in the world.

I myself, by the way, have been stopped by Russian soldiers when I was in the wrong area. And our own country would not have done a thing about it, because it said right in my passport I wasn't supposed to be there. And, you know, "He's not supposed to go in that country."

I've been stopped, and my passport examined. And I told them I had lost my way, you know, and so forth (and I was only fifty or sixty kilometers over the border, you know; of course, I was merely momentarily lost; I'm not too horrible at communication with strange peoples and places, and so forth) – and get into one rousing big argument about whether or not I was in favor of lynching Negroes, just get into a terrible argument, and sit around and soak up vodka, you might say, the local vintage, and so forth, on this subject.

I did this, and everybody got drunk, and we never settled it – whether I was in favor of this or not. We did settle the fact that they weren't. They weren't in favor of lynching them, because they don't have any Negroes in their country. They finally told me this, you see.

And I remember distinctly, out of a sort of a vodkaesque fog, of explaining to them that I was dead against lynching of any kind whatsoever – even lynching dogs. And I remember getting off onto a long dissertation on how you would lynch a dog.

But this was a common meeting ground. This was the propaganda which had been thrown at them continually. Any white American was somebody who went around and as an afternoon sport would lynch Negroes. In other words, an American is not part of the human race. Isn't that curious?

This is the way they say it. They say he is not part of the human race. Well, this is what these boys have been told. And we all wound up good friends, and so on.

But this is true in any nation. I have been in, to date now, well, rather thoroughly, twelve very barbaric cultures. And I found that these people were all part of the human race too.

But they didn't believe, to the degree that they could communicate with it, that the next tribe was human. They were willing, after they talked to me for a short time, to admit I was. I liked poi too, you know. They could see that with the avidity with which I ate lizard's tail that I was quite human. But the tribe that just lived over the hill, hmm. They obviously weren't human. So they'd go to war with them; kill them.

All right. Those are the principal dynamics. But if you're looking at all of life you've got to go into the remaining dynamics. And we go immediately into animals, and we find that animal's and man's are not too far apart as far as functional bodies is concerned, but there's an essential difference between them.

An animal is essentially, evidently, a body running around in a self-determined fashion. And a man is a captured body. See, he is somebody who is ... who's captured a body, who's got more IQ than the body and who is running the body.

But once in a while we find a horse or a dog or something like that, that's been taken over by some thetan on the downskid on the same basis. And so we have some peculiarly intelligent beast – horses that can typewrite, and all this kind of stuff.

All right. We go up along the line – of course, that includes all there are in terms of dynamics – and we get to the sixth dynamic and we consider the material universe, or the woof and warp and laws of a universe, actually, as a dynamic. It's no more important than one-eighth of the entire picture, you see. And it's a dynamic, and it consists of matter, energy, space and time. And therefore the sixth dynamic is called the MEST dynamic. It's matter, energy, space and time. And whatever thrust we have for survival of these items, why, that would be the sixth dynamic.

Seventh dynamic, of course, is as a spirit. And the eighth dynamic is really infinity stood upright. And it simply means infinity. Now, you can come along and say, "Well, you also mean the Supreme Being?"

No, we don't particularly mean the Supreme Being. How do we know that you aren't, collectively, the Supreme Being. See? That's probably much more closer to truth.

There are gods around of various kinds. There are some wind gods over in India; there are various savage gods of one kind or another. But if you give them a good quizzing you find out that they're just a thetan and they behave most remarkably like you would if you hadn't thought that you ought to lay aside all the power you had, too.

I think very possibly there's some thetan in charge of these hurricanes down here. I wouldn't be a bit surprised, you know. I've never run into him. But I wouldn't be a bit surprised at all.

In any words, the sky is the limit when you get into spirits, because you can't see them and weigh them – that is, they couldn't before Scientology. We can come awfully close to doing so now, though. Naturally, to weigh anything and to see anything and to observe anything, the thing has to have mass and location, doesn't it? And a spirit does not have. And so, of course, we are apparently then escaping from an exact science if an exact

science is weighing and measuring. But we don't know that an exact science is weighing and measuring, do we? We could have an exact science of things that aren't weighable or measurable.

Well, Scientology's treatment of the thetan, the awareness of awareness unit of the body, is an exact science, but it's not measurable. It's not mensurate. And here we have our break, you see, with former spiritual, occult, mystic levels of study and action. Some of the old Hindus and Tibetans and so forth – these boys were quite sharp on this subject.

We would also have to include in the seventh dynamic any known spirit. You know, there are people who are known. By the way, there are some spirits in existence which predate the Bible, which are admitted to exist before the Bible begins. And are admitted to exist in every religious work on earth before the beginning of that particular religious cycle. Whether Brahmin, Hindu, Hebrew, Christian, Mohammedan, or any of these other things, we discover that prior to the creation of the Creation, these boys were present. And they are called by very many names, but the ones that we would be most familiar with would be the seven archangels. And those are the boys that continue to hang around and are known far and wide.

And it's a curious thing, but they exist. They are real, they are alive and they're still going strong today. You don't have to take my word for that. That is not an exact scientific statement until you go and look, and shake them by the hand, and say, "What do you know!" Then it's an exact-science statement to you.

Well now, when we talk of the most elementary of the Axioms, we're talking about simply the survival of existence itself in this universe or in any universe. And we're talking about it in terms of a subdivision of the word *survive*, and whether or not people are surviving or succumbing, and how many routes they are taking to do this, which are the four dynamics as far as man is concerned. He really doesn't reach any further than four dynamics. His worship of God is usually the worship of a man. Somebody has to be in human form before he can work himself up a good job of worship, you know? Even Christ had to be in human form.

Now, where you have, then, these basic elements, you have the basics and the basic assumption from which we have started – and why I have been talking to you about this today. I want you to get it very, very clear – our basic assumptions. And these are demonstrable assumptions, which are better than the assumptions of physics because they just assume them. These are very demonstrable. You can discover these things to be true.

Now, these are the basic assumptions, and we depart from that fact and we go along precisely along this track until we reach further workable truths. But I've talked to you today, *this* long, about something *that* elementary to make sure you understood that we have not departed from this.

This is the point from which we take off to study an exact science called Dianetics, and an even broader and more exact science called Scientology. Okay.

# THE PARTS OF MAN OVERT ACTS AND MOTIVATORS

*A lecture given on  
20 October 1954*

I want to talk to you today about the parts of man. It's quite important for you to know the divisions, subdivisions of man, and also, be important for you to know how he got that way.

So actually, this talk today consists of the parts of man, and also overt acts and motivators.

You wonder why these two could possibly come together this way. Well, they both do – so that this is the parts of man as understood through R2-61 and R2-62.

Man consists of four, distinct, separate parts. Although they are all related to each other, they are as distinctly separate as a stove is from the roof and a backyard is from the city jail.

The whole theory of psychotherapy fell down and went boom the moment we discovered that we were not treating the first dynamic when we were running engrams. Psychotherapy went by the boards. It died. It turned up its heels, and it has now even ceased to give an odor. Except in the newspapers, which report the new miracle cures, such as that one reported today, whereby they give somebody an electric shock, play them jazz, give them another shock and play them jazz – I think that, more or less, is the theory of it – and then turn them loose into a jukebox society. They implant an engram.

Well, this actually isn't even odorous. It's simply idiotic. Actually, there seem to be more than four parts. There are the four parts that we know about, and then there is the monkey kingdom. And this anthropoidal, atavistic tendency on the part of psychiatry is of no concern of ours whatsoever.

Psychiatry is doing something, we're not quite sure what, but I asked a psychiatrist once if he ever made anybody well, and he looked very surprised. This was not even vaguely part of his operating plan.

And you are going to be very shocked someday when you discover this yourself – that psychiatry is not supposed to make anybody well; psychiatry treats the insane toward no goal.

And you think that I am just kidding you, I'm just exaggerating that that's the case.

So, psychotherapy is in the doldrums and always has been, and until Dianetics came along, there didn't seem to be much hope for it.

Dianetics covers the first four dynamics, and the fact of the matter is, it understands by the first dynamic, primarily – and originally understood by the first dynamic – what we now call *Homo sapiens*.

When we say first dynamic, we mean all these four parts. But just as you can take any dynamic and split it up into more dynamics, so you can take this first dynamic and split it



down into these parts.

But this is quite important. When you have done so – when you have done so, and split all this down – you discover that you were treating the third dynamic when you thought you were treating the first dynamic. You follow me?

In other words, if we went ahead and continued in this error, we would be way downstairs from the truth and we would never climb upstairs to it.

In Dianetics, we talked very distinctly about the awareness of awareness unit. It's in Book One, you see. And we talk about the Dianetic Clear.

Well, if you read Book One you will discover that a Dianetic Clear could be nothing but just, only, singly, by itself (and it's this thing called "absolute Clear"), the awareness of awareness unit with no other parts.

Remember, we were trying to rub out all the engrams. And toward the end of 1951, if you read some of my papers of that time, you'll discover that the erasure of all engrams would, of course, have resulted completely and utterly in the demolition of the body, you see. So, this is a real curious thing. That's true. It would have, if you carried this *reductio ad absurdum*, simply erased every engram which a person had.

So we were treating, however, in Book One, *this* lifetime. Now, you could erase the engrams of this lifetime and you would make somebody far better off than before, you see? You could take just the engrams – and remember that an engram is a moment of pain and unconsciousness.

I beg your pardon. I misstated something. If you erased all the *facsimiles* of the whole track, the body would be gone. And all we essayed to do was simply erase these moments of pain and unconsciousness, and leave the rest of the facsimiles. You see that? So that would have made a relative Clear, just as you had a computing-machine clear, you know – a lot of held-down fives, and you'd clear these, and the fellow operates better.

The only trouble was, the awareness of awareness unit after a couple, three years of this research kept insisting on exteriorizing. And when exteriorized, we found the individual himself actually was the awareness of awareness unit.

When he lacked any force or personality after exteriorizing, when he lacked any real idea of identity after he exteriorized, when he felt kind of mildly, hopelessly alone, and he was just weakly sort of outside and out of communication, and so forth, and he felt this way, he hadn't been stabilized.

You sometimes pop somebody out and he feels real bad about it. Well, he hasn't stabilized. He has invested into the body so many characteristics, that he himself depends upon the body to have characteristics. When you have resolved this, you will find out that it was he that was investing the body with characteristics. And he can just as easily invest himself with these characteristics.

So, the first dynamic was the first dynamic indeed. It was the awareness of awareness unit, and this is covered, as I have said, in Book One.

Well, then we have the modifiers of the first dynamic. And the first thing which modifies the first dynamic is what we call machinery – the machines of the thetan. And these are actually machines of one kind or another by which he has things done for himself, with which he times his own activities, with which he pretends to go into communication. And that is a very, very sharp, identifiable item – the machines of the thetan. They're very identifiable.

This is just as identifiable as the house that goes around the stove. Where you consider this thetan the stove, he is giving all of the heat and energy out of this. And he has surrounded himself with various barriers, barricades, traps, gimmicks, whatnots, and

he's just sort of built a house around himself, you see – just to this degree.

You exteriorize a lot of thetans and they remind you of the old-time ghost story – because, after all, what are you dealing with, when you're dealing with spirits, but a thetan. You can call him by various names, give him various characteristics.

Many a person feels just exactly like a ghost, in that he's got old clanking chains and his pockets full of tin cans. And he's got all kinds of gimmicks and gadgets that do various, mysterious (and most mysterious to him) things that he can't quite identify – but awfully interesting.

And to ask him to give up all these contraptions is an unkindness, because any child has his toys, any business executive has his various foibles and operating machinery and plants, and any president has his bureaus. Any one of these people get along perfectly ably without all these things. You might even have a government if you took all the bureaus and threw them away and let the president govern. (Not advocating absolute monarchy, but just advocating a government.)

And so here is the awareness of awareness unit, and here then are the products of, or possessions of, or the creations of, the awareness of awareness unit. And the peculiar thing about these machines is every single one of them was made, hidden and forgotten by the thetan. He is the only one who sired them. Nobody has ever given him a machine.

Somebody could have given him an *idea* for a machine, but he had to make it. And from no source under the sun will any energy be fed into those machines except by the thetan himself. Is this very clear?

He cannot eat beefsteak and thus animate his machinery. This does not work; it never will work. But he may, for the sake of randomness, decide that he has to eat beefsteak to keep one of his machines running. But this is just a consideration; just as it is a consideration that he has a machine there in the first place.

Well, this machinery is a fairly private affair, then, isn't it? He's the fellow who makes it. He's the only one who can knock it to pieces. He's the only one that feeds it energy.

But added to that can be a multiple of considerations which make it possible for him to understand something from somebody else, and thus add it into his own machinery, and thus blame somebody else for having given him a machine. You follow me? He could consider that this had happened. And this is actually practically as good as it having happened.

But the truth back of the thing is, while he was making the sign of the cross or something with his right hand, he had to get in there with his left hand and represent a couple of horns. This is the thetan and his machinery.

Now, this mustn't be confused with another function of the thetan, another action, another ability. He can actually create another thetan, just like that, bang! He can duplicate himself. That is to say, he can give birth to or create or bring into being an entirely different life unit – an entirely new, different life unit – which in its turn can have a full personality, which can have full determinism, which can do everything and anything that he himself can do and can be as powerful as himself, or more powerful than himself, according to its endowment.

If he created something with this intention, "This is now more powerful than myself," he then would have to observe its actions and activities, independently undertaken, and then have to modify and cut down his own so as to always have less power than he had granted.

But this is not the creation of a machine. Here we have one little thetan, and the next thing you know, if he is very good at duplication and he considers himself completely

able, you have two little thetans. They don't even have to be brothers. And the next thing you know, you've got three little thetans and four little thetans and five little thetans – not done with moonlight, roses and Chanel Number 2. Not done in any system form. Simply overtly, knowingly saying, "*Pang!*" and another life form appearing. You follow me?

Sex is the supercondensed, many-times-viaed activity of creating other life forms. And the only thing which makes it more complex is the fact that it is considered to be more complex. And it is sufficiently complex that anybody who has been in love would be the first to assert that the whole business is complex.

Basically, the thetan can simply create, without any system, another living being. Now, there's an important thing. This is an ability of the thetan. But it is not a part of the thetan.

A thetan can create machinery, but that's intended to go on doing something *to* him or *for* him. And this is not life units he's creating. This is machinery, just like that. Just like you go buy a car: You don't expect that car to breathe. Neither does he expect his machinery to have life of its own.

But sometimes he gets mixed up and he will endow machinery with life. In *Dianetics: The Evolution of a Science* I talk about the possibility of setting the mind alongside of the body. This was many times misinterpreted, most markedly in a process – a very bad and harmful process – called "E-Therapy."

It had its genus, according to its originator, in *Dianetics: The Evolution of a Science*, wherein it says the great god Throgmagog is set up alongside of a fellow to advise him and give him good advice, and so forth.

A person is totally capable of doing this. A man can get himself thoroughly haunted by living beings – living, breathing beings – simply because he can duplicate himself. This is not machinery, and it is not part of the thetan, by definition. But it is the thetan moving outward through the second dynamic of creation into a third dynamic of becoming a group.

Now, at any time he can then pull off from this group which he himself has created and leave the group living, breathing and acting. And his own absence does not detract any knowingness from him. Nor would it pull anything back from the group.

This is, overtly, the creation of life. And this is how life multiplies in its most basic, simple form. And that is the multiplication of life.

So the first dynamic is capable, through the second dynamic, of creating a third dynamic and, if the plans are sufficiently well-laid, a whole species, such as the fourth dynamic.

So man might have an entirely common ancestor, an entirely common ancestor – one. Very possible. But *who* and *what* would that common ancestor be?

Now, let's look that over when we get up to that, and we discover this individual would have endowed, to make other chess players. .. You know, when you make a chess player you have to endow him with full intelligence and self determinism, otherwise you can't play chess with him. You discover that he, therefore, would not have remained a superior being by the simple act of creating all these other thetans to do this activity. It would have had no connotation of superiority to have done this, since any one of those beings he created could, in its turn, do the same thing.

Maybe man has eight billion ancestors. And maybe he has only one. Who cares? Nobody. It doesn't make a bit of difference to us.

You would have, let us say, a hundred million souls on earth during one period of its ability to advance, and at another period you would have a couple of billion.

Well, how could they possibly disappear? Do they ever become less? Do they just always become more and more and more and more and more? No. An individual could repostulate himself back into his original creative entity – you know, he could just say "I am no longer myself...." Nobody else would influence him to do this, you see. He'd say, "I am no longer this unit. I am now another unit which created me in the first place." You see how he could do that?

Because there is no such thing as time. So, therefore, it must go on continuously and continually as a created existence.

In other words, this thetan could have made five thetans, played a football game, decided which one was the winner, and then have become the winner. And each one of the five playing could have then become just the winner, and they would not have lost either their identity or anything else.

The only thing they could possibly lose, and they'd have to shut that off for themselves, would be their knowingness that they had done it. But to have done it at all requires that they would have had to have shut off their knowingness of doing it.

You recover an individual's knowingness, one of the first things you would recover is the fact that he has occasionally multiplied himself. Now, do you think you understand valence a little better?

Is it necessarily true that Mama, a thetan, has subdivided herself so that the baby could have a thetan, or be a thetan? No, it has nothing to do with it.

Let's look over the parts of man more thoroughly. We discover that having done this often and many times, an individual has, very markedly, laid aside this ability and has begun to hang on to the "only one" computation, and is holding his ability to be himself closely to himself. And holding his ability to himself, then, and being just himself and concentrating on being himself, he is trying to maintain his identity as a first dynamic. He's long since ceased to duplicate just by saying there is another being out there. He is too involved in his own agreements.

He thinks to create another being he'd have to indulge in sex, and then he discovers he has not really created another being at all. That other being is going along a composite intelligence line, and we are now talking about a body, which is the granted beingness of many individualities *based* upon one basic individuality, which of course started that genetic line.

All right. There isn't any reason to get upset about this. Let's take a very clear picture of this.

One: a thetan. He can make machines. He has a body, and that's the body. You know, he has acquired a body. All right. The body has a reactive mind.

What if a thetan got so terribly complex with all of his machinery, and he got so interlocked with so many other individualities and so much grant of beingness in all directions, that he'd forgotten what he was, who he was, and he just knew he was supposed to *be* this identity and repeat the manufacture or creation of this identity?

As a thetan he would have become solid, and his machinery itself would have composited. Right? And this "himself" becoming solid, well, you might say, would be a body. And his machinery, having composited, would be a reactive mind.

Tethan plus machinery, as it becomes more condensed and much more complex, with many, many vias, and much more forgettingness, becomes a body with very, very little knowingness but a great deal of automaticity and randomness, with machinery, which is so condensed, finally – picture-making machines and all kinds of other machines – that you have such things as the somatic-mind–reactive-mind characteristics. You follow that?

Actually, these things are *terrifically* complex and *awfully* patterned. But you have just seen a thetan plus his machinery become so condensed and so complex, and be joined from so many other quarters and get so interlocked in all directions, that he finally was solid-body. So solid, he can be overtaken and controlled by another thetan plus these machines.

Now, unless the body itself is controlled by another thetan, then the reactive mind cannot be controlled by another thetan. The body can control its own reactive mind, or its reactive mind can be controlled by another intelligence.

Only now do we get into the manifestation of the machinery being actually, overtly controlled by other intelligences. A thetan's machinery condenses to a point where the thetan himself is under control, and being himself under control, we then have the manifestation of the reactive mind.

See, we're not calling that thetan machinery any more, are we though? It is so complex, and it now belongs to something which is so thoroughly owned and controlled, that any part of it can be owned or controlled.

Parts of the body are: thetan, thetan machinery, body and the reactive-somatic mind. (Doesn't matter whether we call it reactive mind or somatic mind. Actually, there is no real differentiation between the two.) Follow that? There are the parts of man.

But a thetan as an individual can sexually create another thetan, and so become a group. So we have one, two, three dynamics, see? First dynamic can create (that's a second dynamic) other individuals, and you then have a third dynamic. And if the pattern of creation is sufficiently manifest, we can then have something we would call a fourth dynamic, which would be a species. And we would have, then, a class.

But a species automatically states that there must be other species. And we would work out, therefore, an interdependency of life form and behavior and action which we see here on earth – *Homo sapiens*, the animal kingdom, and so forth.

Now, in order to get to a higher level of truth than simply *Homo sapiens*, it is necessary to investigate the remaining four dynamics. And we look over and we find out that each animal is a species. We find out the animal kingdom works up the same way, really. But no thetans are quite as anxious to control animals or animal bodies – no thetans are as anxious to control them – as they are the bodies of men. Men can talk, they can walk, they have intelligence, they can fight, and so forth. And so a thetan would much rather have a man's body or pester men, or get involved with men as did those thetans in early Greece that we call now, laughingly enough, Greek mythology.

Men can get involved very easily with spirits, because the men and the affairs of men are sufficiently complex to be interesting to control. Take the affairs of a rabbit; they are not at all interesting to control. I mean, a rabbit hops, a rabbit eats, a rabbit goes through many evolutions and mostly he runs and is frightened, and so forth.

And I myself have tried to get interested in monitoring rabbits. It's a little more interesting to monitor a wolf, but again, the affairs are not very complex.

Well, the affairs of man are very complex, and they would interest somebody enormously. So thetans are perfectly content to control men. Men are a terrific theta trap. Women are a better one.

And we see, then, that the animals themselves, quite uniformly, are simply the body plus reactive-somatic mind. And we don't have the other two manifestations.

In other words, we've just watched a condensation of a thetan plus machinery down into a rabbit – see, thetan plus machinery, and eventually we had a rabbit. He just got more and more complex, and we had a whole species of rabbits, and again, we have gone

through the one, two, three, four dynamics in terms of rabbits. See? And we could do the same thing in wolves.

The first dynamic, there was a thetan, and he had his machinery. And he decided to, through the second dynamic (creation, duplication), achieve a similar entity. And then he achieved another independent personality, and this was the third dynamic. And then he decided to make a pattern out of the whole thing, and all they – the whole of them, now – decided to make a complete personality out of this thing. And we finally arrived at a point where we had a species of wolves. See, and that's counteropposed to rabbits, and man, too. Same way with camels or rhinoceroses or anything else.

So, this would be an interesting thing, to continue on with something called psychotherapy in the absence of this information, wouldn't it? Because all you would do would be to get more complex and more complex and more complex. Because you would run into further and further and further complexities.

And the whole problem depends upon simplicity for its solution, since the solution itself must *be* the problem exactly, to be a solution. So therefore, if *you were* or *duplicated* any problem perfectly, there would be nothing left there but static, wouldn't there? There'd just be a static – no mass, wave-length, position – and so that would be a zero. There would be qualities, thoughts or life potential. There could even be personality – as I say, qualities – but there would not be a big mass there.

So in order to obtain mass you have to have problems, vias, all sorts of things. Therefore, psychotherapy is defeative. It could never be anything else but defeative.

So, as we look this picture over, we discover that the auditor is addressing actually four items. And if he cannot differentiate, one to another, amongst these four items, he certainly is going to be in trouble.

There is only one of those items which has enough truth left in it, has enough ability, personality and awareness to deserve his attention. And that would be the awareness of awareness unit *itself*, which we call in Scientology, a thetan. That would be the one thing which deserved his attention.

Other than that, he might as well go out here and process rocks. Process a body – process a rock. I mean, the body, actually, is even less complex than a rock. A rock is sufficiently complex to have baffled even Albert Einstein. But bodies – they only baffle people like the Mayo Clinic.

If you've got to get complex, let's get really solid and dense. Because that tells you how many vias there are in something; how dense is it? That tells *you* how many vias there are on its communication lines.

The distance from cause to effect in a rock is beset by so many vias, and is so interwoven and is so complex, that both cause and effect of the rock are lost.

The impulse toward religion on the part of most people is to discover cause – basic cause; "Why?" – and the effort to discover basic cause leads them to try to go through these various vias. And it's like walking through this famous labyrinth of ancient times, and they only get lost. Because you don't find cause and effect that way. You simply find cause and effect by finding the highest level of freedom, assuming it and then knowing. And you will know, then, cause and effect, because you will *be* cause and you are then capable of being an effect.

All right. We can dispose of this problem quite easily by knocking out of existence all those factors which we are not interested in processing.

Now, as we go up the line and as processes have bettered, we discover that as we are better able to understand something, we are more able to control it. The more able we are

to control something, the less need there is to process it so that it can be controlled. Is that right? We don't have to process it to control it.

So in modern Dianetics and Scientology, it is only necessary simply to do this: to knock out the factors you do not want to process, because you do understand sufficiently to control.

And the first of those that would go would be that most illusive series of factors known as the reactive-somatic mind. We can control it. If you don't believe this, read Book One. Study up processes in that and *Science of Survival*, and process yourself a few engrams. You can control that mind. You can knock it backwards and forwards and turn it wrong-side-out. You can lock-scan – do all sorts of interesting things. But that is all in the interest of learning what it is all about. And once you have known these things, by the way – you know its anatomy – there is no further sense in trying to knock it out of existence, because we can assume control of it. So you're not going to process that.

Now, we have already learned, through the vast example of medicine and other factors, that the actual direct processing of the body is, in itself, not to be countenanced. It's just of no use, really, to process the body. So we'll just say, "Body and reactive mind – process these? No."

Well, how about the thetan's machinery? Well, it's interesting to process. It's interesting to process long enough to a point where you can control it. But we know enough about it now so that an individual could come into the possession and control of it, if he wanted to. We have processes which do this. So why process it?

And this leaves us, then, with this now-very-narrow sphere to be processed, which if processed, can then assume control of the other three factors, and being able to do this, can of course resolve all his own problems without any trouble.

So the short way through on the thing is simply to separate the awareness of awareness unit from these other items, have him recognize his identity and his capability by putting him through various drills, and then having him turn around and do what he pleases about setting his own machinery to rights, in setting the body to rights, in setting the somatic-reactive mind to rights – and, if you do a good enough job, why, just thinking that they're right is sufficient to have them be right.

There's where you got "right thoughts." "Right thoughts" is a wonderful process, providing you have a Clear to begin with. It's not a process you would use on a sick man.

Actually, all a right thought would be, would simply be a thought which would promote the optimum survival on the optimum number of dynamics. That would be a right thought. It has this precise definition.

All right. Now, if all this is the case and we can see all this, something else comes into the picture: If all we're interested in is processing this awareness of awareness unit, where are we going to enter this picture? There must be some kind of a button.

Of course, the button is "Be three feet back of your head" for most people; that accomplishes it. And you go on and drill him some more, and he recognizes some more, and he'll start telling you about his machinery and his body and his reactive bank. He'll tell you all about these things. So "Be three feet back of your head" is a very, very magic button.

Well, there's a magic button, *still*, for those people who don't do this immediately. And that magic button is on a very neglected part, in Scientology, of Dianetics. And that is the overt-act-motivator phenomena. The magic button is right there.

Because here is the mechanical process by which a thetan becomes solid enough to be a body – surrounded by his machinery, *now* becomes solid and complex enough to be

called a reactive-somatic mind.

It's the overt-act-motivator phenomena which is the mechanics of this hardening or solidifying process.

And now there's one lies immediately behind that, which is the consideration which matches the overt and motivator. Well, I'll talk to you about the consideration in a moment. And I'll tell you about the mechanics first.

The mechanic is simply this: An overt act is a harmful act performed against another. And it could, of course, be performed against others. So that's a precision definition. If you were asked that on an examination paper, that would be your answer to the question. An overt act is a harmful act performed against another or others.

An overt act could actually, technically, theoretically, be performed against oneself, couldn't it? Theoretically. People just try to do that, however. We don't have to take it into account particularly. But remember, this is possible.

And it actually could be even more precise if you said it was a harmful act on any dynamic. And that would be the clearest statement that you could make of that.

Now, a motivator is an overt act against oneself by another. A motivator is an overt act performed against oneself by another. In other words, a motivator is a harmful action performed by somebody else against oneself.

Bill hits Joe with a club. Well, to Joe, that is a motivator. He is the one who has been hit. He is the hittee. And Bill over here has done the hitting – he's the hitter – and he, of course, has performed the overt act. And he has given Joe a motivator. So it has something to do with viewpoint, doesn't it?

Well, you're right downstairs from pan-determinism. You see that then you have to have the idea of self-determinism before you can have overt acts and motivators, and that pan-determinism would clarify overt acts and motivators. You see? You wouldn't be taking sides anymore.

All right. If one receives a motivator, he then may consider himself licensed to perform an overt act against the person who harmed him. Anyone receiving a motivator considers that he is now licensed to perform an overt act. And that is the basis of all licensing.

That is why a boot in a training camp in the marine corps is kicked around so thoroughly, and why they really call him a boot. He is thoroughly, arduously pounded around to a point – he is commanded so thoroughly – that he is given sufficient motivators to be the meanest soldier in the world, and to be thoroughly overt against people in his vicinity, making them obey his orders when he becomes a private first class, a corporal, a sergeant.

Without that arduous course of training he would not have enough motivators to carry him through his military career. And thus, the "big brother" policy of that great, glorious institution, the United States Army, is chaos.

This is not one-sided. It isn't because I've been just a marine and haven't been in the army. I've been in the army, too. I've been in the army and the navy and the marine corps. And I naturally know which one's the best outfit.

But the funny part of it is, that this "big brother" policy – "Let's pat all the poor little recruits on the head and make them very, very conscious of the fact that we're doing our best for them" – breeds you up privates first class, corporals and sergeants who will not make their orders felt. And in battle, instead of barking out a command or two which people immediately obey, they hint that maybe, possibly somebody might – if he gets around to it, of course – fire his gun.



This accounts for the fact that when the army takes a piece of ground alongside of a regiment of marines, the army doesn't take any ground but marine ground. This is a direct fact, I mean, in battle. You never put an army regiment up alongside of a marine regiment. You couldn't do it.

It has its inception right in training. And although the marine corps has had to buy, wholeheartedly, the entire army policy on paper, they don't conduct their training camps the way they say they do. The training camp at Quantico is still carried on very much the way the training camp at Quantico has always been carried on. And those people up in Washington can write all the orders and regulations they want, training must go on in Quantico. Parris Island, same way.

He's got to have – to be given, *actually* – *actually* has to be given enough motivators to last him his military career; just right like that. Because actually, when he is really in service, and so forth, men tend to be rather decent to each other, and it's not easy for an individual to gather them.

Oh, he can try. He'll occasionally get a ... Life can get very arduous, and so forth, to him.

Then the enemy, in the opening of action, will begin to provide motivators. And the enemy will give him a lot of motivators. And then, he is then licensed to fight. And unless he has been licensed to fight all the way up along the line by motivators, he is not a good soldier.

And unless you have been badly processed, you will never have the right to badly process anybody. You'll always have to process somebody well, won't you?

Now, unless you yourself have, to some slight degree, been controlled and pushed around, you will never be really willing in an auditing session to push somebody around. And once in a while it's necessary to push somebody around. Believe me, it's necessary.

All right. The stress and strain of life is made up between these two factors: the overt act and the motivator. And these get into an interesting state of affairs.

Now that we're looking them over, we find out that a motivator is of two classes. There are two kinds of motivators. We used to call this DED and DEDEX – this I'm talking about now. But there's a simpler nomenclature which I am giving you here.

When one commits an overt act without having received a motivator – you see, he wasn't licensed – he attempts, then, to mock up or acquire a proper motivator or justify his own harmful action. You know?

He walked down the street, there was a fellow there he had never been introduced to – no quarrel – and he all of a sudden walked up to this fellow and he hit him in the teeth. You meet him twenty minutes later and you say, "Hey! What happened?" And he'll say, "Why, that fellow spat on me."

Nothing like this occurred, see. He'll have to believe this, though, to have had the license to hit the other fellow.

An overt act delivered in the absence of a motivator, we call an *unmotivated act*. It wasn't an overt act, then, was it? It's an *unmotivated act*. Actually, these are the same class – unmotivated act and overt act – with this exception: A person was licensed when he undertook this overt act. And he was not licensed when he undertook an unmotivated act. Technical terms, which you will be using quite a little bit.

Now, a justifier is the technical term we apply to the mock-up or overt act demanded by a person guilty of an unmotivated act. This fellow hits this other fellow in the teeth, goes down the street, and says, "He spat on me!" That is the justifier.

The justifier we understand not to have happened (nonexistent), as an effort to justify

the fact that the fellow committed an unmotivated act. So we have unmotivated act and justifier going together. And we have motivator-overt act.

Actually, motivator-overt act is perfectly all right. There's nothing wrong with a motivator-overt-act sequence. Nothing wrong with it. It will always balance out. Everything will be equal. Nobody will ever go insane, no matter if he gets his head cut off or anything else. If we are dealing with nothing but motivator-overt-act phenomena, see – we're just dealing with that sequence only – nobody will ever become insane, upset or even hurt. Because he can always get out of this, one way or the other.

And if nothing but overt-act-motivator phenomena had been on the former track, we would not now be talking about aberration. This other one, however, the unmotivated-act-justifier, is the villain of the piece.

The fellow did an action harmful to another, which other had never harmed him. This is so much the case that there is a very interesting novel written about World War I, about the fate of one Sergeant Grescha, a Russian sergeant who was given bluntly, and he received, an unmotivated act from the German government. He was hanged for no crime.

And this novel traces the downfall of Kaiser Bill's empire to this one unmotivated act – so much so, that it tries to teach this lesson (whether true or not): That nation which harms another without just cause is itself doomed. That's possibly quite true.

But it is certainly true of an individual. That person who harms another without just reason is doomed. And that's why a thetan is doomed, because he can *never* receive a motivator. That is the *exact* reason why we have a dwindling spiral. There is no other reason.

A thetan has no mass, no wavelength, no actual location beyond what he supposes to have. How can he ever have received a motivator? His original, primary action must always, then, have been an unmotivated act – so much so, that the overt-act-motivator sequence in actuality, in life, originally did not exist.

Today, however, we can look at status quo: Johnny comes over and he steals your toys and you go and hit him and knock him flat. You're not going to suffer for having knocked him flat. And so we get enough of these actions going through life, so that there appears to be – just as isness appears to be and actually isn't – there appears to be, then, an overt-acts-motivator phenomena going forward in life. But it is preceded, and was preceded on the track, by an unmotivated act justifier sequence.

A thetan can never, never, never be harmed. But he can *consider* that he is harmed. And considering that he is harmed, he can then *act* harmed and really be very unhappy about the whole thing.

And he can go right downstairs, straight into the basement. Because he has *never* received a motivator. Everything a preclear tells you is a search for a justifier. Remember that. His endless search through his bank is only search for justifiers. And when he starts searching for justifiers, he very rapidly wears out what few actual, credible motivators he has. He wears these out immediately. He as-ises them. And he doesn't have anywhere *near*, anywhere *near* enough motivators. He doesn't have anywhere near enough motivators.

And if he hasn't enough motivators, he of course, then, *must* be guilty of unmotivated acts. And being guilty of unmotivated acts, we have this queer business, how that everybody has to dream up how badly he is treated, what terrible condition he is in, in order to live with his fellows at all. He has to be sick, he has to be wronged. He has to be betrayed.

This thirst for being betrayed is the most strange thing that you ever tried to examine

amongst man. But his efforts to tell you about how he is betrayed, and how many times, and how he was betrayed, by whom, is an action in a conversation by which he is trying to mock up enough justifiers. He's giving you justifiers ... Remember, justifier isn't true. See, justifier. He's giving you justifiers, and he pretends he's giving you motivators.

Look that over. So there's only one real trick you'd have to play on a thetan in order to get this into the dwindling-spiral category and into the category of unmotivated acts and justifiers. There's only one way you could do this, and that was to define "harm" for him.

And now we've moved into the field of consideration, haven't we? Good and evil – R2-61: Things are bad; that's a consideration. Things are good; that's a consideration. It only requires the consideration that harm can take place to then set off the chain-fission reaction of unmotivated acts and justifies. It takes an education that you can do something harmful. You have to be carefully taught that your actions can be harmful before any dwindling spiral will occur.

Now, you could only be taught that these could occur if you yourself had invented it in the first place. We're again back to overt-act-motivator sequences in the field of considerations.

A person *intended* to be destructive and *was* destructive. And he intended this action to be a harmful action. He then has defined for himself "harmful." But he doesn't really come into a play of resenting harm or resisting it or doing anything about it until somebody else destroys some object or product which he himself has created. And when this occurs, he then is in this interesting state: He has to define harm for the other fellow. But he had to do it himself first, for the basic reason that he had to communicate first to be communicated to. A thetan had to communicate before he could be communicated to, always.

How is this? Nobody would have known where the devil he was in order to communicate to him, unless he'd put up a signal.

All right. So we have the thetan guilty of an *infinity* of unmotivated acts. Bodies – he's created them against bodies. Good heavens! A young fellow walking down the street; all of a sudden this thetan comes along and zaps him silly. Well, what did that boy ever do to that thetan? Nothing! But if you met that thetan twenty minutes later, he would explain what the boy had done. And this is a lie, isn't it?

So a justifier is always a lie, and any solidity or departure from static is a lie. So the way we depart from the absolute truth of static is via the lies of justifiers.

This is the course of the dwindling spiral. And this is hallucination. This is black masses. The fellow can only see black masses. This is the idea of being problems to himself. This is the idea of his difficulties with communication, his inability to be aesthetic, his inability to create, his inability to be handsome or her inability to be beautiful. These are all traced to the fact that there is a long departure here from static – which itself is beauty – a long, long, long departure. As we go down the line, we finally get *way* down the line.

By what route? The route of justifiers. Any justifier is a lie. Any lie will bring about, eventually, a solidity. All solidities are made up of only lies. This universe pretends to be a good universe. But, by its very existence, it must be a lie.

Now, what is the route of the dwindling spiral? Via justifiers. A thetan also has this one (this is not in addition, but this is just part of the same package): He has an anxiety about creating an effect. His highest effort there, in terms of third-dynamic relations, is to create an effect.

All right. Find the thing on which you're really going to create an effect. If another

thetan never, never, never can receive a motivator, you're going to get somebody anxious after a while about creating an effect. He knows no real effect can be created upon himself, except as he considers it and agrees.

Therefore, he knows actually, basically, intrinsically that he can create no effect upon another thetan and, therefore, must consider life units as solids. The second he begins to consider them thetans, he gets very upset. And thus people turn away from Scientology. They like Dianetics. They like all these studies. But you've made them face the idea of an exteriorized being who cannot be reached, struck or harmed. You're telling this fellow he cannot create an effect.

So he's caught between trying to create an effect and, the moment when he has apparently created an effect, of *then* being guilty of an unmotivated act. So he counterposes his effort to create an effect against the fact that one must never indulge in unmotivated acts.

And all he had to do to get messed up – he was trying to create an effect, you see, trying to create an effect – was to discover that he was capable of harm, of harming others. And when this was beautifully defined for him, good and evil, or he's defined them for himself, or he's defined them for somebody else, so forth – however that got into the run ... It got in there very easily, actually: he had to make up his mind about it and then afterwards agree to it.

Then, and thereafter, you would have him becoming more and more solid, and departing further and further from truth because he's trying to justify his actions. He's trying to justify all these unmotivated acts. And his effort to justify them would result in a chaotic state where he was concerned, and his whole past track would be composited almost entirely of hallucination.

Your extreme case is always packing around huge masses of energy. The amount of energy a person is packing around with him, and his own state of sanity – beingness – are directly proportional. The insane pack the most incredible quantities of facsimiles – nearly all of them mocked up. They're justifiers.

Now, a mocked-up facsimile – in other words, a picture that didn't happen which a person thinks happened – is a justifier. A justifier is a facsimile of something which never occurred.

Your preclear sits there and chatters at you madly: "Oh, my mother did this to me. My mother did that to me. My mother did something else to me. Yap-yap-yap-yap-yap-yap." You know what this person is trying to do now, don't you? This person is trying to mock up justifiers in the process of the communication.

Well, one immediate way to handle this, which is intensely effective and one of the most devastating and violent processes I know, is have him sit there and mock up or outline or list things his mother could do to him.

"Things that anything could do to him on the seventh dynamic" is the process. And you simply ask the individual to sit there and mock these up. Of course, this is a type of processing which comes close to remedying of havingness. And it belongs under Remedy of Havingness, of course.

You just have him mock up things, or have him list things, that all dynamics have done to him.

In other words, "That you've done to yourself"; that sex has done to him (sexual partners, in other words: women, if he's a man; men, if she's a woman); that groups have done to him; that mankind or other species have done to him; that animals have done to him; that the physical universe, that space has done to him; that energy has done to him –

just keep talking, you see, mocking these things up, or simply listing them for you, and just plain remedy that scarcity of justifiers. Of course, you take in spirits and God too, you know. And your preclear, having remedied his scarcity of justifiers, will be well. This is the most single powerful process I know.

Right next door to it is have him spot – you know, Remedy of Havingness and Spot Spots in Space; well, this is the background process of those two processes – have him *spot* all the spots where himself or anyone else considered harm could or had been done.

Actually, the technique is given in R2-61 of the *Auditor's Handbook*, printed edition, and the technique of overt acts and motivators is given in R2-62 of the printed edition of the *Auditor's Handbook*.

Okay.

# **R2-61: GOOD AND EVIL; R2-62: OVERT-ACT- MOTIVATOR SEQUENCE**

*A lecture given on  
21 October 1954*

Okay. R2-61, Good and Evil, and R2-62, which consists of the overt-act-motivator phenomena: These two processes are interlocked; they're interdependent, one on another.

One of them – R2-62 – is Remedy of Havingness with a specialized significance, and R2-61 is Spotting Spots. Every one of the Route 2 processes depends on Straightwire, two-way communication, Remedy of Havingness and Spotting Spots. Every one of them fall into those categories. So let's not even vaguely get confused about this tremendous number of processes, and feeling that you were taught certain, fundamental processes, and then that this has immediately been changed by the addition of all this R2 line.

This R2 line consists entirely and completely and utterly of two-way communication, Elementary Straightwire, Remedy of Havingness and Spotting Spots, and particularly two particular processes which are in that R2 line which are also basic processes, but which don't need any further amplification. And that, of course, is R2-16 and R2-17 – Opening Procedure of 8-C and Opening Procedure by Duplication. So we don't need any additional ramification of that. Everything else in that list is dependent on these basic processes of two-way communication, Elementary Straightwire, Remedy of Havingness and Spotting Spots.

And the only thing that the R2 list does is give some specialized significance, some facet of human behavior, and each one treats a highly specialized, specific phenomenon, which is actually necessary to the mental disinvolvement, you might say, of the preclear – every one of these.

Actually, there are many phenomena involved in the mind. But the basic operation of the mind responds to two-way communication, Elementary Straightwire, Remedy of Havingness and Spotting Spots, and the specialized processes, Opening Procedure of 8-C and Opening Procedure by Duplication. These are highly specialized processes. They need no further amplification, and are done without any significance.

Well, what, by the way – just off the beat a little bit – what special phenomenon does Opening Procedure of 8-C address? The special phenomenon is that human beings consider present time to be communication with the physical environment in the instant of its existence. And the phenomenon more particularly is that there is an instant of existence known as "now" in each successive instant in the physical universe, and present time is a contact with the "now" of the physical universe. So that is a phenomenon, and it is best remedied by the Opening Procedure of 8-C.

I say that completely unqualifiedly: It is best remedied by Opening Procedure of 8-C

– without frills. Opening Procedure of 8-C has been working itself into a very interesting state of prominence.

Now, Opening Procedure by Duplication does this one: It takes the present-time phenomenon and adds to it the fact that a person can have things happen again in present time, by having him duplicate.

Now, once more, the basic phenomenon is the fact that life is in contact with present time as long as it is in contact with this environment in its instant of now. There is that one and an additional phenomenon used, by duplication, only in that the communication formula, to have a perfect communication, must contain duplication – duplication at effect of what was at cause. And that is a perfect communication. So duplication occupies, therefore, that prominence. So we have run the most significant portion of the communications formula – duplication – in on present time.

So, the first one, 8-C, is the only one that really gets him in contact with present time. And the other one remedies experience. The individual is convinced that it must not happen again, and you show him that he can go on doing the action again and again and again.

Now, if he can't have things happen again, he cannot communicate at all. And to teach somebody anything – if that person is unable to duplicate – is not only arduous, but impossible. And for a person to live and be unwilling or unable to duplicate is very, very arduous indeed. And if he is totally unwilling to duplicate, he is dead.

Shock, in all of its considerations, is simply this: an expression of an unwillingness to duplicate, which leaves him in a state of abandoning the situation which he is being called upon to duplicate. Too much for him to duplicate – that's shock. And so he just abandons the whole thing. That's, actually, merely a consideration. It isn't even mechanical.

I've known men, by the way, to be perfectly able, and walk around until they looked down and noticed the injury. And then have them fall flat on their faces. Curious, huh?

All right. Let's take up -61 and -62 in the knowledge that all we are doing in -61 and -62 consists of two-way communication, Remedy of Havingness and Spotting Spots.

Now, Straightwire comes in to this degree: When you start to spot spots, certain amounts of past are going to jump into view, and the process itself might make things sufficiently unreal about the past, that you might care to go into some plain ARC Straightwire. You know, "Let's remember something real," and so forth. He might get so foggy that he'll start to go so far out of communication – and something might happen on it – that you could ask him to "Remember something real about it," or "Remember a time that is really real to you." You could vary that one in there.

Actually, it'd be, really, a little bit bad processing to do so. But if a preclear was not really able to run -61 and -62 when you started it, you could get into a situation where your only remedy would be to snap in with some ARC Straightwire. Make it real to them. You follow me?

You might be able to shove them right down through the bottom. You would notice this happening. They would simply go out of communication with you entirely. For the first hour it'd be fair to consider this as something like a communication lag. But for the succeeding hours, you could assume that they were really out of communication.

Now, in Good and Evil, R2-61, we would find this somewhat to be the case, and we would handle it in this fashion: After we've run R2-61, and if he just got foggier and foggier and foggier and foggier, we might say, "Remember a time now that's quite real, when you believed that you had harmed someone. Let's see if we can get a recall on a time that you really decided that you had harmed someone. You know, an incident that's real to

you." And the jam is liable to come apart. So we're using Elementary Straightwire there.

See, you could just use ARC Straightwire and get something that's real to him and snap him up the line if he were too depressed to run it. Now, the only reason I bring this up at all is because it's kind of a tossed coin whether you run R2-61 or R2-62 first.

These are very, very rough processes and would never be run on anybody who hadn't had an awful lot of R2-16 and R2-17. You savvy? I mean, there are a lot of other processes that we would run on them, particularly those two, before we'd tackle this.

Why? This is entrance to the MEST universe and the reason why they're here – R2-61 and -62.

All right, let's take up -61. I mentioned it before, but let's take it up from this basis: good and evil. Now, you could say about this universe that it was obsessed with the idea of good versus evil. And out of this comes the fact that it becomes good and evil, colloquially speaking.

The fact is that this is the primary fixation of philosophy and is very often the primary fixation of the preclear. There'd be several ways that you could run this. The best one I know, however, is by spotting spots.

"Let's spot some places where you decided you had done harm. Let's spot some places where other people decided they'd done harm." We'd do that by having him spot the spot, and spot a spot in the room. And spot the spot, and spot the spot in the room. And spot the spot, and spot the spot in the room. You know, back and forth. Having found one, we would get him to spot the spot, and find a spot in the room; spot the spot and find a spot in the room; spot the spot and find a spot in the room, until he got that spot into present time over there. Because that's the *one* spot that you would find hung up on the time track.

Now, do you remember in Dianetics, old shame-blame-regret? Hm? Well, all of that phenomena is associated with good and evil. Now, when a person is really degenerated, he has decided that he is evil. He's pretty badly degenerated. And when he goes downhill from that, he quite commonly decides that he is good, and he will be good.

So, we have a sort of a sandwich, one of these multiple-decker sandwiches, of which the bottom strata would be just *nahhh*. And immediately above that strata, we would have a good slab – he's deciding and acting good, now – and above that strata there is an evil one where he is really... you know, he's decided, well, it's too evil for him to do anything about. He's evil, and so evil ... It's all bad over there. It's all ...

What I am telling you, by the way, connects intimately with 16-G of the *Journal of Scientology*. Remember that essay in there on the subject of "It's bad over that way. It is all bad over there," and so forth? Well of course that is just a declaration of evil or harm. *Bad* means it can harm you, or you can harm it.

All right. So we have this second sandwich up from the bottom, the layer would be evil, you know. And immediately above that, why, he is good, you know. Sort of beautifully sad, a mucky sort of a thing. You know, the "Dear Souls" area, way back on the track. He's good. You know?

And above that, he is covertly evil. Now you're recognizably on the Chart of Human Evaluations, aren't you? Covertly evil – covert hostility, 1.1.

And right above that you quite commonly find one of the more evil people, 1.5, being so confoundedly mean and evil because they're trying to make everybody good. You know, that's just a complete mixture, you know. They're doing all these evil things because the end justifies the means, because in the end everybody and everything will become good.

Hitler ran on this computation exclusively. And all his acts were good and necessary,



and that was why he had to burn all these Jews in lime kilns, you know? And that was why the *Schutzstaffel*, and so forth, had to exist, and ... You know, I mean, it just runs out in this idiotic, insane patter of "We've got to do all these evil things so as to make everything good." You know?

Everybody was very confounded about this thing and they kept writing essays and wondering whether or not this might not be true. And everybody could get confused. And at 1.5 we have an utter, tumbling confusion of good and evil.

And that's what's the matter with 1.5. You know, he "*Grrr-grru*, it's good, it's evil. *Ur-grr*, it's all *grrr-mmm!* But I'll have to be angry about it unless it's good." You know?

Now, here's the catch at 1.5: The second that it becomes good, he will work like mad to make it evil. Whatever it is: what is good, he makes evil; what is evil, he makes good. He tells somebody he has got to work. The second the person starts to work, he stops him from working. The second a person has stopped working, he tells him he has got to work. But the second the person starts working, he tells him he has got to stop.

If you move, you're wrong. If you move, you're wrong. If you're motionless, you're wrong, see? – good and evil. He just really will evaluate anything as good or anything as evil to permit him to give off this amount of emotional discharge.

We go upscale from there and we find out these things are lying still in sandwiches. We find out up around the level of boredom, if anybody did anything evil, it would be sort of insouciance, you know, and be considered the smart thing to do. But it's really not very evil. You know? And if they did anything good, they would negate against it. Here we have another hold-point, where good and evil are all mixed up.

Now we take enthusiasm. The only trouble with enthusiasm is that if you put somebody on an E-Meter and asked him how he feels about enthusiasm, you'll get a death tick. The death bop starts hitting an E-Meter.

Yeah, it's the death-facsimile bop, you know. It's a little hunt. It's a little nervous twitch of the needle back, bop-bop-bop-bop-bop-bop. And you just say "enthusiasm" to him, and he will immediately get this death bop.

He doesn't like other people to be very enthusiastic. This is quite uniform amongst preclears. This is very amazing. But the only trouble with enthusiasm is we have merged up there with a band where this individual claims it's good. See?

It would be good to do this. It would be good to destroy that. It would be good to do this. It'd be good to do that. Whatever he's doing, he's in there fighting. And generally, right at that band of 4.0 he will only fight for things which he himself considers good and, actually, will not go willfully over into evil actions.

It's enthusiasm. And this is just a terrible thing to most people – enthusiasm. Especially if they are below that scale.

We move on up the line from enthusiasm, and there is a band up there of the most insidious, overt, complete cruelty that you ever wanted to notice. It is vicious. There is a band of cruelty above that – evil. There would be harm and evil simply for the reason and purpose of harm and evil.

Here you have the great criminals of history – quite normally operated in that band. They seem to be tremendously high-toned people. Now, when I say "great criminals of history," I'm talking about people like Alexander the Great. This man was no less a criminal simply because he was Alexander the Great.

*The Twelve Against the Gods*, by Bolitho is an index and discussion of this personality. But it's above enthusiasm. These people were tremendously effective. They were way above tone of the human race. But what they did was very markedly harmful.

But they didn't seem to have any conscience about it at all.

Well, watching this, the human race will try to pull people out of that band down into the lower tones. And then they will really do evil things. It becomes much more evil as they become less alive, and it becomes quite insidious. There, you go downscale and get a scorpion, and so forth.

Well, anyway, above that band there is a band of overt goodness which would be too tough for most people to face. In fact, anybody coming along, lucklessly showing up the fact that he had a body, would be liable to be crucified if he appeared and represented that particular band. Because it would be a very, very interesting band. It would be a band of sufficient power that all he had to do was look at somebody, you know, and give him a perfect duplicate of his ills and put goodness in there as a mock-up, and the guy would buy it. You know, they'd pick up their beds and walk.

Well, people would be upset about that band, too, because that is starting to look like high electricity. It's starting to look like lightning bolts. They will associate it immediately with God. And the superstitious people have always associated lightning bolts with God.

All right. We go upscale just a little bit higher than that, and we find a gradual fading out of what you might consider harmful. You would not find a concept of harm or a concept of good as we move up out of that upper band that I've just been discussing, which, by the way, is probably around 8.0 or 10.0.

And above 8.0 or 10.0, you would just fade into no definite consideration about this thing. Because you would get up to a level of rationality which saw immediately that all things have their ingredients of good and all things have their ingredients of evil. And good and evil would not be a pressing problem at all – so that you would not get conduct evaluated against a conscience. Things would be done for no reason at all or for the reasons connected with games, because we've passed out of the band, then, of fixed evaluation, haven't we? And the second we've gone out of the band of fixed evaluation then you would get a freedom of action.

But that freedom of action, oddly enough, would be in the direction of constructiveness, keeping life going, keeping the ball rolling. Because somebody up along that line isn't worried about stopping it. He doesn't consider that it's any threat to him, and it's just a good game.

And this is a great puzzlement to early and primitive peoples – very, very great puzzle – how God would come along and make a wolf, and make a rabbit for the wolf to eat.

Now, anybody making a wolf and a rabbit as two different species (if we grant this as having stemmed from one God, or something of this sort), making two different species of this character which are counter-opposed – then this individual making both species certainly would be able to understand and tolerate the evil in the wolf, very definitely. And be able to tolerate, also, the goodness in the wolf, and see it. And tolerate both the good and evil in the rabbit, because rabbits are not 100 percent good. They're nuts, for one thing. You eat rabbits at certain times of the year in seasons and they'll kill you deader than a mackerel. They also carry certain diseases, and they overrun certain parts of the world, and they're awfully hard on plant life.

And if you were to line up a bunch of cabbages that could talk and ask them to vote as to whether or not rabbits were good or evil, they would tell you immediately that rabbits were evil. And the farmers that grow the cabbages would say the same things.

But here would be somebody who was able to tolerate these different values, and would see them so clearly that they would not particularly puzzle him or worry him.

The one thing he might get puzzled about, after a while, would be the fixation that

certain people had on certain actions as evil and certain actions as good. This fixation might titillate his curiosity. How did they get so fixated on this idea that this action is good? Because observably this good action has many evil facets.

Well, philosophers (whether upscale or downscale, we don't care) have uniformly gotten, one way or the other, into this puzzlement – a discussion of good and evil. But your preclear is definitely in that kind of a squirrel cage – good and evil. Your preclear is *definitely* there.

He believes he himself is fairly evil. But he knows he intends good. But some of the things he's done are evil, but was Mama really good or evil? Now, which one was Mama? Was Papa good or evil? Which one?

And these are big maybes, because he has to make a pronouncement and he's not free to do so. And so he's pinned on the track by such stuck considerations.

Well, here's good and evil, merely meaning – as far as we're concerned, as far as good is concerned – survival-assisting. That'd be good. Evil would be survival-desisting, or succumb, see. Does it have succumb potentials for others, or self? You know, well, that's evil, then. That is the degree of its evilness, when we evaluate this thing by survival – so that we would quite commonly have to evaluate it from a viewpoint.

You see, creation can be both good and evil. Destruction can be both good and evil. Wiping out bubonic plague – that is a destructive action – could be good for the people being threatened by the bubonic plague. It would be evil for bubonic plague.

And the second we move over into good and evil – now fan your ears on this one – the second we've moved over into the field of good and evil, we have moved over into the field of one-sided determinism: self-determinism as opposed to pan-determinism. For pan-determinism, the values of good and evil practically vanish. In self-determinism, good or evil are simply established by the self one is protecting.

Now, that should be easy to grip there. Creation of a type of grass that would sink all the farm fields of America eight-feet deep in indestructible thorns, and so forth – inedible grass – the creation of such a grass would be very, very evil to people dependent upon grass, to animals dependent upon grass, to people dependent upon fields, and so forth, in order to sustain themselves. This would be an evil action, wouldn't it? So there is a creative action which is evil.

So evil does not mean destroy, and good does not mean create. You see? Create means both good and evil, depending on viewpoint. Destroy means both good and evil, depending on viewpoint. And that viewpoint is modified as to whether it is contrasurvival, you see, or prosurvival, depending on the viewpoint.

If you move out of good and evil as consideration, you have, of course, moved out of the viewpoint which is a highly specialized viewpoint – so that a superspecialized viewpoint brings about the considerations of good and evil.

And when an individual is only able to occupy and protect the substance around one viewpoint, he then becomes beset by the riddle of good and evil. He's trying to protect the viewpoint. Therefore, anything which threatens it, of course, is evil; anything which helps it is good. And as long as he is protecting it, this is a very powerful consideration with him, and modifies and monitors all of his works and actions.

So therefore, from a man's viewpoint, we could rack up with great positiveness and certainty the evil factors which beset man, and the good factors which man would like to have – do this very easily.

But try and do it for man and ducks. Try to do it for man, ducks and bacteria. Now, let's draw up a list of evil things from the viewpoint – valid in each case – of man, ducks

and bacteria. You try to draw up a list, and you see that it becomes an incomprehensibility.

What is good for bacteria is not good for man, because you have counteropposed viewpoints. So people, when they try to move up into pan-determinism, get all mixed up in, primarily, pro- and contra-survival. And this is what we mean by good and evil: They get mixed up in the problems of pro- and contra-survival, and so they cannot assume these upper pan-determined lines.

And this is the line that stops a person from becoming an Operating Thetan. And this is all the line that stops him from becoming an Operating Thetan. This is also the line which stops a person from perceiving. This is the block, the consideration which primarily blocks perception, because individuals conceive things to be bad and try to unmock them, and unable to unmock them, they occlude them. You see, they just say they're not there, even though they know they're there. And they will perceive, with such avidity, things which they consider good, that they as-is them – you know, they wipe them out.

The buffalo was a good beast for America, and he sure got wiped out, didn't he? All right. Everybody thought he was far, far too delicious. And the more repeating rifles they got, why, the more buffalo they killed. They killed them for hides – bones, so forth, latterly – and finally wiped them all out.

It's almost as if they were running a program to exterminate buffaloes. But if you'd ask anybody who was hunting those buffalo about "were buffaloes good or evil?" – "Oh, buffalo is a good animal." See?

But he as-ised them, mechanically. Not just by consideration. They were as-ised. They were wiped out. They were quite acceptable, buffalo were. The only reason the Indian didn't wipe them out priorly is he didn't have enough weapons or arrows.

When you think of a herd of buffalo crossing the Missouri River so thoroughly and at such length, and so many buffalo getting drowned in the river – you know, a negligible percentage of the herd, but enough buffalo getting drowned in the Missouri River to impede the progress and navigation of steamboats – you get some idea of how many buffalo there were.

And the Indian used to drive them over cliffs. He'd have a thorn Y, you see, which would have at its apex, instead of a stop point, a cliff, and drive a herd of buffalo into these wings. And the herd would just simply condense down, down, down, avoiding the edges of the, you might say, corral, and simply go right on over the cliff and bang! And that was the earliest way that an Indian hunted buffalo.

The reason I'm talking about buffalo is not because this is the West; because there was an entire civilization based exclusively upon the bison.

Buffalo fat, buffalo bones, buffalo horns: all of these things – quite in addition to buffalo meat, the skin and so on – made up practically every implement. The buffalo made up almost every implement and practically all the diet of an entire race of people. All exclusive with this.

But that race of people would have as-ised the buffalo to the last buffalo, had they been able to manufacture enough arrows or enough corrals or enough cliffs. You see?

White man came along, he couldn't do anything about the buffalo until 1874, really. He didn't really make an enormous dent in the buffalo of the West. They were doing pretty well. But not until they got a Henry repeating rifle – and all you had to do was jack another shell in and fire, and jack another shell in and fire – could they wipe out the buffalo.

It's astonishing that the buffalo once ranged clear to the Atlantic Coast and were

common in Virginia – very common. And the early settlers were very thankful for the buffalo. So they wiped them all out. You see?

Now, here is a case of as-ising a goodness. A preclear can do this with his bank and is doing it with his bank, and that is primarily what's wrong with his bank. He's as-ised all the goodness in the bank and he's left all the evil. And now you as an auditor come along, and you will find this preclear telling you, "I have had nothing good ever happen to me in my life. I have never been well."

Well, every time he sat down to think – early, when he was a kid – he used to use facsimiles. He sort of ate them up, you know, and he'd think about that fine time he had with Johnny – slurp, *slurp* – and there went that facsimile, you see, and didn't mock up another one to replace it.

He gets to be an old man, you know, of twenty-one, just entering college, and things aren't looking quite as bright to him. He's being more cynical about life. And he has become very conservative by the time he's about twenty-eight, you see – become pretty darn conservative. And by the time he is forty, boy, is he conservative.

What has this got to do with it? Life is done, as far as he's concerned. All that has happened is he simply as-ised all the goodness out of his life. And this leaves nothing but the postulates and considerations and memories of harm, which are occluded. They're all occluded. See? Because he has got to push this harm away and under cover, and it's not edible as far as he's concerned.

A facsimile of an inedible devil is itself inedible. This is not true. This is an error. A facsimile is edible, no matter what it's of. But a facsimile of a devil is, of course, considered by him to be inedible, simply because the devil is inedible.

All right. Now we turn around and look at it the other way, and we'll see that we have really got a very fine problem on our hands here. The individual requires, at the same time, an enormous number of justifiers. So completely aside from as-ising all the goodness in his life he's adding up all kinds of justifiers to add to his bank – hallucinatory or otherwise – to justify all of his own unmotivated acts.

And remember, a thetan can't be guilty of anything but an unmotivated act. I mean, he can't have any other kind of an act than an unmotivated act, really and truthfully. He can add it up in the woof and warp of a society so that he actually does have motivators and overt acts, but it's kind of like isness. It's an apparenity but not an actuality.

Actually, a thetan, not being able to be harmed or even located until he located something and touched it, he then cannot be guilty of anything under the sun but an unmotivated act. He cannot be guilty of an overt act, because there was no first motivator.

Now, the motivator always has to precede the overt act. Let's get that: has to *precede* the overt act. A justifier always *succeeds* an overt act. It succeeds an unmotivated act. The sequence, plotted against time, is first there is the unmotivated act and then there's the justifier.

All right. Otherwise, in the band of the condition of isness – you know, an apparenity but not an actuality – there is a motivator followed by an overt act, you see: Johnny hit you in the nose so you hit Johnny in the nose.

Well now, life can live with that one. That's perfectly all right. Johnny hits you in the nose, you hit Johnny in the nose. Okay. You're right now. You're all right. You have simply remedied an evil.

Okay. How about this other condition? Well, the other condition goes wrong and won't go into line because it goes unmotivated act, justifier. An unmotivated act is followed by a justifier. And a justifier is a mocked-up motivator. But it's after the fact,

always.

So it won't line up with the bank, and time starts to run backwards. And that's what you get as regret – shame, blame and regret. That's why they run backwards, is the unmotivated act is followed by a justifier which the individual recognizes full well belonged *before* the unmotivated act. So he has just reversed his time sequence, hasn't he? Completely reversed it.

And you'll find out that an individual running a great deal of regret – you know, "I have done an overt act," you know, "I have done an unmotivated act" (that brings about regret) – will actually be able to run the facsimile backwards with great ease but will not be able to run it forwards. He's trying to get back there and get the justifier into line.

Well, you could simply run it backwards and wipe it out as an overt act, or you could have him postulate before it – since time is only a consideration – you could have him postulate before it, the justifier. And you could have him go on and mock up enough justifiers until he had knocked out the imbalanced condition of being guilty of nothing but unmotivated acts.

Well now, an individual cannot be (quote) "guilty" of an unmotivated act, and thus in need of a justifier, unless he has first bought the consideration that there can be harm. An overt act, a motivator, an unmotivated act and a justifier are, all of them, dependent upon the consideration that harm can be done.

Now, if you will demonstrate to me how you can actually, actively harm something which cannot be reached, such as the thetan, himself and intimately ... How you can harm him exceeds, actually, anybody's imagination, unless we have simply been riding forward on the consideration that evil and harm could occur.

Did you ever step lightly upon the toe of a little child, and brush him away immediately afterwards? You have not injured that child, but the amount of scream which meets your intention to harm is all out of proportion to the injury. And so it is with every thetan since the beginning of time.

The amount of howling which he does in the face of his enemy is very convincing but, itself, not properly motivated. "I'm killed, I'm killed, I'm dead, I'm dead."

Now, I have played a game with kids of howling and protesting madly every time they touched me. And they eventually built themselves up into such a belief of power, they got quite well. But there was a decaying element kicking around with it. That was "they could do harm."

I noticed a little kid the other day, that I'd played this game with a couple of times, didn't want to do something I was leading her toward. You know? And I had the lightest possible hold of this child's wrist – featherweight – and this child, "Ow, ow, ow, ow. Don't, don't!" You'd have thought I had a dull butcher knife in the child's spine and was one by one disconnecting the vertebrae on the amount of "yow" there was there.

All right. Early on the track a thetan learned how to howl loud. And he finally howled so loud that he convinced himself that he could be harmed, and made a second consideration besides the consideration of communication. Here's the consideration of communication: "I can communicate." The next communication consideration would be "I can be harmfully communicated with. I can communicate harmfully. I can communicate destructively." And we go down into the field of viewpoint and out of the field of pan-determinism, and we more and more specialize in specialized protective viewpoints, you see, until an individual spins right on in – all on this basis of harm.

R2-61 spots the spots where the person decided things were harmful or somebody else decided that harmful things could exist, see – especially, harmful communications. But

then a decision of harm is what you're looking for – a decision that harm could be done. You could have him spot spots where somebody, himself included, decided that harm could exist or harmful things had been done.

This is so high a level of consideration that it depends more upon the understanding of the auditor and his ability to communicate it to the preclear than it does upon the sharp meaning of a word. You follow me?

So we could put it down as a very, very set pattern. But because it's such a sloppy consideration, an auditor is going to have to go into two-way communication about it. He simply can't tell somebody command such-and-such – you know, you just *arr-owr* and expect the preclear to get this. Because the preclear won't start to talk about it right away. He'll have more conditions around this. "Now, what do you mean by really harmful? Harmful of what?"

So the auditor counters this simply by using the dynamics. "Let's spot a spot where you considered you harmed yourself." He can't find one. You say, "Well, spot a spot and maybe one will show up."

"Go on. Let's see if you can find a spot, anything like this, where you harmed yourself."

"Ho ... Yes!"

"All right. Where did that happen? Okay. Let's spot that spot. All right. And let's spot a spot in the room. Now let's spot the spot where you considered you harmed yourself. Spot the spot in the room." He'll finally blow it clear.

You'll find it was quite aberrative. Go up to the second dynamic – "where you harmed somebody sexually; somebody harmed you sexually" – and that one has enough charge on it to make a very, very interesting session all by itself.

Now, as you spot the spot, and spot a spot in the room, your preclear is going to have a dozen, dozen other spots show up. He's going to start to get spots all over the place. In that case, what spot do you have him spot next?

He just spotted this spot and now he tells you twelve more incidents. You have him spot the same spot he just spotted. This was the tenuous thread that was holding together an enormous package of reversed time. And that's why things free out of it: time reverses – shame, blame, regret. That's because the unmotivated act precedes the justifier, and he wants the justifier to precede the unmotivated act. Those are his considerations and the laws he's playing the game by.

So when you spot a spot where he decided something was harmful, you know, or he decided to harm himself or decided he *had* harmed himself, and then a spot in the room, you're always going to get some more data, that you have him spot that original spot again – until you've got his time straightened out. Because it is in present time, when it should be in the past. And that is what gets it into present time, is the fact of shame, blame and regret.

Now, after you've spotted this a few times, after you've worked with this a little bit and kind of flattened the comm lag on maybe one dynamic – you know, flattened the comm lag on one dynamic – it might be very well for you to run into and use R2-62. Because this is the same breed of cat, only we remedy havingness with justifiers.

We spot spots concerning harm to any one of the dynamics. But we want the decision about harm or the consideration about harm, not the action of harming, and we spot that. Well, that's Spotting Spots.

Now, the havingness remedy that goes along with it is to mock up sufficient justifiers earlier on the time track than the unmotivated act – and on all the dynamics – so that your

preclear eventually surfeits himself with justifiers. But a justifier placed before the unmotivated act makes the justifier into a motivator.

So although he mocks it up, although the truth of it to him is not apparent, we still tell him to mock it up before the unmotivated act. And the next thing you know, his time track will turn over. You'll get the same phenomena.

You do it the same way. You mock it up and pull it in, see, and mock it up and pull it in and mock it up and pull it in. She had an enormous amount of trouble with her fourth husband. See, her fourth husband was very mean to her. And this was quite aberrative to the preclear.

She's come into the session. She's telling you, "Well, if it just hadn't have been for William, you see, I would have been all right today. Because, you know, he was so mean to me. You know, he used to take me and hold my head in the toilet stool for two or three hours at a time. And he was very, very mean to me, and always..."

And you listen to this line for a while and ... If you were asleep all through this class you won't know this, and that is simply this: Their whole object in telling you all this is to mock up enough justifiers. And it tells you boy, do they need them. You got that?

If they're giving you this line, they must be justifier hungry. You could also call that motivator hungry, but you couldn't be motivator hungry unless you were justifier hungry, so it's really justifier hungry. They're just hungry for this stuff, and so they're trying to mock it up while they are sitting there on a two-way communication line.

Well, it doesn't remedy very well. It's much easier simply to let her have the justifiers, prior to the time.

"Let's mock up your fourth husband, William, cutting your head off when you were two, and pull it in. Now let's do that again. Pull it in."

"But I didn't know him when I was two."

"That's perfectly fine. Mock it up and pull it in." The chances are they won't protest, because it is exactly what they have been trying to do.

You mock it up when they were two, and pull it in to the time track. And the later time track will suddenly unfold and straighten out.

A grouped track is nothing but this action of trying to get a justifier prior. And the whole track will collapse.

A fellow by the name of Shakespeare said, "Methinks the lady protests too much." Well, that's certainly applicable to a preclear. But that in itself is a magnificent diagnosis for an auditor. This preclear is protesting. When they protest – believe me understand that they are protesting too much only where they are in desperate need of justifiers.

So, R2-62 is: You have them remedy the havingness with mock-ups pulled in, which are so obviously prior to the unmotivated act whatever the unmotivated act was that they're quite acceptable to the preclear. He could put anything on his past time track because all he has got there is not really past incidents they're not flesh and blood he's got facsimiles, and they're trying to unwind.

All right. You do this by the dynamic. Do this by the dynamic. Now, you could start out with the second dynamic with some preclears. If you had somebody who was a homosexual, for heaven's sakes start out with the second dynamic.

"All right. Mock up your mother raping you a hundred-thousand years ago."

"What mother?"

"Your present mother. Mock her up raping you a hundred-thousand years ago, and pull it in. Do it again. Do it again. Do it again. Do it again. Do it again. Do it again."

"Oh, well, she wasn't a bad old lady – I mean, in a lot of respects."



Anything you would care to do on a line which would get a justifier in there ahead of the unmotivated act would straighten out this homosexuality. That certainly is an indicated course, isn't it?

Actually, homosexuality is very easy to solve. Old 8-D, which is simply "Spot where such and so would be safe." And just take any item connected with sex, you see: "Spot where that would be safe. Spot where it'd be safe again. Spot where it'd be safe again."

Got a case report in here, by the way, from Washington, DC, that he has straightened out one of the worst ones he ever ran into, simply by running the second dynamic, parts of, with 8-D – spotting spots where these various things would be safe. This guy had turned completely normal and gotten in decent condition.

It's a longer process, however, than the one I'm telling you about right now. This is a much shorter process.

All right. Here we have a process which would take up, dynamic by dynamic, any possible justifier that you could dream up or the preclear could dream up. Now, it's better if you let the preclear dream them up. But just like we run 8-C-A, B, C, D – it's probably better for the auditor to make up his mind what to mock up, and have the preclear mock it up; whether it's reasonable or rational to the preclear or not, see. Just like in Part A, we find the spot and tell the preclear to touch it; so, we might give him, the first run over on this sort of thing, the incident necessary.

But let me tell you a key incident. Simply tell him to mock himself up sitting in another universe, minding his own business, and the MEST universe moves in on him and starts to crush him. Mock that up. Pull it in. Mock it up. Pull it in. Mock it up. Pull it in. Mock it up. Pull it in. It's an incident that never existed, and he has been looking for it for seventy-four trillion years.

That is the overt act against MEST, and I am talking to you, oddly enough, about the resolution of gravity. The overt-act-motivator / unmotivated-act-justifier phenomena itself is responsible for the agglutinousness of MEST. The overt acts against MEST are actually – by the thetan – of course, unmotivated acts.

And he has it happily considered that there is no such thing as an unmotivated act against MEST. You can walk over and kick as many walls as you like, and it will only hurt you, your mother told you. Only that's not true. Every one of them is an overt act if the individual has any idea that he could harm anything made out of MEST. And when every kid is a little kid, he gets punished for beating up his own toys, doesn't he? You know, he gets scolded and pushed around for his mishandling of MEST, his cluttering up of spaces. And he's given the idea eventually that he can harm MEST and harm spaces. And he is taught harm consistently and continually, and will stick in his head and will invert.

And the mechanism of inversion: It would be a series of unmotivated acts which eventually reverse time for the individual, so that when he wants something, he can't have it. This is the type of consideration that comes out of it. Everything will go backwards on him. It'll all be a 180-degree vector. When he tries to be successful, he fails – all this sort of thing. Why? Overt acts against the physical universe, overt acts against space.

Mock him up there – the MEST universe presents him with all this space, and he fills it all up and wrecks it; he ruins it. And it presents him with some more space, and he ruins it. And if you did that a few times, your preclear would practically spin in. Because what are you giving him? You're having him mock up unmotivated acts.

But have him mock up sitting there, comfortable, not troubled by it all, and suddenly the MEST universe puts a lot of space it there and stretches him out to eight times his size.

Got it mocked up? Pull it in. Do it again. Pull it in. Do it again. Pull it in.

And all of a sudden, seventy four trillion years of track will start to go scream, scream, scream, scream. Because that is the first thing that happened.

He made the space. He cut down his own knowingness by making the space. The odd part of it is, the bank gets satisfied on the justifier, merely because ... We'd have to understand, by the way, End-of-Cycle Processing to understand this thoroughly, because the individual has consistently and continually tried to sufficiently justify something to end the cycle. Until he can justify something utterly, he can't end the cycle.

I had an interesting real-life experience of ending a cycle with a justifier one day. An individual who had been in dealings with a partner of his, and who had been gypping the partner most gorgeously – you know, tapping the till and falsifying books, and so forth, and had finally driven the partner down into almost complete destruction – the individual who had been doing this, all of a sudden had a nervous breakdown. Bam! Went very, very badly to pieces.

Now, you say, "Well, of course, he did this many unmotivated acts to a guy, and he knew it was harmful. He'd been taught to be honest, you know. It was harmful to do this to his partner. Went on this way, and he went on this way for years. Sooner or later he'd crack up, inevitably."

But would anything in life itself ever set him to rights? Well, it would be an unusual circumstance which did. An auditor could set him to rights simply by having him mock up all kinds of overt acts, you see, by the partner against him prior to the partnership.

That's why people will tell you sometimes that you killed them 180 lives ago. They'll give you awful silly stories about this sort of thing – past-life phenomena mocked up. They're just justifiers, you see.

The past life is there, but their justifiers are so hard to come by that the memory is all reversed and scrambled and occluded.

All right. All right. This guy had an actual incident occur in real life which set his bank to rights. He found out that his partner had been shacked up with his wife since early college days, and that his first two children had been fathered by his partner! And the second he discovered this and confirmed it by blood test so that it was absolutely convincing, he himself became completely cheerful and well.

Now, the way man would think of this ordinarily, you'd think that would just add insult to injury – the fellow already nervous over his business, you know, and he'd just have this much more bad news, you know, and that would cave him in.

But it didn't. It made him perfectly well. Now, you understand how this sort of thing would work out? But it'd be a very, very unusual sort of an existence which would actually right with an end-of-cycle, this sort of thing.

End-of-cycle for the unmotivated-act-justifier action would be for the justifier, by mock-up or actually, to suddenly jump in before the unmotivated act – and as a result, of course, straighten out the unmotivated act by giving it a motivation prior to the fact.

You can do anything with mock-ups, and you can do anything with a bank. It should tell you that if a bank and regret can reverse, if a bank can get grouped or run backwards, that you could do anything with a bank – it ran backwards, didn't it? Any way you want to mock up a bank, it will resolve. Now, do you have to have the same duplicated action? No. *Anything will* satisfy this sort of thing.

Now, the guilt that Mr. Freud talks about ... You knew, of course, that Freud was forbidden to be a doctor. The medical profession was very mad at Freud all during the years of his life, practically. He was an outcast from the field of medicine, although he

himself had been to medical school. He dared invent something. Freud had a tremendous fixation on guilt.

Well, he was living in a Victorian sort of an age, and boy, the amount of harm which could be done by jilting a girl at the altar, you see, was the stuff really sung about in the textbooks and the romances. And there was always somebody around who had been ruined, in fiction or in life – and people lived these things in their lives had been ruined by some betrayal of some sort or another. Nobility was the high note, and nobility righted wrongs, and people could be so harmed so easily you could harm people mentally or emotionally with great ease in that period that he became quite fixated on this whole idea of guilt. And he keeps talking about guilt, guilt, guilt, guilt, guilt.

Fantastic, the amount of discussion he gives guilt, and the tremendous emphasis he places on the remedy of guilt.

All he wanted to do was expose the guilt to light, and I guess the sun or something would make it evaporate. But the truth of the matter is, guilt is nothing but the unmotivated-act-justifier sequence, you see. And guilt is resolved simply by mocking up the justifier often enough to remedy the havingness of the facsimile which is held in.

Mocking it up and pulling it in, and the unmotivated acts themselves will demonstrate themselves to view, and the individual will start to let go of the overt acts which have been done to him. See, things done to him will start to let go. And he'll stop talking about being victimized by life. And he'll stop discussing how horrible Papa and Mama and everybody else was to him.

He stops being justifier hungry. In other words, he stops being guilty.

Spotting spots in space, of times he's been guilty, would be the same thing as spotting spots in space when he decided something was harmful.

You could solve all of Freud with R2-61, which is simply "Spot all the spots in space where you've been guilty." It would be an interestingly simple process.

However you express it, you're simply talking about the concept that something can be harmed when you are doing R2-61.

Okay. We got these two? Fine.

# SECOND LECTURE ON TWO-WAY COMMUNICATION

*A lecture given on  
22 October 1954*

Two-way communication: This is the most basic process that we have. And this process of course underlies all auditing of whatever kind. For instance, it is a two-way communication difficulty when you, an awareness of awareness unit, direct your body to lift its leg and it doesn't. That's an immediate breakdown of a two-way communication.

Well, what about the leg telling you that it can't be lifted? Well, it not only doesn't lift, but it doesn't tell you why it can't be lifted. Doesn't give you a communication back at all. That would give you a one-way communication, wouldn't it?

Immediately you'd have a difficulty. First there would be this difficulty in communication – not two-way communication – of now your leg not moving when you told it to move, and the other difficulty of your leg not saying why it can't move.

These difficulties would be immediate and manifest, and would lead people to believe, who have been giving their body orders for a long, long time, that a body cannot talk and does not have ideas. A body does talk and does have ideas, if they are only circuitry ideas, if the speech is only circuitry speech.

So anxious is the individual to have two-way communication, that he will mock up somebody to talk with him. You'll see a child do this. A child will go out and mock up strange playmates. Thirty years later we discover this individual having trouble with a demon. If we're not auditors, we don't connect the two experiences. If we're auditors, we know what happened: he set up a circuit and then it closed terminals with him.

Now, in view of the fact that the thetan can create another thetan and give it life, don't be too surprised if, on a much lower scale than this, he can simply set up some sort of a machine that will talk back at him, that apparently has a separate life and intelligence. I refer you to circuitry, demon circuitry, in *Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health*. There's quite a discussion of demons there.

So here is your preclear, as an awareness of awareness unit, having a difficulty in communicating with the body – one of his primary difficulties, he quite often communicates with a body verbally; he tells it what to do, and so forth – and having difficulty trying to get answers back from the body, and so forth. This is a very involved situation, and it is about as low as you can get. You will find it in all preclears of whatever kind. In all preclears this will be discovered. But it is uniformly discovered in the very psychotic.

The very psychotic are in such a two-way communication with demons and devils and things that go boomp in the night that they have no time to talk to you as a human being, another human being. Now, their proper target in conversation and communication is, of course, another living being. This is their proper target. And they no longer use this as a

proper target.

Does this mean that they are no longer trying to communicate? No, it does not. It means simply that they are in communication with things usually of their own creation, and a suborder creation, such as a machine or ally and their body and they are in a conversation. No matter how one-sided or two-way or otherwise, you have a complete communication setup, totally alive, on a very, very condensed basis.

Everything to which the psychotic is communicating is so close in that you yourself cannot observe it. We validated this to some extent in *Dianetics. The Modern Science of Mental Health* with flash answers. We had something that we called – and it always operates in a preclear but is just a circuit – we had something called the "file clerk." You remember the file clerk? Well, that is a circuit. Everybody has this circuit.

But it is a low order of circuit. A person who is getting into good condition, or even vaguely coming up toward optimum or Clear, is going to pass this point of a file clerk. He's no longer going to ask himself questions and get answers. The confusion is that he believes these things are himself simply because he created them. Let's not confuse the awareness of awareness unit with the products of the awareness of awareness unit.

Now, every time a thetan goes into communication with a product, he is asking for a slight difficulty, because this product is not going to be able to perfectly duplicate the thetan, or it would be nothing. Now, a thetan can of course simply mock up another thetan. All right, fine. There's another chess player there. Somebody to play games with. That's all right. And this would be all right unless he gave it form or he himself had form. You see, here would be a difficulty. The thetan, believing that he is a form – a body – is trying to communicate with a nothingness which he has mocked up. And this would be a very difficult thing for him to do, because it would have to follow that the communication formula in any communication has to be obeyed.

Now, what is this terrifically important thing, this communication formula? It is cause, distance, effect, with duplication at effect of what emanated from cause. Cause, distance, effect, with a duplication at effect of what emanated from cause. And with the intention of getting some attention. Duplication must occur.

So a thetan talking to something is always going to get into difficulty of one kind or another since a thetan is nothing. And *something* talking to nothing is always going to get into difficulty.

But what's going to happen? A duplication is going to be attempted of one kind or another. Now, let's say the somethingness is cause. It's cause as far as intention is concerned, and it is trying to talk to a nothingness. Well, in order to talk to this nothingness adequately, it will believe that it itself had better mock itself up as something that can be duplicated – a nothingness.

So here you have a person being a body, talking to God, or talking to a demon or a spirit which he conceives to have a nothingness of form, while he himself has form. He would have to then – he would feel to get into an adequate communication to God or a spirit or something of the sort – be, himself (a somethingness), nothing. This body in trying to talk to God would have to mock itself up some way so that it could be better received by a nothingness, which means it would have to degrade itself toward nothingness.

It's quite one thing, you see, to be an awareness of awareness unit, exteriorized-quite one thing. It'd be quite something else to believe that you were utterly a somethingness, a body, and try to communicate with a nothingness. If you did that you would cave in. You

would have to go around and tell everybody what a sinner you were. You would have to rush around madly and convince everybody how degraded you were. And you would have to dress poorly and have no money and crawl in the gutters of life. That's the way they do it. They start communicating with a nothingness out there and instead of becoming ennobled, these people who believe that they themselves are a somethingness become degraded.

Similarly, an auditor who is dead in his head, trying to communicate and drill an exteriorized preclear, is up against the identical communication difficulty, and will himself try to degrade, one way or another, his physical beingness – make nothing out of anything he has – in order to continue this communication.

An auditor not exteriorized, then, is to some slight degree asking for it in processing somebody who is exteriorized. And he will counteract eventually, and he will react badly against this, and he will say, "Look, I am really just processing that body that's sitting in the chair across from me. It's too painful to reduce myself to the nothingness necessary to get a perfect communication through to this so-called exteriorized person. So of course he can't be exteriorized; he isn't really there. In fact, I can prove it to him with very little difficulty that he really is not exteriorized. And if I invalidate him hard enough and fast enough, then I will be in the optimum position, as far as I'm concerned, of processing a body."

And auditors quite commonly process people to their exact case level.

This is simply a problem in duplication and a two-way communication. He's trying to make it easier.

Therefore, an auditor very often will process out of the preclear what should have been processed out of the auditor. And a demonstration on a couple of E-Meters will show you rather clearly that wherever you have had a co-auditing team failure, it was where the auditor was running what should have been run out of him, out of the preclear. We'll put the auditor on one E-Meter, and the preclear on another E-Meter, and then just go over the things run by this auditor formerly upon this preclear; and do you know that you'll get a big jar on the needle out of each one of these items, on the auditor's E-Meter, but none out of the preclear's E-Meter.

It isn't that you have done a transfer there, it is simply the individual knows what is wrong with the world because this is what is wrong with him. This is quite common. It is so common that the manifestation has defeated uniformly all former endeavors to solve the problem of life.

You have Nietzsche with his terrific fixation on superman and all that sort of thing. Nietzsche was trying to philosophize to the rest of the world everything that was wrong with Nietzsche. And it didn't happen to fit the rest of the world.

And we have old "Skip-Skop-Skopenhauer" with a tremendous command of how we must all lie down and die. Well, Schopenhauer merely wanted to lie down and die. And he said this is the way you went about it: You just defeat all life; the way to defeat all life is simply to die yourself. Don't procreate.

This is clearly represented, not as an isolated idea, but as the central motif of his philosophy and is represented in his publication *The Will and Idea*.

Now, here is a case of somebody who was quite aberrated and unable to get a clear view of things, trying to tell the rest of the world what is wrong with it, when we find that is what is wrong with him. So we very often find Papa raising the devil with his son because his son cannot save money, because he's indigent, because he can't keep a job.

Who is "can't save money, indigent and can't keep a job"? Papa! That's the one. Two-

way communication problem, isn't it? Papa's trying to mock himself up while he's being cause so that he will be received as an effect.

So we very often find people running around, oh, having an enormously impressive time, convincing people how immoral they are. Don't look! Don't look very close at that person. Don't pick up a slight layer on top of that person's secrecy screen and look in. I can demonstrate to you on every vice squad more vice than there is in the rest of any city – every time.

Beware of your reformer who says the rest of the world is evil and he's trying to reform it. The person he's tried to reform basically was himself, and having tried to reform himself, failed, and thus had to reform others.

All right. In view of the fact that to a very marked degree we started out on Dianetics and Scientology on a synthetic, totally synthetic study ... Here was nuclear physics on one side and mysticism on the other side, and they were both very interesting subjects. Both of these subjects were interested in seeing how far we have to look in order to find a solution to this situation.

Nowhere up the line, actually, is everything being condemned as being bad. As a matter of fact, there is a premise in *Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health*, very early in it: "Man's basically good," it says. Yes, he is; he's basically good. But he has certainly been convinced long enough and often enough that he's bad, and other people have tried to convince him long enough and often enough that he's gotten into a terrific smear-in on the subject. Bad, bad, bad; it's bad over there; it's bad over somewhere else.

Until you can get an individual to make the postulate that something is harmful, nothing can happen to him. Remember this: Nothing can happen to an individual until you can get him to make the postulate that something is harmful.

Auditing never is and never will be anything else but a game. As a method of getting along in the world, it's optimum. It is something that is interpreted as a tremendously, *tremendously* serious activity. It can be a sincere activity without being a tremendously serious activity, can't it?

Men want to be processed and get upscale to being something better, right? Okay. Let's put them up there. Do they have to be up there? No. Therefore, it becomes an amusing game. And only if tackled in that bracket, just as the research itself was done, can an auditor be totally free, even though auditing.

Two-way communication difficulty would not enter in if he understood what communication he was trying to put through to the preclear. If he understood this, he would then not have to mock up horrible things one way or the other to try to communicate back and forth with the preclear.

I want to make myself very clear on this. Auditing is not a serious down-to-the-grave effort to reform the world because it is bad and evil. That is not the goal of auditing. It's a game, and a very interesting game – very, very more interesting – particularly since the end product of the game is to make far more able players.

And as a person comes up Tone Scale, he finds himself confronted by an insufficient quantity of able players. This is a fabulous thing. It is one of the roughest problems that any coach ever had in trying to teach and play football: not enough good players. And if he has an excellent team, he runs into the next problem: not enough excellent teams to play.

There was some football team a few years ago down in Texas or some other foreign country, and this football team was so good that nobody would play this football team. It just dropped out of all leagues everywhere. Nobody would match a game with it. I think

they won consistently and continually every game played for a long time.

Better known is a basketball team that consisted of some boys who were about six foot eight or something, and they had to recruit another team similar to themselves and simply go around the country playing exhibitions.

Why? Because nobody would engage in a game with them. They always won.

Fantastic scores: 180 to nothing, and so forth, just continually. Nobody even cared to look at these games. I mean, nobody could possibly even make a showing in the face of such expertness.

Well, their main problem was the fact that they couldn't have a game.

And they couldn't have a game because there were insufficiently able players.

And if you've got everybody sitting around in beautiful sadness believing utterly and completely that life is an unhappy and dolorous affair and that it's all bad over there every place, just try and get him interested in a game of marbles. He'll play a game of corpses with you. He'll play many other kinds of games with you, such as "Let's all sit down and weep." That's a game too, you know: "Let's all sit here and cry." That's a Russian game.

"Let's all go down in the basement and be morbid so we can be happy."

But it's hardly the kind of game that anybody wants to play as he comes upscale and gets into action. As soon as you're able to move around rather freely through this universe, you will start to look around rather in vain for players. But there is this hope for you.

So auditing does have this serious side of it: There is this hope that you will process a bunch of people here and now – and maybe on another planet or two – and you'll process some of these people, and they'll come way up Tone Scale and they will do fine; they'll have a good understanding of life.

And then while you're doing this you will maybe forget who you've processed, or they will exteriorize and get a different body or something of the sort. And one day you will run into a very able player that will really put you on your mettle. And you'll say, "My goodness, where could this fellow possibly have come from? I didn't have anything to do with this. Why, look at this game he's playing here!" Get the idea?

Along that strata, there is a slight seriousness: lack of a game. But if we had broadly an intention, all across the boards, of simply reforming every human being because he's so evil and bad, I wouldn't be here talking to you. That's a game that you and I played out a long time ago. And that game's really dead.

That's the Christian era – early Christian era. We, I'm sure, convinced the entire Roman Empire it was so evil it finally caved in and after that wouldn't even build a gold palace. It'd build them out of mud or something.

The point I'm making here is that a game comes down toward the end of game, and along about that time, somebody's got to come along and pick it up again. Well, a game is essentially a problem in two-way communications.

All right. There you are, you see, and you're doing all right in life, really; you're walking around. And you talk to Joe the banker, and Joe the banker is saying – 1.5, 1.5, 1.5, 1.5, 1.5.

Well now, there are two ways in which you could communicate to Joe the banker: Either with total knowingness – see, you'd just know what a 1.5 is and what he'll listen to, and in total knowingness you 1.5 at him. Oh, and boy, are you in communication! Or you obsessively are influenced by his communication and you turn 1.5ish simply because you're talking to a 1.5. In other words, you could do it knowingly or unknowingly. You start doing it unknowingly, and you're in trouble. That's restimulation.

Doing something unknowingly is restimulation. What is restimulation? Doing



something unwittingly, unknowingly and without any understanding of what you're doing. That's a restimulation – no matter whether it's because of engrams or anything else. It might be just because of the communication itself.

Somebody 1.5's at you, and you don't have any engram bank on the subject of 1.5, and you all of a sudden 1.5 back to him, see? You just unknowingly, unwittingly do this because of the pressure of that. But you look at him and understand what he's doing, you understand clear across the boards what this man's reactions will be – that itself becomes an amusing game.

Anybody who knows can make putty out of anybody who doesn't know. And that in itself is one of the games. You fix it up so nobody knows, except you, see. And then everybody's real stupid and then you make putty out of all of them. And that game will continue for some little while, till all of a sudden you come to your senses and realize there aren't any players involved. You might as well have done a bunch of mock-ups of your own and pushed them around in the first place. See what a silly game that would be? It's a game that ends itself.

Maybe such a game was played around earth here. Maybe such a game was played here. And if such a game were played, then one would start looking in vain for any able leader throughout the society. This could happen you know. But it'd be a problem in two-way communication again.

A game is essentially a problem in two-way communication whether it's two football teams passing a ball one to the other, and lining up in formations and butting each other down, or whether or not it's the pitcher and the catcher and the batter. No matter what these are, these are two-way communications, except some communications are more solid than others. That'd be a nice wisecrack for you to remember if you're ever hit by a bullet: "Some communications are more solid than others."

There is no real, essential difference. The person who fired the bullet, unwittingly, as he raised his gun – to communicate to you perfectly – would have found you standing there with your gun raised to fire at him, see. That would have been a close duplication. And as such, soldiers don't feel very bad about shooting at soldiers.

But you take an army and have it start beating up on the civil populace and you find out you have a very unwilling sort of an army. They have to become something else. They have to become police or something. And they very often do not take it at all, because there's no duplication involved. So the next thing you know, the army obviously in trying to control a civil populace, has the right answer: it throws the entire civil populace into a militarism. The way to do this is declare war on some other country. And then the police force, being army, has army it can go into contact with within and without the country.

You will find people uniformly trying to solve all their difficulties, one way or the other, by attempting either a duplication of themselves or trying to duplicate that with which they're going into communication. No greater simplicity can be uttered on the subject, and that simplicity is a very true simplicity.

They're trying to solve any communication problem they have, either by getting whatever they're communicating to, to duplicate them, or by mocking themselves up to duplicate whatever they're communicating to.

You see, a cause-point, well knowing what it was communicating toward, could mock itself up as something like the effect-point. Thetans are very good at this.

For instance, if you ever were to influence the Vatican, it would be very wrong to go in there in the shape of the devil. You would have to go in in some other form, you see? And a good mock-up would be to go in as the Virgin Mary – preferably one of the Virgin

Marys they have painted around the place.

Now, there's an essential difficulty in this because you have an intention and a consideration always messing up the duplication. And that's the only additive thing that you could put on it.

Any thetan is liable to mess things up in a communication line by adding a few new considerations to the line. Such is a thetan, an awareness of awareness unit's avidity for a fight on low scales, that if you were to show up mocked up as the pope, you would discover yourself with a fight. The existing pope would fight you if you were to mock yourself up almost exactly as him.

Why would he do this? Well, that's the lower ranges of the scale, and he has found the exact opponent.

People on the lower ranges do not assume brotherhood because of a complete duplication. They assume that they have another player. The basis of the thing is a game, not a brotherhood. And people just go all out for a knockdown, drag-out, yank-'em-down-to-the-goal-post sort of game the second that they get somebody who is an exact duplication. Now, I didn't say a *perfect* duplication – an exact duplication.

Two-way communication, then, is a curious thing. Something that you could well investigate. It's a fantastic sort of a thing – trying to get something on the order of a duplication at effect. And the whole problem of the thetan is to get a duplication at effect of whatever he's putting into the line at cause. And that's his problems, and that categorizes the basic problem that he faces.

All right, two-way communication is all well and good, as theory, and we could talk about it for a long time and say many extravagant things concerning it, but it does come down to these basic laws – the formula of communication: *Cause, distance, effect, with an intention to have attention*, which of course enters in our figures of interest. You know? Interested is at cause; interesting is at effect. A lot of other descriptive conditions can be, but the basic formula is *cause, distance, effect, with a duplication at effect of that which emanated from cause*.

Now, in order to effect a duplication at effect, cause will very often mock itself up to be close to what it wants duplicated at effect, having recognized that effect is limited in its ability to assume new forms. So you talk to a 1.5 banker, you could mock yourself up as a 1.5 – better a 1.6 – and you would discover that you were in communication with this individual because you had already assumed the principle and primary ingredient in the communication line which he could echo to. But in view of the fact that he cannot freely change his position on the Tone Scale, it is up to you, knowingly, to of course shift yours if you want a communication. This is an interesting thing. Salesmen do this all the time without all this technical verbiage. Only, if they really knew what they were doing, they'd stop messing themselves up.

After a fellow has sold for a long time with a very unclear idea of what he's doing, he starts to go downhill. He's just mocked himself up as too many different people, you see, and he didn't really know he was trying to. He was just sincerely trying to sell and trying to be understood and it's all kind of foggy. And he winds up one day as nobody being everybody, or something.

Well, we look over two-way communication and we discover that if this is underlying all auditing, we discover that it is the most basic process there is. Well, how many types of communication could there be? Well, I remember I told you some communications are more solid than others. Therefore, you could have manual, tactile, olfactory, thermal communications. You could have verbal communications or communications of form –

all kinds of communications.

Now remember, the *total* definition of communication is *cause, distance, effect, with a duplication at effect of what was at cause*. We didn't describe the particle or the message or the going-down-the-line, did we? Hm? Well, *that is* what is variable. And it has enormous variation, because it varies to the degree that there can be an intention. You could have all kinds of intentions for this duplication to take place. And there could be as many intentions as there could be postulates – which is a great many.

So there could be all kinds of messages, but how are these messages proceeding? They are proceeding from cause, distance, effect with a duplication at effect of what emanated from cause. That's the basic picture of the message and the basic intention of the message, is to create an effect.

All right. We look over some preclear; we find out one of the most salient things about him, the most obvious thing about him – whatever preclear it is; any preclear – will be his communication lag. Why "lag"?

Well, he has as much lag proportional to the amount of vias and relays he has on his communication line. That is his amount of lag. That's the *exact* amount of lag.

And therefore, a person will require time to digest, understand and return a communication. The amount of time required is his communication lag. A communication lag is the amount of time necessary or intervening between a question and the exact answer to the question.

Now, that's a one-way shot, isn't it? But it has to go into two-way form of some degree, because he's going to use words. And he's going to say back the answer. Well now, does it matter what intervenes and fills that time? Remember, it's the question; the exact answer to that question is the back-turn, see? – the question and the exact *answer* to it. You follow me? This is all that's important.

Now, therefore, a great deal of outflow, agitation, diversion, crossquestioning, muddlement, stupidity, ignorance or even silence could be the intervening factor. But as you process people you will find their communication lag changes. If the process is effective it will discover a long communication lag, and then discover the communication lag flattening and then the communication lag becoming almost zero. And you've taken just that many vias and relays out of this person's communication line.

Here you have a person who is supposed to be, and really should be outside of a body to communicate or to communicate well with the body. And to be outside the body would be thetan (a nothingness, you see), distance to the body, effect (the body, see) – cause, distance, effect.

Now, the thetan can mock himself up as, or simply assume *that*, he is being the body every time he orders it to do something. And he can effect a perfectly reliable, completely booby-trap-proof communication system. He'll say, "When I order this thing around, I'm a body." That doesn't mean he has to be *in* the body, you see? He just assumes he has the same form of the body and the body'll obey. But he has to do this knowingly, he can't do this *unknowingly*, the way he's doing it.

All right. We're trying to string a straight line. That's why we call Straightwire, Straightwire. We're trying to string a straight line from the thetan, a viewpoint of dimension, to a destination. And we're trying to string this as one line.

Now, the trouble with a person who can't exteriorize is he is not at cause-point. You see, he's at a number of relay points, and he's buttered around, and when he puts an order into the body it goes through here and there and over to there, then transfers at this point and then switches back at that point. And a person gets to a point where he no longer

conceives himself capable of being cause, because he never seems to be able to get at the cause-point of a communication line.

So he thinks he's taking orders from the right and orders from the left and orders from behind and orders from before.

So having mocked up a great many of these demon circuits, he himself will take orders from these demon circuits or even let these demon circuits handle and run the body. He's no longer at cause. He doesn't know who is doing this. And one thing a preclear who's having a tough time will tell you is they don't know who's doing this. The way to test this is run Opening Procedure 8-C and introduce this interesting little line: "Who's doing that?" you ask him every once in a while. The real bad-off ones will say, "Well, my finger did it." And somebody else will say, "My arm did it." And somebody else will say, "My body did it." And when they really come out of the mire they will simply say to you with complete certainty and recognition, "I did it." See, other things did it.

All right. I've even had preclears look at me and say: "Well, you did it." They touched the wall and you say: "Who touched the wall?" and they say, "You did." This guy, you know, he includes the whole environment into his circuitry.

All right. When we're dealing with a two-way communication system, we should be aware of the fact that it has liabilities when nothingness tries to communicate with somethingness, or when somethingness tries to communicate with nothingness, see. These are liabilities on that line. Nothingness most easily communicates with nothingness, naturally, because of the duplication factor. Somethingness most easily communicates with somethingness. So again, we have the same communication factor. Duplication is native in the somethingness or the nothingness of the situation. Right?

Okay. No matter how many times our preclear has communicated or with what he's communicated or how he's communicated, his difficulty totally sums up into this something-and nothing difficulty with communication. It isn't a progressive difficulty; it's just something he has to know.

And knowing this, why, he is then capable of carrying it forward, This is something he has to know. He has to know that he has to assume that he is an ant in order to communicate with ants. But he also has to know that he's assuming that he is. In that way you can make a perfect communication to an ant.

I've made ants jump two, three inches straight off the ground, and also blown them apart, by assuming I was an ant blowing up or I was an ant jumping off the ground, or something like this, you see – without being an ant, and having no mass or form. I simply assumed mass and form, which assumption was perfectly adequate to control an ant.

Now, if you as an individual were to assume that you're a body, willfully and knowingly, assume you were a body – you would then be able to communicate much better to a body. Particularly, if you knew you weren't a body.

It isn't as involved as it sounds. You just knowingly assume. You know you're not, so you assume momentarily that you are a body, and then you communicate with it, and of course you can do wonders. The person who can't exteriorize is somebody who is obsessively assuming that he is a body, not knowingly assuming it. See, he's obsessively assuming that he is a body. And having assumed obsessively that he is a body, naturally, how can he possibly get out of it if he is *it*?

And this is the proposition which you offer somebody who doesn't exteriorize easily. How can he get out if he's it? "Get out of it? What is to get out of it? You mean my body gets out of the body? You know two things can't occupy the same space," and a lot of

other chitter-chat.

Well, let's go further on this two-way communication. Is there a specific process just involved in two-way communication? Well, if two-way communication underlies all other processes, would there be a process right there with two-way communication and no more? Yes, there'd be a technical, mechanical process. It would simply be: exercise out of existence the communication lag between you and the other person in your common conversation. That would be it. You just knock flat the communication lag by insisting on an answer to what you said.

Now, on an elementary form of this would be you say *Gotterdammerung* and the preclear says *Gotterdammerung*. And you say *Gotterdammerung* and the preclear says *Gotterdammerung*. A relatively senseless word; not likely to restimulate anybody but Wagner – who committed the overt act. And so we would get this bouncing back and forth; you'd have the fellow in communication, wouldn't you?

Now, on a little bit higher level, you could say, "What's your name?" And the person would say, "My name is Jones." That's fine.

You'd say, "Well, how old are you?" And he'd say ... Don't ask a lady this. If they're over six, why, they're sensitive about their ages. You say, "How old are you?" "Where do you live?" And they answer these questions, and you go back to the first part and say, "What's your name?" They say, "Name's Jones."

"How old are you?"

And they say, "Eighteen."

And you say, "Well, where do you live?"

And they say, "664 Hellcat Avenue."

And they'll look a little puzzled about that a moment and you say, "Well, what's your name?"

And they say, "Jones. Jones! *Jones is my name.*"

And you say, "Well, how old are you?"

And the fellow will say, "Well, I'm *eighteen.*"

And, "Well, where do you live?" Is he really duplicating?

Now, *YOU* see, that is a slight twist on the communication line, you see. To answer the question is a slight twist. You got that? That's not a perfect duplication, is it? But yet, that's communication lag.

Now, somebody who is sane – this should represent something to you terrifically – somebody who is sane, who is all right, can very easily do this, see. He can carry on a conversation and be just as happy as a clam for hours at a time, and he's never saying the same thing, he's never really duplicating what you're saying at all. You can go on and carry on this conversation with all sorts of complexities.

So it isn't *just* duplication; it's the ability to be able to duplicate and do something else. But that's way, way, way higher than most people can go. They've got circuits set up. When you say, "What's your name?" They say, "Jones." You say, "What is your full and complete name, including your middle name?" And they say, "Oh ... uhm ... Do you have to have that?"

You think they're sensitive about their full and complete name. This isn't true at all. You've just stopped talking to a circuit at that moment and you asked the guy, and it – nobody asks him what his full and complete name, including his middle name, is. See, he's either Lawrence O. Jones ... But to tell somebody he's Lawrence Oswald Jones is something else.

Once in a while somebody who's been in the service will say, "Jones, Lawrence

Oswald." He's happy to do this because he's done this before and he's got a machine set up to keep him from doing this duplication.

And that is really the total purpose of a machine: to keep somebody from doing duplication. That is the total purpose of a circuit: to keep somebody from duplicating. This is the total purpose of a body: to keep a thetan from duplicating. This is the total purpose of a wall: to keep somebody from duplicating. And this is space. The total purpose of space is antipathetic. It's to make it possible for somebody to duplicate. Space makes it possible for this type of duplication to take place.

All right. So a person has as little space as he has machines. Go further: He has as little space as he has possessions. Space makes duplication possible, you see. Machines are there so he won't have to duplicate. See, he sets them up so the machines will duplicate, and they'll do things, you know, and he doesn't have to. This therefore doesn't engage his attention, and does other things. It's a way to keep it from getting attention. Well, all right. We'd say on a very low level then that simple, simple, very elementary, simple duplication would be an indicated process, wouldn't it? Now, it could go both ways and still be therapeutic.

Now, I've run this on a monkey. I won't tell you about the monkey I ran it on. But a fellow who filmed the Dennis Roosevelt expedition in Africa told me this very, very amusing story. Because every morning a baboon would come up to the edge of the clearing where he had a hut there. And the baboon would squat down and raise one hand like this, you see, and then would go like this to wave his hand. And this photographer would be sitting there editing something or doing something with his equipment, and so forth. Every morning, you see, just before the photographer went out on safari this would happen. It kept on happening because the baboon obviously found it so terribly therapeutic to be able to motion at something that was vaguely similar to him, you see, and not have that thing run away or attack him. And so the baboon would make this motion. And the photographer would turn around and raise his hand the same way and go like this to wave to the baboon see.

And they developed an enormous friendship over this whole thing. Back and forth they were having this busy communication system. And one day the photographer was very impatient and very upset because he was having to go out much earlier than usual, so when the baboon showed up he simply waved his hand at him for the baboon to go away. And the baboon just got raging mad, rushed over to the tent, picked up the guy's camera and busted it into smithereens and dashed off into the brush and that was the last he ever saw of him. Broke the Auditor's Code.

Well, you could say that actually a transfer of intelligence and knowingness had been taking place along this line. Certainly, certainly could have happened.

Now, old Frieda Fromm-Reichmann – "the great" Frieda Fromm-Reichmann – has a process which is intensely successful. If she knew where to go from there she would be a great psychiatrist. She is the greatest in the United States, in the world almost today, but that doesn't make her a very great psychiatrist.

Anyway, Frieda Fromm-Reichmann will go into the cell with a madman who is standing there gibbering and raging, and if he will reach down and pick up a handful of excreta and throw it against the wall, why, Frieda Fromm-Reichmann – this dear old lady – will suddenly reach down, pick up a handful of excreta and throw it against the wall. Anything the psycho does, she'll do. And they all of a sudden start talking to her. Isn't this peculiar?

Then, God help her, she goes on and uses analysis. There's the effective process! Not

just to get somebody in communication. Any time you think that two-way communication as a process is simply to get somebody into communication, you're going to forget that the rest of your processing is basically two-way communication all the way through. And any other significance added to the line whatsoever is simply froth added to an already frosted cake. See this? So we're just adding something more.

So basically, fundamentally, two-way communication is the most important auditing area. Most auditors, if they fail, fail in the field of two-way communication because they forget this. They deliver their communications mechanically, disinterestedly, they forget about the duplication and so forth.

I ran a preclear out, one time, of coming in to the beginning of every session and going over how bad he felt and how bad auditing made him feel, and everything else. He walked in one afternoon walked in the front door, and says, "I'm ..." – just starting out – and I said "I feel terrible. Auditing you has just about ruined me. Ever time I audit you I feel worse, and you're not doing me any good, and I don't know why I'm letting you come here.. And I just laid him out, practically in the same tones of voice. And the fellow – apathy. So I simply laid him out, and I said "Every time I audit you I feel worse ..." I went through the same dramatization again "*(Sigh)*" Real apathy. So I went through the same dramatization again, and I went through the same dramatization again. And all of a sudden he started to cry.

Now, we know the Tone Scale. It starts with apathy and goes up to grief. Next step would be fear. Most people would think that we were just violating the Auditor's Code across the boards and caving him in, see. So I went through it, all the way through again, and the guy started to look like he was scared, and then before I got through the dramatization he was angry with me, and he got antagonistic with me, and he started to yap at me rationally for the first time on an antagonistic line – instead of just a dramatization and then sit still like a little doll and do the process, you see.

I don't know what circuit I was processing with that preclear. Never found out because it blew along about this point. I got him up, pushed him on through boredom simply by running his chronic dramatization. I reversed it just to this degree: How bad auditing *him* made *me* feel – and this after six consecutive sessions where an individual had walked in and told you, "After being audited by you, I just feel terrible. I don't think I can go on. Last night I almost killed myself ..." almost the same words, you see. He had just dubbed in auditing into the engram he was using as a dramatization record – and quite non sequitur. I reversed the tables on him. Not a recommended process, but just demonstrating what you could do with just two-way communication as a process.

Now, I've had a preclear sit, and they had a habit of tapping the arm of the chair. And I would start tapping the arm of the chair. You understand, I get very rough preclears. I don't get any of these cream-easy ones. They never come my way. It's almost like being the famous Western gunman, you know; he's got to be better than everybody else that shows up. Well, he only gets the tough boys in the area. Similarly, I only get the tough cases.

So, this dramatization on the part of the preclear who had been out of communication, I started to echo. And this preclear got very nervous and upset because I was echoing this. You know, I just tapped the arm of the chair. So they stopped. So I stopped. We were apparently going on talking, but I was evidently talking to a circuit or something. Because the actual attention of the individual started to center on me and my hand to see whether or not I'd start that again. And they tapped a couple of times experimentally just like with the monkey. And I tapped a couple of times experimentally. And then I tapped three

times, and they *obsessively* tapped three times.

So I said, "What do you know! We've done a lot of talking, all of it non sequitur. This person disassociated badly. And what do you know! For the first time we're in communication."

We went through, then, all sorts of idiotic motions. I stepped on their toes three times very lightly, and they stepped on my toes three times very lightly. And we went round and round a chair and so forth. And this wild, insane light started to show up in this individual's eyes. And it went on out. It went on out and they started talking, and that night ran a terrific fever.

This would scare an auditor who didn't know these types of manifestations: ran this terrific fever, and smelled like he was dead – according to his wife. And they actually do this sometimes. There's an odor of fear that comes off a preclear once in a while. Horrible. And also the glee of insanity. You can see it shine on somebody's face. It's really something interesting. Anyway, ran a terrific fever, and went into this horrible odor stage and terror, and the next day, for the first time *really* reported for the session with alacrity and speed, although in horrible condition, and so on.

And I just went on, and we went round and round the chair again and round and round the sofa. And then we took a Ping-Pong ball and tossed it back and forth between us, and so forth. And then I'd wave my right hand and then wave my left hand, and they'd wave their right hand and wave their left hand, and we'd do this several times. Then they'd start bobbing their head... Just as monkeyshines as you could possibly think of, but it was all 2-way communication, and it was all duplication, every bit of it. This person came right on out of psychosis.

An auditor can actually sit there and repeat the words of an engram enough times over to run it out of the preclear. Not, again, a good technique, because it's too rough – just like this other technique was too rough for this psycho. It was too rough to go into two-way communication over a long period of time, but it did break the psychosis.

So, round and round you go with a two-way communication. But whichever way you look at it, you are looking at the primary difficulty of the individual.

Now, communication lag as you could see, in its most perfect form, would simply be how long it took the other person to wave after you waved, see? But in verbal speech amongst relatively sane people, you can measure two things with a communication lag. One, whether or not they can sanely rationalize and assume the cause-point in order to emanate a new communication at you, you see. That's their answer, you see. That's a new communication. Although it's sequitur to your question, they have received and duplicated your question. They didn't say so; they didn't do it physically, you see. But then, they were at cause-point, and now at cause-point they put the answer back on the line. And you with your ears and recording mechanisms duplicate it, you see.

So a two-way communication lag is a direct measure of this. But as I say, optimumly, the length of time it took you to get them to raise and wave their right hand after you had waved and raised your left hand, you see, making a mirror duplicate, would be the optimum definition of communication lag.

Now, all you would actually have to do to use this as a process, well it's simply just keep on asking the preclear questions, and making sure that you never ask a new question until the old one had been precisely answered. Just keep at it, puppy to the root; drum away, drill away, see.

You say, "What is your name?"

"Well, I don't know, I made one of those out for your secretary. Uh ... there's an



enrollment here, you know, and so forth. I mean, an application. I ... I ... I did make one of these out, and I gave you my name, you know, in the letter. The letter which I sent you some days ago, I think my husband [wife] wrote you this letter. And your name ... the name was in that too. And you also have the name in your files because I've received several of your ... of... of letters from you when you've sent out circulars in the immediate area."

"What is your name?"

"Well, as I just said, I just gave you the name, you know? I mean, after all, I mean it's ... you ... you have it all around here and so forth. If you didn't know my name you wouldn't be sitting there processing me, would you?"

"What is your name?"

"(Sigh) I uh ... I ... I just told you. It's in the files. And ... and you . (sigh)"

Just watch them. They'll start heaving sighs, and groaning and moaning. Now, these sighs, these groanings, these moanings, and all the rest of the thing that goes along with it – you as *Homo sapiens* would consider this is the way *Homo sapiens* acts. These are his peculiarities of actions, his explanations, his justifications, and everything like that. Every one of them is simply a communication lag of one kind or another.

You finally say to him, "What is your name?"

He says, "My name's George. (Sigh!)" You'd be surprised how fantastically relieved he will be when he finally gives you his name. And what would you do then? You've only asked the question once and gotten one answer. And it took you fifteen minutes to get that answer. What is the communication lag at that time? Just because you had to repeat the question several times to keep his attention back to it does not shorten the communication lag, does it?

All right. So the fifteen-minute period there was the communication lag from the time the question was asked, to when it was answered. So naturally, you'd simply ask his name again. And this'd start driving him out of his mind, because he can't duplicate.

The first thing, the most immediate thing he'll tell you – "I just told you! I just told you my name. What's the matter? George is a common name ... uh ... and so forth." He didn't answer you, see. "George is a common name," *he* said. He didn't tell you his name was George.

You say, "What's your name?"

Finally he says, "(Sigh!) George Palmer."

You say, "Good! Fine. Fine." (Keep affinity in that line, you know?) "Fine. Fine. What is your name?"

"Nooooh! But I've just given you my name, and you had it in the files and letters and leaflets, and it's all in *waoo* ... My name is George Palmer!" "What's your name? Come on, what's your name?"

"(Sigh!) I just told you!"

You say, "Well, what is it? What's your name?"

"(Sigh!) George Palmer."

Finally stack it down by doing this. And you will watch him come up every manifestation of the Tone Scale. You'll see him dive out of the machine – social position on the Tone Scale, straight down to apathy, the second he starts to cross over from a machine to himself.

And then he starts going in through apathy. He'll go up through higher ranges of apathy, and he'll hit grief. He'll hit fear, he'll hit anger. He'll hit antagonism, he'll hit boredom, he'll hit enthusiasm. He'll hit apathy – lighter this time. And then jumping

upscale and missing a few, anger, enthusiasm. You'll watch him go over that. Each time they go over, it's shortening. And finally you'll get into communication with him.

I've taken a very, very tough preclear who was unwilling to give me any computation or anything else except, "You know, my father abused me so much and everything abused me so much, and I felt ..."

And I would say, "Well, what did you think specifically that we ought to do today?"

"... and my father abused me so much and (*sigh!*). It's just terrible. I mean, he used to beat me, had sexual intercourse with me when I was four or five years old, you know, and I think that's a terrible thing for a person like that to do, don't you?"

And you say, "Well, what can we accomplish here today?"

"Well, I just want to tell you about my father ... and he's terrible, and ... " and so on.

Actually, this is so chronic in psychotic and neurotic people that psychoanalysis had to make a complete fetish out of it. They got beaten into apathy themselves to a point where they would simply go back into apathy and let the preclear talk.

Psychoanalysis, if it lasts two years or ten, is one long communication lag. It's nothing but a communication lag on the part of the preclear. You could shorten that up simply by asking the same question many times.

Now, there's a duplication drill that could be carried out amongst individuals. Duplication drill (would be a very, very good one) whereas you, talking to an individual or a group, you'd say a word, and have them say the same word. And you'd say the word and they'd say the same word. Or you'd take two words and you'd say one word and they'd say it, and then you'd say the second word and they'd say it. You'd say the first word, and then they'd say the first word again, and then you'd say the second word and they'd say the second word.

And then, after a while, have them say the first word and you say it – flow back and forth, any way you wanted to do it, you see. You do that many times, always keeping up with the same words. Merely ... And you will notice the differences of response on the part of a class, particularly, or unit or a group, and in particular, an individual preclear. A unit preclear – one preclear – responds much faster individually than a group. Your reactions are much more violent because he's not being supported and duplicated on every side. He has to take responsibility for what he's doing; he can't shove it off on the rest of the group.

Okay. Two-way communication is quite a process, then, isn't it? There's a lot of processing to it. It's the one thing that underlies all other auditing. Until you understand communication lag, and two-way communication and its uses as a process, you would miss many, many things and manifestations in a preclear which you ought to be able to catch and recognize and improve in the preclear. Okay.

# COMMUNICATION AND STRAIGHTWIRE

*A lecture given on  
25 October 1954*

This is a lecture of – date?

Audience: 25th.

October 25th, 1954.

Want to talk to you about communication. Actually, I can probably stand here and talk to you a long, long time about communication.

I want to talk to you about the basic fundamental of communication. And one of these days, long blue sparks will jump, and you'll know all about this. I am going to talk to you about Elementary Straightwire – communication in relation thereunto. Okay?

We call it Straightwire. It has been called Straightwire for more than three years. I invented the term to designate the stringing of a line between the preclear and his past. And if that was a straight line, then the preclear could remember his past, but if it was a crooked, bent line with lots of vias in it, why, he was not in communication with his past then, was he?

It is indicative of this that somebody writes in a diary. He has got to go through a via to get to his past. If you can't remember your past without a diary, why, that's too bad. Looks like you'll get aberrated sooner or later.

Now, a person should feel at will to string a straight line between himself and any point in his past without fear of consequence. And the whole process of Straightwire is to demonstrate to somebody that he can freely communicate with any part of his past, whether this life or any other life, without immediate consequences. That's its purpose, that's its function and that is all we are trying to get him to consider, and sooner or later he will come to this consideration – sooner or later – that he can remember, without consequences, any part of his past.

Why do we call it Straightwire? Well, the original concept had to do with a telephone line. If you ever review old lectures and so forth, 1950 I was talking about this. We take a telephone line and we string it straight from one person to another.

But if it has to go to Joe to be relayed to Bill, to be relayed to Oswald, to go through several switchboards, and so forth, it becomes less and less workable as a communication system; becomes more and more complicated, doesn't it?

If a person has a bunch of machinery which is remembering his past for him, he's in trouble. Got that? He's in trouble. No modification on this. If a person has a bunch of machinery which is remembering his past for him, he's in trouble.

What do you think a facsimile is? What is this thing called a facsimile? This idea of pictures, called in psychology – in the back end of a couple of old forgotten and neglected texts – "eidetic recall," covered in psychology a little bit; covered very, very thoroughly,

and remediable by, Book One and the processes therein.

What is this whole subject of energy masses around a person? Take 1952, the discussions on ridges, discussions on all kinds of odds and ends there – electronic phenomena, one kind or another. What is that whole subject?

That whole subject is again the subject of a person using some kind of machinery in order to recall things for him.

It has an additional significance. These masses are very often preserved by the individual to act as barriers or barricades which hide him or hide something else from him – protective barricades, defenses. But how on earth do any of these defenses come into existence in the first place, except by a person having somebody else remember for him.

Actually, this is true. The initial entering wedge is getting something else to remember for him – his unwillingness to string this communication line from himself to the past.

But how does it get this way? Well, he gets unwilling to have a communication line strung between himself and something else in the present. And then this unwillingness carries on into the past. You see? This is a very simple mechanism.

So he believes he's still defending himself from things in the past. Well, if something else beside himself was counted upon to break the communication line – now, let's be real distinct about this – to break the communication line between that lion and himself ... See? If he counted on something else to break the communication line rather than himself – a completely direct zap (if he didn't like that lion) – he was in trouble *that moment*, and that moment is continued as a moment of trouble all through the past. So that when he tries to remember something, he gets into this intricate and interesting state of affairs: "There are other things there which must break the communication line."

Now, you, as you sit here right this moment, what do you think you're using to break communication lines? Now, let's just look over a few. Is there anything here in the present that you are using to cut a communication line other than yourself?

You find some?

Look around.

Are you using something else?

How about the sun? Are you using anything to cut the communication line between you and the sun?

How about these very sentences I am giving you? What are you doing with them? Is anything hearing for you? Why can't you hear straight? Why couldn't you hear directly? Would it be harmful to you to be hit with the impact of sound, to vibrate to yourself these various wavelengths, vibrations?

Now, you sit there in a body. If the sunlight were to pour in straight upon you, without the interruption of the earth's atmosphere, you'd get fried, wouldn't you? So it must be that you're protecting something else than yourself.

How about yourself? Would you, an awareness of awareness unit get fried if the sunlight hit you? Couldn't, could you? Not unless you put up something to get fried. Well, maybe a body is just the process of putting up something to get fried.

So every minute of the waking day, if one considers himself trapped and immersed and of necessity compelled to use a body, he is adding up – I hate to tell you this really – he is adding up a long, consecutive channel of defenses which will therein and thereafter impede, amongst other things, simply his memory.

By introducing barriers to protect – to own, to hide (you know, own-protect-hide) – by introducing barriers to do this trick after this moment is past, after this moment is past,

it cannot but follow, having counted on something else to shunt communication lines ... And remember, we don't care how solid the communication is. Some communications are more solid than others. Having entered ownership, protection and hiding into your present, now recall back through that line is to some slight degree similarly impeded.

Now, these past lines, past moments, can only get involved if you're still sitting there, depending upon the protections of those past moments. Want to know what happens to somebody's memory? He owns, protects, hides – barricades, barriers, vias and so forth – in each successive moment of present time, and then doesn't go to the direct source of what he's trying to remember, but remembers back through all of these devious mock-up barriers which represent the past moments. He gets to a point finally where he's carrying along a whole bunch of pictures representing the past situations.

Now, trying to get an energy line through them would be difficult enough. Simply trying to recall straight through them is quite difficult, so that man commonly considers practically a complete state of amnesia as a fine memory. What man considers a fine memory should be considered almost a complete state of amnesia.

Now, I dare say, sitting right there at this moment you can recall very well picking out those barriers which were interrupting you. Can you recall doing that easily? Can you recall that easily? Is it difficult or is it easy?

Now, we have introduced the idea of a barrier there, haven't we? It was a subject that was appertaining to barriers. Now, let's recall a time in the past when you used a tremendous defense. Just recall a time when you used a defense.

Now, let's recall a time – whether you got that or not, it doesn't matter; this is not a processing session – let's recall a time when you felt you could operate without defenses. What period of your life was that? Wasn't it a period of your life before you had been taught that everything was dangerous? Hm? Wasn't that the period you hit? Childhood – some such period. Regardless of what it is, you're dealing with these present-time energy barriers which represent past energy barriers. And there is a dependency all in itself which impedes Straightwire.

Now, the truth of the matter is that theta, as you might say – people talk of theta as if it's a commodity – a theta activity would simply banish all that. I mean, you just wouldn't pay any attention to the routes and vias. The more you validate these dependencies and so forth on the part of an individual, the unhappier he gets.

Now, I probably, as you're sitting there, made you feel very unhappy. I tried to make you remember through barriers after telling you that you couldn't. Dirty trick, huh?

All right, let's pull a much better trick. Now, let's pick out something right now that you'd feel free to communicate with. Got something you'd feel free to communicate with? Get something else you'd feel free to communicate with. Look around. Something else you'd feel free to communicate with. Got some?

Look around your actual surroundings. Let's find some things that you're free to communicate with, or which you feel free to have communicate to you.

That make you feel better? Did you find some? Make you feel better? Of course it made you feel better. You weren't validating the intervention of barriers, were you? No barriers.

Now, here is a very interesting fact. This universe is a game consisting of barriers. And those barriers are space, those barriers are energy. Did you ever see an energy barrier? Did you ever try to swim a tide race or something like that some time or another? That's a barrier in motion rather than a solid barrier. Matter, energy, space and time – each one of these things are barriers. Time is a barrier. Where is 1770? And it is actually the

key and principal barrier – the principal barrier: time!

One measures time by the flux and change of form, and so the particles which were there in 1770 have changed in form so that over there in the wall is probably a speck of rust from a flintlock rifle. And there is probably out here in the dust of the street a bit of a feather on an Indian arrow. Certainly in this very ground this area is situated on, here in Arizona certainly, there is shards. And if one were hearing this in London, of course, he'd probably be sitting on old bits of slings and stuff like that.

These atoms have departed from their original form and have taken part in some other form, and so we have the illusion that time is very destructive. Time is actually destructive of nothing but form. Change. That's in this universe.

So here we have these barriers. Barriers of space are quite interesting. It's a very, very effective barrier between here, for instance, and the moon for a person in a body. It's very difficult to get a body up to the moon. In the first place, space-station commands are fitted for people about one meter tall, and they're certainly not fitted for people who are about 5'3" to 6'6"; that's a different size range. It's rather hard.

Furthermore, these meter-tall people can subsist much more evenly upon oxygen – low oxygen content, and so forth – than these bigger bodies. An amusing idea – the fact that there's space, you see; space is a barrier.

If you were going to construct a prison and keep somebody in it, you would have to teach him that he was something else which could not be transported. See, that would be an absolute necessity if you were going to make a prison or a trap. You'd have to teach him he was something else that couldn't be transported. Nontransportation. You ran nontransportability.

Science-fiction writers love to write time-machine stories, just as though the past forms were still there. Well, a time actually could still exist in various forms. Actually, if you went back in time and you started to mock up and spot spots in – just as though they were there – and mock up 1770 again, you could probably create, to your satisfaction, a pretty darned good 1770.

If the people of earth just decided that everything was just like it was in 1770 and moved in that direction, of course we'd have such a broad agreement, and so on, that we'd be all back to flintlock rifles and Tower muskets.

No, the Tower musket didn't come in just then; Tower musket was issued to the British troops ... Oh well, that's – we'll get off of that I remember the issuing order. Anyway ... !

It said, "Hereinafter as aforesaid, troops will not refer to this weapon as 'Brown Bess.' " It was decided that this was derogatory. Anyway!

You have a very complex thing – time, space, incidents.

Now, incidents spot, seemingly, forms, don't they? Incidents consist of combinations and motions of forms. Right? Isn't that an incident? Combinations and motions of form. Of course, you have to add to it significances, ideas. And that's an incident.

Now, if you are certain that incidents must consist of form only and the motion of that form, and that that is what makes the happenstance or incident, you're in trouble to just the degree that you have to have in order to recall. For instance, can you think back to the moment when I was asking you to feel how free things were? – you know, get things you were freely in communication with? Hm? Do you remember that moment well now? Hm? Do you? Do you remember that one well?

Well, what do you know, you didn't remember the time when I turned you loose into barriers very well, did you? Hm? You remember first I asked you what things were

intervening between you and the sun, and so forth. Remember? And then a little bit later I asked you to recall that. Well, then I asked you what things you were in free communication with. And now I've asked you again to recall that. Which did you do the most easily? Do you get my point?

Now, we start out with the assumption in all Straightwire and communication, unfortunately, that there's some difficulty going to ensue on the recall. That's a basic postulate with which we start. That's an unfortunate thing, isn't it? Nevertheless, it seems to be perfectly justified by the fact that if we ask somebody off the street to come in here and tell us what he had, not for dinner last night, but for lunch, what kind of an answer do you think you'd get? How much comm lag do you think you'd get?

Now, let's ask him what he has in his pockets, and when he put it there. *Dahh! Guhhh!* Be an interesting experiment – so that it's very reasonable for an auditor to assume that people are going to have difficulty recalling the past.

Let me assure you of something. A person is going to have as much difficulty recalling into the past as he himself is counting upon facsimiles, or has in the past depended or counted upon facsimiles, to give him his past on a silver platter.

The fellow who recalls 1770 and is presented with a facsimile of 1770, and then recalls 1770 because he's now seen a facsimile of it, isn't doing too well. He is still depending, you see, on some kind of a mechanism to give him the past. He's going via.

All right, worse than this is the fellow who has it all black. *Duhhh!* See, it's all black, totally. The mechanism has been depended upon so that he was no longer authoring this mechanism. And the mechanism doesn't work anymore, but he has depended on this mechanism, hasn't he? And now it doesn't work anymore, and yet his dependency is still there, not unmocked. In other words, the dependency continues to exist after the mechanism has broken down.

Why did the mechanism break down? Because he was the only one that could put a mechanism there. Get that very clear: Who could put a mechanism of assistance of memory into the bank? The preclear. Even when somebody else gives him an idea, it will depend upon, originally, his own mechanisms. The idea he is given cannot be otherwise than simply a lock on his own dependencies and postulates in this particular direction.

So we look over the whole subject of Straightwire, and we look over the subject of freedom. Freedom consists exclusively of having a straight un-viaed, uncrooked, unrelayed line between the preclear in the present, and the ideas and concepts of the past – not the barriers of the past. Straightwire has as its goal "return of idea or conceptual memory with the absence of all facsimile or machine assists." To accomplish that goal it is only necessary for an individual to be practiced in remembering to a point where he can abandon the mechanisms which are assisting him.

Now, I'll give you a case history. I had a preclear one time who has had hallucinatory images, gone down through blackness, and had a complete inversion, so that it was enough for this person to think of something to be presented with an entirely erroneous picture of this somethingness. You know, an erroneous picture. The way this person was remembering – (quote, unquote) "remembering" – was to remember what you said a half an hour ago with an entirely different sonic, and then tell you absolutely that you, a half an hour ago, spoke in a high treble and you had recited the Declaration of Independence. And this was what you had said a half an hour ago. In other words, this person was batty. And this person had at one time been occluded, and the occlusion had turned into a terrific amount of hallucination, utterly out of control.

Well, the solidity of energy masses around this person was something marvelous to

behold. Now, I've had a lot of psychos like this. It is a characteristic of a particular kind of psychosis that we used to call the "wide-open case."

This person would be asked to mock up something or copy something, and would get a copy of it far, far more solid than the original sitting right in front of their face. And there'd be something wrong with the copy. Ask this person to copy a window curtain, you know? Oh, we used to say "duplicate it"; we say today "copy it." All right. "Copy this window curtain." This window curtain (the copied version) would be far, far more solid and real than the actual window curtain, but there'd be something haywire with the copy – only recognized by the auditor, of course, by the auditor's utter insistence that this thing be described. Now, you're asking this person to copy something; you're not asking this person to originate something.

It would be characteristic of a very, very high level thetan if he could mock up something so darned solid that probably other people could see it too. You see, that'd be something else.

But the difference is, he would be mocking up what he was supposed to be mocking up. You see, he'd say, "horse," you know, and he would get a horse. Well, not this other person, not this low-level manifestation of the same thing. You'd say, "Copy that horse," and this person would get a rocking horse, see – solid, *very solid* – and be appalled at the solidity of the copy.

Now, you'd say that person should be able to remedy havingness very easily. The only thing with it, you see, is these things were out of that person's control. And a little further explanation and a little further investigation on the part of the auditor would demonstrate on any such case something equally amusing: It's the auditor's command which makes it appear.

Just be alert to that. A little point I'll probably never touch again, and you'll run into sometime or another. You told them to copy the curtain. They didn't copy the curtain. You indicated a condition that the curtain had been copied. You see, by merely telling them to copy the curtain, a copy would appear. But who copied it for them? You did.

Otherwise this person is almost totally other-determined, and all of their machinery snaps and pops and salutes anybody else who comes along. Of course, that depends upon the earlier machinery which they have set up to do something like this. So this is where a dependency on some kind of machinery like this can go. An utter dependency upon other-determinisms straight across the board can become a very interestingly insidious thing. So that other-dependency, however, would have to do with the recognition of the superiority of all other beings except self.

Now, you ... Apparently we've stretched one there, and I've gone awfully fast across a number of steps. But dependency consists basically and foremost upon the recognition of the vast superiority of the remainder of existence as compared to self. Dependency exists only when a person has admitted the vast superiority of the environment as compared to self. A piece of writing can be more valuable than a self. A soldier, for instance, carrying a battle message is, of course, far more impressed with the message than he is with his own life. He is trained that way; he's indoctrinated that way. Therefore, this message is a superior thing – to him; he'd lay down his life to get it there.

Well, this is perfectly all right. There's nothing wrong with this as long as it is a game. But to actually admit from that, that every message had more value than he had, that everyone's utterance was more important than his utterance, and to select this out as an activity in life – simply granting great importance to any printed page as being far more important than anything one could compose himself, or originate himself, or think himself



or say himself (just the fact that there's a printed page there makes a person believe the fact that it's there, you see) – that kind of activity winds up in a resignation *from cause*. A person resigns from being cause.

One of the most amusing incidents along this line that I ever saw was a fellow one time was in a vast argument with several other engineers. He was an engineer, an electronics engineer, a very good one, and he'd had a lot of other engineers to dinner. And they got into an argument after dinner about a certain law, and they – its application in the field of electronics. And there was a lot of gab-gab-walla-walla amongst them, and they were condemning each other left and right. And finally the host, this engineer of whom I speak who was upholding this certain law, reached up onto the bookcase and got down a book (a very heavy book) and opened it up and pointed to a certain page, and they read there the words which substantiated what he was saying. And they were all satisfied and they stopped arguing, and the point was entirely and completely settled right there at that moment. And he put the book away.

Amongst them, I was the only one who noticed that he was the author of that book. I was a nice fellow. I didn't contradict him. Okay? Do you point there? They wouldn't believe *him*.

So it is a trick that all of the rest of the world plays on an individual, isn't it? What is agreed upon is true, and what you think – nahh! What is agreed upon is true. It's been through the test of time; it has even come down into a point where it has been indicted in print, black and white, and this of course makes it true.

Yet no written account of any battle ever fought is a true account of that battle. So wild is this, that the collection of stories for the three days subsequent to a battle in the earlier part of World War II, demonstrated from day-to-day an entirely different battle was being talked about. And finally, the official version of the battle which was released, which became part of newspapers and which became part of the history books, had very little to do with the battle that had been fought there – very, very little to do.

How can we actually, completely pervert present time? Well, let's just make a composite of everybody's viewpoint of it – you know, depend on that rather than some observer who was there, he saw it, so on.

We get a number of people witnessing an accident: They're all looking from different directions at this accident, they're all seeing different things, and they all have different restimulations with regard to this accident, and they all turn in different stories on it.

Now, how ... What happened at the accident? It actually very often takes a court of law to decide what happened at an accident. And it takes it after it's listened to all these witnesses, one after the other. And then it makes a composite story which is the accident, but that isn't the accident.

Similarly, a child, when he becomes five, six, seven, eight, nine, is interested in hearing his parents talk about his early life, and he will take their composite views of the family – the composite views of the family – as a version of his early life. And so his early life will become occluded. Oh, you thought I'd went way off from Straightwire, talking about this, didn't you? Fooled you.

The account of the battle, the official family record of the battle, is probably the wildest departure from truth imaginable, and yet this person's sanity depends on his being able to recall or reestablish his own viewpoint – not the official viewpoint; his *own viewpoint*.

Now, we don't care whether that was correct, incorrect, bad, good, backwards or upside down. All we care about was his actual concept or idea of the positions of masses

and forms, and their ideas and intentions. That's what we're interested in when we ask him a question about his past. And we find nearly every child is totally occluded up to the age of four, five or six. There isn't any reason why they should be, you see, except that the family always has the official version. Now, if you want to cut through this Gordian knot, you of course don't even validate the official version. We're just going in now, "Why don't people recover recalls of the very, very early ages."

Well, I will give you a preclear one time, who, all he'd talk about the first session or two, is he'd had a vivid recall when he was about five, of a time when he was six-months old. And there'd been a roast parked on the stove. He was in the kitchen and mopping around on the floor with his dress and so on, and the cook had opened the oven door and set this roast out on the oven shelf there. And the boy had been sitting there and a big dog came in, the family dog came in – pardon me, I think it was the dog next door – came in and picked up that roast, hot as it was, and ran outside with it and ran away with it.

And he'd remembered this vividly, you see. Only he couldn't talk. He couldn't tell anybody at that moment what had happened to their roast, and everybody was very upset about this roast, and so on, and it made quite an engram in the family, one reason or the other.

So the years went by, and when he was about three-and-a-half or four, he had told people what happened to that roast, you see, just as soon as he could talk and was in good communication with the rest of the family. What happened to the roast? Well, he told them. He said, "I was sitting there on the floor ...." And they all jumped in. They said, "Why, Johnny, that's impossible! That's utterly impossible. You couldn't possibly remember anything like this." *Bang! Bang! Bang! Bang! Bang!*

He went on for years like de Maupassant's piece of string, you know – that sort of a motive. He went on for years, protesting that he had remembered that, and eventually one day they convinced him that he hadn't remembered it. But he still remembered that he had remembered it, but he'd been convinced of this.

Well, getting into this, the closest approach that we got to it on Straightwire was something on this order: "Well, my memory isn't so good. A lot of people think they can remember things very early, and so forth, but that's all hallucination."

But this was what he was dwelling on and talking about. But even letting him talk about this a little bit sort of as-ised it off. So I started looking for some specific recall that this fellow was evidently fishing for. And first we found something on dismay, on the order of forgetting things, and then we found something on the order of the family telling him he mustn't remember, and we all of a sudden sprung that one just like that.

We sprung the remainder of the invalidations, and all of a sudden he remembered remembering the roast. And a tremendous span of his early life turned on, merely because we'd hit the main suppressive button.

But this is an accident – hitting something like that, that dead center; hitting such a story. This is an accident.

All right. An accident like that isn't something an auditor wants very much to do with. We're not interested in the psychoanalyst's viewpoint. He believes that there's probably only one incident in the last seventy-four trillion years that's aberrated him, and if he could just get a recall into this incident, he'd be all set. That's not true. Not true.

Now, the most descriptive things there are in theta is this: affinity, reality and communication. And of these, the most important is communication. And communication is modified by the amount of duplication which occurs, which is reality. Reality is simply the degree of duplication. And affinity is the mass-distance factor.

Now, there's no need to go into it much further. But affinity is actually the size of the particle and the amount of distance, and possibly could even be figured out to have velocity connected to it. I have made no exact approximation of affinity, as such, in all of its operations and working – hold your hats – because it is the entire subject of physics and chemistry.

And if you want to sit there while we go over the entire subject of the various particles, compounds, interrelationships, cohesions, adhesions, repulsions, diamagnetism, paramagnetism, magnetism, fields, fluxes, and so forth, why, I would be happy to do so, but we don't teach physics here.

Affinity even has such things as the terminal manifestation. You get two terminals and there is an interchange between these two terminals. And actually, the exact likeness of these two terminals, trying to communicate with each other, greatly enhances a flow, and so forth. It's a tremendously complex subject which we don't need to have anything to do with, because there is where complexity enters the whole business of living – affinity.

We must remember this: The greatest affinity there is, is a perfect duplicate. And the more particles and the more distance you get into it, the less affinity there is. Somebody says, "Absence makes the heart grow fonder." I have never found that to work out myself. Occupying the same space makes the heart grow fonder. And that I've seen work out many times.

All right. Here we have flows, ridges, fluxes and barriers under the heading of affinity.

Under reality we have the degree of duplication, and under communication we have cause-distance-effect with the intention and attention, and, of course, the interest factor. The interest factor is what marries communication to affinity – pardon me, the interest-disinterest factor. And the more disinterest there is, the lumpier the affinity becomes.

Why is somebody interiorized? Oh, you could work a tremendous number of things out here. Why is somebody interiorized? Well, he feels an affinity for his body. Well, how much affinity can he feel for his body? That means the occupation of the same form, same space, in the same time concurrently and immediately with it.

Now, how about this as this affinity falls off and goes into the DEI cycle – Desire, Enforce, Inhibit, and so forth? The person feels less and less affinity for his body and is trying to fight his way out of his body. Well, he'll eventually get buttered all around the body but will not be in it. And you won't be able to find him either. He's dispersed; the body is superior to him. Actually, if he was as good as the body, you see, if he had the idea, "I'm just as good as this body. I'm as smart as this body...."

There's a drill that goes this way, by the way. It's a little freak piece of processing which I don't advocate to you at all. "Now, which is the best: you or your body? Oh." Whatever answer, see. We finally get the question answered. "Which is the best: you or your body?" See? "Which is the most deserving: you or your body?"

And the guy will ... It doesn't matter what he gives you as an answer, he's as-ising this nonduplication situation which brings about and assists the malaffinity, see, the misaffinity. Do you see the idea?

He doesn't even recognize he's in his body. The reality factor has fallen way off because, you see, the body is all-important; he's not important. He's degraded compared to the body. You see this? And therefore he isn't even occupying the body. And the body is everything and he's putting that forward. And he is nothing, and so the body isn't putting him forward. Get the idea?

And so we get a maladjustment of the terminal's reality, see? No duplication over

here. We get no duplication in the field of reality, so therefore we get some kind of a misaffinity over here. And this misaffinity will go in to where we have a compulsive adhesion or cohesion between the thetan and his body. It isn't a matter of occupying the same space with free choice or free will; it's a compulsive, obsessive occupation of the same space and we don't get him exteriorizing.

Well, whatever you want to say about A and R and C, these are the three principal factors which make up understanding. These *are* the three factors which make up understanding. It's a triangle.

But that triangle gets compressed down to a (almost) dot by exterior determinism, you see. Right down, *boom!* See? But it never vanishes. As it expands upward, it finally gets pretty big, so a fellow has a large distance tolerance, you know. And he could control things a considerable distance, and all this sort of thing, you know – heal at a distance. Big distance tolerance is getting up here. And all of a sudden we get it out here, and as it starts to approach infinity, it disappears and it becomes complete knowingness.

So we get complete knowingness going down into the mechanics of ARC, which have a distance factor in them; and then that triangle more or less decreasing, so the fellow can have a game and barriers entering into it; and then the triangle collapsing on itself down to a minute point, because it is compressed from all sides. And it never gets to zero.

But a person at about 20.0 starts to misunderstand. And his understanding starts to deteriorate. So that with a good understanding of life itself a person becomes relatively free. He's going upscale, isn't he?

Well, how about this fellow that doesn't understand his past? Supposing he doesn't understand anything about his past? His past is just the most incomprehensible thing to him. He can't remember any part of it, really; he's, you know, *Homo sapiens*, average man. Recalls on a conceptual basis always, as sort of a blur that he – he was a ... he was a ... He had a hometown, and he went to uh ... uh ... school, and uh ... he's had a jo ... Well, uh ... right now, he's working for uh ... uh ... Blitz and Company, but before this he ... uh ... Let me see, uh ... uh ... Yeah, well, he ... uh ... Oh, he came over here from Smith and Company, that's where he ... Well, job ... uh – um ... Let's see now. Job before that ... Now, let's see, it was when ... uh ... it was just before Maggie had kittens. Yes, that's right. Uh... No, it was the blizzard of the uh ...

What is this guy trying to do? He's trying to relate other forms enough to patch up a world of incident which he can then look at. Well, *Homo sapiens* is in that kind of a blur. How do you resolve it?

We say that his understanding of the past has to be increased. Therefore, his freedom with regard to the past has to be increased. That's the most basic statement that you could make on it: He has to have a greater freedom with regard to his past. He has to be less constricted by his past, less held in the groove. And his ARC with various parts of existence has to be improved. So we have as one of the primary remedies that you already know, ARC Straightwire.

And he never did quite understand his mother. He never did quite understand his first wife. She never did quite understand her father. She never did understand her first three husbands. You know? Well, when they can't understand them they can't remember anything about them. Now, just put those two things right down side by side, and you've got it. And you'll know why we use ARC Straightwire: When they can't understand anything about them, they can't remember anything about them; if they don't remember anything about them, then they don't understand anything about them.

Just reverse it; it goes both ways. And that could be an axiom which you could very

well follow with regard to people's past: If they didn't understand them, they can't remember them; if they can't remember them, they didn't understand them. The component parts of understanding are affinity, reality and communication. So therefore, hitting these three buttons will produce an effect. It'll produce quite an effect. A fabulous one, actually, if carried on any length of time. All right.

Now, we could enter this several different ways. We could clean up the fellow's immediate ease in his environment quite interestingly. We could clean up his unease and make him easy about something by simply discovering what part of his past he doesn't understand, or who he didn't understand in his past, or who he doesn't remember in his past. And then have him remember something real, have him remember a time when he felt some affinity for, have him remember a time when he was in communication with this person. Just as easy as that.

Let's say this person is still living with Mother and he's forty-eight, and he's never been married – of course, he's got a couple of boyfriends. Boy, he doesn't understand anything about his mother, believe me. Furthermore, he can't remember anything about her. Here would be key personnel to blast out of existence in this person.

"Remember something real about your mother."

"Remember a time when you felt some affinity for Mother." "Remember a time she felt some affinity for you."

"Remember a time when you were in good communication with your mother."

"Remember a time when your mother was in good communication with you."

"Remember a time that's really real about your mother."

And the odd part of it is, he'll come up into an understanding of his mother. Isn't this curious?

All right. Now, let's say this fellow doesn't remember anything – he doesn't understand physics. You know, he had five years of it, standard university background, and he doesn't really know anything about or remember anything about it. He's gotten a job at Boeing and he's upset because he keeps designing planes that crash. No, Boeing wouldn't fire him for that. He keeps designing planes that fly. Yeah, they'd probably fire him for that.

And we get this boy, and he just doesn't seem to be functioning. If he could just remember his education, he says to you, he would be all right. *Umum!*

All right, let's get those two things side by side. You got a little clue to how you'd do this now?

He doesn't remember it; he didn't understand it. But you can now make him understand it by simply as-ising all those damn barriers and ridges which he had mounted up about it. And as you try to ask him to remember something real about his education, a time when he felt some affinity for it, a time when it felt some affinity for him, and a time when he was in good communication with it, and a time when it was in good communication with him; you would be amazed at the amount of chatter this fellow will give you about how horrible the stuff was and having to go to school and having to be confined and having to do this and having to do that and having to write out examinations and reports and ... Well, we're just talking about barriers, aren't we?

Because what is a barrier? The common denominator word of barriers is restriction. So he was too restricted, so he couldn't remember easily.

Walking academies in Greece were far better than the modern university with four hundred students per class in a small room. I think they've gotten up above that now, but we'll be charitable. It was pretty bad right after the war. It may have simmered down now

to three hundred students per class. But they put them on an assembly line and punch them as they go by. And you'll find these people coming out afterwards, not able to understand. Why can't they understand? Because there wasn't any ARC.

The first reactions somebody will get when you've done something to them is tell you they don't understand you.

All right. We write to Joe Jinks – as the CECS has been doing, and has now been stopped – telling him that his certificate has been cancelled. See, we tell him his certificate has been cancelled. We find this individual doesn't even understand the letter, communication or what was in the communication, and writes back some of the darnedest balderdash you ever heard in your life.

The most logical thing in the world would be to write somebody who studied for a certificate – didn't get a certificate – and to write and tell him something about his certificate, see. Let's just try and get in communication here.

We get all sorts of things. For instance, just this morning, such a person, trained and not certified by the Foundation a couple of years ago – the Foundation refused to certify this person – we wrote and gave this person a chance to restudy and get certified. You know, that's about the kindest thing you could do. Somebody wouldn't certify this person. Well, this person is convinced that this person's been certified, but it's right in the Foundation records as they came to us here in Phoenix, the person never was certified. See, it's right here. And this person is going to go to the postmaster general or something, and we don't quite know what this person is going to do, but it's something drastic and terrible – this we can be sure of. But the person never read the communication received. They don't understand it.

All right. So therefore, you drop anything into the category of entheia which would be misemotion, you see, on the affinity line, no duplication on the reality line, and a via-via communication at best, and do we get a non-comprehension. You could say bluntly that as desirable as it might be to police and punish, it is utterly and completely impossible to communicate in the presence of no duplication and no affinity.

There might be giants stalking this earth at this moment who are mad at men. Men would never even see them. They might be able to victimize men in all directions, and yet man would never see them – like Ambrose Bierce's thing of no color. And they might be there but he would just never see them, much less understand them. To get some idea that you don't understand, you at least have to start perceiving. So this is the way universes get stacked up, one to the other, and actually coexist. One never sees them. One has no affinity with them, duplication of them or communication with them, and so we would get a no-perception.

Now, how about this fellow that can't perceive? Let's give him an entire past which is without understanding, and then let's ask him to see the room. The room will have disappeared by this time. The only thing we could do for him would be to give him some ARC – the only way we could communicate with him. ARC would be possible. Have to get some semblance of duplication, some feeling of the kinder emotions, and some semblance of a straight line in order to get any understanding at all.

In view of the fact that we could call both Dianetics and Scientology simply an understanding of life ... And it's too bad that man insists on everything being labeled, because that's a far more satisfactory definition of what we're doing. Dianetics, an understanding of man; Scientology, an understanding of life. And we could call it that, simply because we are dealing exclusively in the factor of understanding.

But if there is understanding, of course, there's cognition. If there's understanding,

well, there is perception. If there is going to be any understanding, there must be some semblance of duplication. In other words, a person has to be alive, slightly. That's one of the semblances of duplication: to understand life is to be slightly alive – at least faintly warm! And these people who don't understand life aren't faintly warm if you ever really wanted to touch them. They aren't running a temperature. Go around and shake some hands with psychologists some time. You've got to be alive to get into communication with life.

All right, it boils down to this – boils down to this as far as an auditor is concerned: An auditor can utterly and completely neglect the past of a preclear, because going to a better future through the clarification of the past is itself a via. Isn't that right?

So what is your test of any process? A test of any process would be simply this: How many vias are in it? How many curves does it take to arrive at a certain goal?

You want a better present and future for this preclear. You can't work with his future. You're sitting there with him in the present, hm? So one of the very best processes that you could possibly run on this individual would have to do with the address of the present and the complete neglect of the past. Leave it to the analyst.

Nevertheless, Straightwire is necessary. Why? He's so stuck all over the place, he is so incomprehending, he is so incomprehensible himself that you can't even get to him to indicate that there is much of a present. Well, clear up a little bit of the past, and you'll spring him slightly so that he will see some present. But remember that it's a via.

We have to remember how to do Straightwire. The best Straightwire there is, in terms of clarifying a person's past, is ARC Straightwire. Just that simple.

There is a present-time address to the problem of ARC, however, which we mustn't neglect. ARC amounts to freedom. *ARC amounts to freedom.* Complete understanding amounts to freedom. So we have a new common denominator, and we could call either Dianetics or Scientology sciences of freedom. We could call either one a science of freedom, and it'll serve with fair accuracy.

So there would be a code word about the present. There would be a code phrase about the present that could be used that would promote ARC in all directions, and I just gave it to you in this lecture as a little test process: "Point out some things that you could be free to be, do and have," or "Point out some things you could directly communicate with," which is old Opening Procedure 8-C. But "Point out some things which you would feel free to be, do, have in the immediate environment" adds enough idea and significance to it to promote ARC in the immediate environment. And because this complies with the conditions of existence – because you cannot as-is freedom – it'll keep pushing the preclear on up the Tone Scale without dragging him down.

Stretch a straight line, make him free and validate freedom in your processing, and you will accomplish anything you wish with a preclear. Of course, if you wish him something bad, the best way to accomplish it would be to get angry at him, to jaw at him, to run an involved and complicated process that would take him through many vias and finally cave him in – would wind him up in a complete confusion of understanding nothing.

If you want to communicate, show affinity and show some semblance of duplication and you will succeed. If you want to miscommunicate, if you don't want a communication to arrive, why, be ornery, mean, upsetting in general, and you won't get a communication through, or any understanding either.

If a preclear complains that life does not understand him, you want to wonder sometime and process in this direction: How ununderstandable *is he*? And how far out of

communication is he?

That's why people don't understand him and why he doesn't understand them.  
Actually, there's nothing much to understand about people, except they're there.  
Okay.



# SURVIVE

*A lecture given on  
26 October 1954*

Today I would like very much to talk to you about some sundry common denominators to human behavior and activities. Some of these are more comprehensible than others.

The first and foremost of the common denominators of human behavior is "survive." There is no arguing with this after all these years. And after all now, it's been lots of years – twenty, thirty, pretty near – since that concept was first to some degree established. And it has been very, very well established for about fifteen years, and it's been holding very constantly in Dianetics and Scientology, even up till now.

Now, the only advance there's been on this common denominator is that there are two other facets to it. And that is the original curve or cycle of action. The first place we see this cycle of action is way back in the early days of the Veda.

We have a description of the cycle of action, which is: All things proceed from nothing, and then they are born into a somethingness, and then they grow and finally they start to decay, and die. And that is the cycle of action.

Actually, in Scientology we have a much better description of that: create, persist, destroy. And this could be create, survive, destroy. In other words, survival also belongs – as well as standing by itself – it also belongs on this more descriptive curve.

This curve is apt enough that you will occasionally get a preclear, and knowing nothing but the fact that human behavior has as its common denominator survival and that it has also its cycle of action, you could do a great deal for a case.

You could do something like this: You could mock up a fellow falling dead. And mock him up falling dead, mock him up falling dead, mock him up falling dead. You just have him do this, you know, lot of times. You've ended cycle for him. He's arrived. He has managed to accomplish death.

Now, sometimes he has intended death for people and has never finished his cycle of action. So you have him mock his mother up dead and mock her up dead and mock her up dead. Or his father, or something like this.

To give you some kind of an idea of the workability of this End-of-Cycle Processing, which is what it is called, I had a preclear come in one time, and all this old girl could do was simply sit there and say how happy she would be when I finally accomplished her demise. That's real cute, isn't it? Preclear's sitting in your office giving you the full responsibility for knocking her off.

You were supposed to knock her off. And she wanted to be separate from her body so she could fly away and thus die more easily.

Well, I fixed her clock for her. I simply ran End-of-Cycle on her death. You see, I had her mock herself up dead and mock herself up dead and mock herself up dead and mock herself up dead and mock herself up dead.

I did this for about fifteen or twenty minutes and that was the end of that obsession.

That finished the obsession, and then we could continue with some auditing and get somewhere.

The majority of preclears who come to you are actually on the succumb curve. And whereas they will tell you that they would be very, very happy to improve and get better, their actual goal is to succumb.

Now, any preclear occupies some position on this curve of create, persist, destroy. A preclear is always someplace on that curve. He can be located on that curve in this interesting and rather intricate fashion: If he is able to get three-dimensional visio, he is on the create side of the curve – somewhere along there, to the degree that he can get three-dimensional visio. If his visio is just *media – media*, well, he's on the survival end of it. But if he's over on the destruction side, his visio is flat. And if it's clear on over very close to destruction, it is nonexistent. That's real cute, isn't it? I mean, you can just actually spot him exactly.

Why? Because in creation you have lots of space, that's all. And one of the first things that creation requires is space. And the thing which survival requires is conversion – conversion of energies to energies, to forms, to other forms; you know, conversion – and necessarily, conversions are not particularly flat or ... They're not either destructive or creative; they're simply just there.

So a fellow never really notices whether or not he has good three-dimensional visio or not. It's sort of – you know, it's not completely flat, it's not ... You know. That's right in the center.

And you go down on over into the destruction end of the curve and the three-dimensional character becomes two-dimensional, and then becomes nonexistent as you hit destruction.

This is not very important, what I am telling you. It's one of these thousands of phenomena which I've unearthed, of one kind or another. But it happens to be a common behavior pattern amongst all preclears that you will process. They'll be someplace on that curve.

You could say, then, that the first common denominator to all of existence was survival. And this survival breaks down into the eight dynamics. And you should know these dynamics very well because you use them, every now and then, in processing.

The dynamics, of course, are so well known that some people don't know them. And the first dynamic is the dynamic of self. The second dynamic is the dynamic of sex. Third dynamic is the dynamic of...

Well, what do we mean by dynamic? We mean the urge toward survival for that particular sphere of existence.

Third dynamic: groups.

Fourth dynamic: mankind.

Fifth dynamic: animals.

Sixth dynamic: physical universe – meaning matter, energy, space and time.

Seventh dynamic: spirits.

And eighth dynamic: infinity. Properly named infinity; infinity turned upright makes 8, and we can say – in the field of religion, when we're talking to people that we do not have to be too exact to – we can say this is the dynamic of God.

But here are your eight dynamics, and that merely comes into this category here of survival. And actually, if you looked at each one of these dynamics, you would find that each one of those had, as well as survival, the rest of the curve. They would also have create and destroy as part of them.

So there's the creation and destruction on the second dynamic. There is creation and destruction on the third dynamic, you see. It is the urge or the cycle of action.

So we could then plot our eight dynamics in this fashion: We could say the first dynamic – a total statement of the first dynamic – would be the urge toward creation, persistence and destruction of self.

In this universe, in this time, it happens to be – the emphasis happens to be – on persistence. And so we have survival as the most apparent urge. But remember we have creation and destruction there.

Now, the fellow who is always trying to mock up these fancy tales of what he is and how many titles he has, and all kinds of odds and ends and bric-a-brac about – that aren't true particularly. He's merely trying to create himself, you see.

And the fellow who goes around and commits robberies and burglaries, and leaves clues on the scene, he is simply trying to destroy himself. And so we have an urge toward destruction.

Now, the dynamics become very, very comprehensible if we recognize these other factors. They become very comprehensible. Instead of just specializing in survive, we take into account create and destroy. And therefore we get the urge of a group to create, the urge of a group to destroy.

But the predominant urge at this time, in this universe, happens to be to survive, to persist. That is its emphasis. It doesn't wipe out, however, the create and destroy part of that third dynamic, you see.

Similarly, in the Old Testament you read perpetually, continuously, and forever and aye, about the creative and destructive instincts of the eighth dynamic: Yahweh.

Boy, he was the author of the whole universe. He built the whole thing in six days. "Vengeance is mine," saith the Lord." He destroyed all the sinners and he brought on the flood. And he was a busy fellow, just in general, looking over his activities.

But these activities were observably survive. You see, the eighth dynamic was surviving, simply because it is obviously going along with this universe. See, this universe persistence would be the persistence of endeavor of the eighth dynamic.

Now, there's the creative and destructive instinct which goes on either side of it.

The cycle of action then expands into the eighth dynamic. And if we recognize this, a great deal of understanding of existence will take place.

Now somebody, somewhere along the line dropped in a word there, and said that there was another principle of existence known as "evolve." No, that does not belong there and is not supposed to ... It wouldn't do anything to amplify it if we understand survival.

Survival depends, in this universe, upon conversion. Let's understand this real well. Let's understand survive real well. It's persistence. This, of course, takes into account the time factor.

Now the time factor, as it goes on through the line, naturally is some kind of a uniform agreement of rate of change of position of particles in space. That's time. It's no more than this. It's merely a consideration which is agreed upon, that there will be this much rate of change. And therefore, this consistent rate of change gives us this manifestation – survival.

All right, as we look over this rate of change, we discover that the entire universe seems to be a coordinated thing. It seems to be very coordinated. Well, how is it maintaining this rate?

This universe actually frowns upon creativeness. It also frowns upon destructiveness. This universe has as its motto: "Status Quo." It's rather interesting that it's so insistent

upon persistence – tremendous emphasis on survival.

This is the one point that can be isolated and very readily understood. There's this tremendous emphasis. Well now, how is this survival taking place?

We see by the conditions of existence – which you will learn about in your Professional Course tapes and so on; the conditions of existence, which happen to be as-ness, alter-isness, isness, not-isness – these four conditions of existence require a continuous alter-isness (in other words, change of position of particles in space) in order to get an isness.

Now, somebody said the other day here that actuality was truth. Well, no. Actuality is isness. Isness requires alter-isness in order to get a persistence, you see. Things have to alter their position in space – continuous alteration of position in space.

And that is the motto of this universe. Alteration of position in space, on and on and on and on and on – new position, new position, new position, new position.

And when something really goes into apathy, when something *really* goes into apathy, it sits down and becomes a tree. And then when it's so far below apathy that you couldn't even measure it, it's a rock. See, it's real solid. Change of position in space.

And when it's no longer able to change the position of *form* in space, well, it figures it's more or less arrived, see, it's there – but it's dead! The fact that it has arrived tells it it's dead. And so they behave in this fashion.

A tree is not quite arrived. It can still change position in space. How? By throwing out seeds which get blown by the wind and get planted some place else, or buried by squirrels, or something of the sort. So a tree can even change position in space. But not a rock, except in the case, of course, of volcanic upheaval. It apparently doesn't change position in space. But at the same time, the rotation of the planet is changing the position in space of the rock continuously. The orbit of the sun is changing the position of every particle here on earth.

And so we get – even though we've reduced it to an apparent immobility – we still get this tremendous dizzying motion which goes on in this universe: change of position of particles in space. And this alone measures up what persistence is. So the woof and warp of survival would be the regularity with which position was changed in space. It's as simple as that. Survival is then accomplished by change of position in space.

Well now, in view of the fact that nothing in this universe can remain ... Let's see, the most ancient statement on this is a Greek – Anaxagoras, I think – who said a mixture which is not shaken stagnates. You know, a mixture which is not shaken stagnates.

Anything which ceases moving in this universe – totally ceases moving in this universe – becomes nothing. It's an interesting fact. It would disappear utterly if it stopped moving. If you could totally stop its motion, it would no longer be in this universe.

Well, this is then the top and the bottom of the Tone Scale. You could go out the bottom, you know, by stopping moving utterly, and be free – people think; never saw it done – or go out the top and become a thetan who has no location in space.

See, he's not located in space except where he says he's located in space. You know, he says, "I'm here," so he's here. You know? He has no fixed position in space and he doesn't have to accomplish a rate of change.

Well now, in between these two things you get a continuous conversion. Let's not confuse it too much with the conservation of energy.

Do you know what conservation of energy is? Were you unlucky enough to have this taught to you arduously in your physics class?

It is taught in this universe that nothing diminishes and nothing increases, it only

converts. Conservation of energy.

If you were to burn a piece of paper, you would obviously no longer have a piece of paper, would you? But the physicist convinces you utterly and completely that if you were to weigh the ash and were to condense and weigh the smoke and – he's never done this, by the way – weigh the smoke and particles which escaped, and if you were to take the heat and take the mass of all these things, put them all together, you'd have the same weight as the weight of the paper.

In other words, although you burned the paper, actually no particle or atom or electron or molecule of that piece of paper altered in the slightest degree. You can conserve energy – energy is conserved – but energy is neither created nor destroyed.

This hogwash is a major pile of ties across the railroad track of nuclear physics. Nuclear physics has found such things as holes in space. And they knock an electron through a hole in space and get back two electrons, you know. And they knock another one in and get two more.

And something around here seems to be creating electrons. And everybody says, "Well, it probably can all be reduced down to conservation of energy." But the point is, they haven't so reduced it.

Now, this is observable where life is concerned – that as long as life goes on being creative and creating, it is progressing, it is healthy, it is happy, it is well. And when it ceases to create and simply begins to convert energy, it really ceases to be very happy. It's sort of doggedly in there, you see – persistently, doggedly converting, converting, converting, converting.

And when it gets over to the other end of it, of destruction on the thing as a goal, and so on, it always will destroy itself.

When life starts in with a destructive motif – whether it's that expressed by Hitler, or that expressed by scorpions, or that expressed by any other thing which is all out for survival on the first or second dynamic, you know, or the third dynamic; and very, very down on any other survival – the second it begins to specialize in destruction, it cannot do otherwise than uniformly decay on all dynamics, and will destroy itself.

This is an interesting thing, that the dynamics act as a unity. This is one thing which is common in behavior of life, is the dynamics act as a unity, and something is as bad off as it is acting in disunity with the rest of life. And this is the optimum solution. The greatest good for the greatest number of dynamics is the optimum solution.

You can actually sit down and almost mathematically plot the right decision to make. And if you plot it on the basis "the greatest amount of good on the greatest number of dynamics" – in other words, the most survival for the most dynamics – why, you will have something close to an optimum solution. Now, that's solving problems by survival.

All right, the conservation of energy is that process by which you take an energy in one form and put it into another form. It translates this.

Now, in view of the fact that you have no such thing in this universe as a perfect converter ... There's always heat loss. As an example of this, a steam engine burning coal – a railroad engine, rather, burning coal – has as its factor of efficiency about 9 percent in cold weather.

In other words, only 9 percent of the available heat in that coal ever goes into the driving wheels of the locomotive. That means that 91 percent of the heat and fuel, which was made available by coal, is lost.

A transformer comes very, very close to being a good converter, but there is still heat loss in a transformer – so that you put in 110 volts at one end and get out 220 at the other

end, you should theoretically, you see, get just exactly the same voltage and amperage, you know, converted. You know, there ought to be the same power in the line, but there isn't. There is a heat loss. And everywhere we look through this universe we find heat losses or some similar loss.

Let's look that over very, very carefully. Because right there is the whole snag, hook and sump of human behavior – right there.

Survival: In order to survive without creating or without destroying – to any excess, you see – you would have to engage uniformly in conversion. And if no new energy came from anywhere, life would deteriorate and perish, and *does* deteriorate and perish unless it adds new energy to the form continuously.

No matter how many pigs you ate, or cows, chickens or goats, you still would not be able to burn the amount of energy, you see, completely, or use that energy. If we look at the human body like a conversion mechanism, we will see that there is an enormous loss in growing a pig and eating him. The actual BTU of that pig will never arrive in the driving legs of the body – there'd be loss; going to be loss all over the place. And when life ceases to create, this loss eventually adds up throughout the whole conversion system of a race or species – or all life, let us say, on a planet – and destroys it.

You are looking at planet earth right now on a dwindling spiral – a rapid dwindling spiral – whereby, for instance, the oxygen content of the air is dropping steadily. Why? Well, too much conversion, too little creation.

It's almost as though life gets obsessed after a while, like Schopenhauer became obsessed, and says, "We've got to stop all this. We've got to stop life." Well, the way to stop it is to stop creating, and to stop the people in life and the things in life which create.

This is an interesting thing. Germany will never be the same with the Hebrews decimated. Because the main creative lines carried on in Germany were carried on by the Jews – whatever Hitler said. He robbed a nation of its artistic or musical creativeness to a very marked extent.

This is fully as damaging as getting the nation knocked apart by war.

Now, we're over there right now, making very sure that the German people, who know the German people ... You know, it's always a benefit in government, you know. You should have a government knowing something about the people it's governing.

And right now, they have it so rigged – these various unit commands, and so on – have it so rigged, that it would be impossible for the German people actually to make any decisions for the German people or do anything forward for them.

They have that nation very, very sharply stopped. The rubble lies all over the streets. It's an amazing mess – it's rails, and so on. It's amazing that it has done anything at all. Because they're making sure that the German people don't govern the German people. And nobody else is complicated enough, ponderous enough, in order to figure out the problems that are peculiarly German and get the wheels of that civilization moving again. So there's another thing, you see.

Any creative instinct in the field of government ... Let's say we will mock up a new plan by which Germany can then progress and live, you see. That is just cut right straight off. There is none of that.

This is not a criticism of military government. This is simply a forthright observation of the activities of Allied control at the present time in Germany – not read by Gunther, but looked at.

And the German people say, "Oh, if they would ... if they would just ... if they would just ask somebody who used to be on the traction board, we could then get our streetcars

running again. If they'd just ask somebody why they don't run."

Instead of doing that, why, the present Allied government puts up a sign and it says, "The streetcars will all run by Thursday." And there's no streetcars by Thursday.

You see, it has to do with a number of very, very obtuse and strictly Germanic factors. In other words, here the impulse to solve the existing problems, you see, the impulse to carry forward the proper conversions inside the nation (I'm not beating the drum for Germany; I'm just showing you what can happen) – the proper conversion mechanisms are not being followed, you see: the governmental plan going into action, people do this and they do that, and that carries forward.

So there's a tremendous loss in that nation right now, you see. There's that huge loss taking place all the time. So these conversions of the energies of the German people into the restoration of the German nation, that loss there is so gigantic that *nothing* at the present time could rise up and give it sufficient creative impulse, you see, to pull it all together *again* – *unless* they simply turn it back, at least, to the German people.

The introduction of "stopping arbitraries": Here we have a nation which is terribly interested in the growth of food – here in the United States – very, very interested, you hear, about the growth of food, and this and that. The U.S. is doing perfectly all right, except for a half a dozen things.

They write big articles about timber conservation in the *Saturday Evening Post* and the Republican Party annuals and things like that, and then they don't bother to do a darn thing about it.

If you went up to the Northwest and asked the big timber barons about their timber conservation, they would turn you over to a boy who was fully informed on this subject, and he would show you more maps whereby recutting would be accomplished in another sixteen years, and charts, and oh, the most terrific stuff you ever saw in your life – none of it in effect. Not one scrap of it in effect. No timber conservation program is going forward in the Northwest. But a lot of *talk* is going on about it. Well, as a consequence, there's only one stand of timber left – Alaska. That's the last stand of timber that is inside U.S. territories.

Well, what's this got to do with survival? It's got a lot to do with survival. Nobody's letting those trees create new trees. You see that? They can do a lot of talk about it because the public expects it.

I'm not beating the drum, again, for conservation. I'm just showing you how this thing can get derailed. People have nagged them about conservation. And so they say, "Yes, yes. We have conservation programs." But they don't have conservation action.

Compare this to an activity that takes place in France. If you cut a tree down in France, I think you have to plant two, at least. And here in the United States, the rainfall, and so on, and the conversion of oxygen and of carbon dioxide, and so forth, is all dependent on the amount of trees, not the amount of lake surface, or something, you have in the country. An acre of trees puts back into the air tremendous quantities of water, compared to an acre of water.

So, here we have all this timber, you see, and grasslands, and so forth, which have been wiped out. Now, there's nothing replacing it. And if you look around very carefully, you'll find we're eating up the animal from tail to horns. The heat loss is catching up, see – the loss along this conversion.

If we go solidly and continually on the basis of conversion then, the losses and waste will whip the whole thing. You've got to create new energy as far as life is concerned. New energy *has* to be created, new activities *have* to be engaged on in order for anyone to

win at all. And that is not what is taking place at the present time.

Here you have a nation increasing continuously in its food consumption. And here you have a soil getting more and more tired, less and less animals, less rainfall, and other factors.

It'll go by fits and starts. You know, things will look a little better this year than last year – and then so on, and so on. But you'll find out the average productiveness of this nation would be declining.

Why? Well, it's because they're so sold on the idea of conservation of energy and the conversion of energy – so terrifically sold on this, and so completely ignorant of the *creation* of energy or even the destruction of energy. See, these things are out of gear. Life is a peculiar thing. It forms and makes certain kinds of energy.

Now, the common denominator as far as the whole race is concerned is that it slides along as a whole race somewhere along the cycle of action, and as a unit race could be considered to be – or a unit planet – could be considered to be somewhere between create and destroy, see; somewhere on that cycle.

And when it gets exactly pinpointed dead center on survival – without any creation or without any destruction – it has no other action but to go on over into destroy. It can't help but slide over the border – because of these heat losses.

So lets take a preclear who believes that he will be able to eat up and convert energy from outside sources to a sufficient degree to survive. He cannot survive! The second he makes up his mind that he is totally dependent on conversion and can safely depend upon conversion of energy, he immediately slides over in toward destruction. The most unstable point on the curve is exactly in the center of survive or persist.

If an individual is doing nothing but persist, he will be destroyed. And this is the one conclusion and prediction that you can make that will be common to all life forms. They have to be over on the creative side in order to maintain a survival. They have to be over here on the creative side to maintain survival because the second they're on survival dead center, they are doing nothing but convert. And the losses involved in conversion are such that they slide immediately into destruction. You see that? It's an unstable point, this thing called survive, if it is not aided and abetted by creation. Therefore, we take – let's be more intimate – let's take the Foundations. Nothing was being created in the Foundations for two and a half years. A forty-two thousand mailing list ... A thirty-five hundred membership dwindled to a hundred and thirty-four people.

Because it was simply trying to subsist on what was already there. See, it's tried to subsist on what is there. It tries to convert the existing product without any new introduction of anything, see, without any creative impulse going into this line.

Even a creative impulse in the form of sales, or anything of this character, would have been good. But instead of that, they even dropped out some of the things that were already posed in the line. And so, although all the materials were there, although there was really nothing else there but what had been there, well, with the greatest of ease it simply ate itself up.

And every time you find a preclear in bad shape, you are facing somebody who is eating himself up. He has decided "I am John Jones and John Jones is a surveyor." *Tuh, tuh*. Won't work! Won't work! Never has, never will.

See what he's decided? He's decided to sit exactly in the middle of survive. Now, he's going to convert, and he's going to follow the laws of conservation of energy. In other words, he's in total agreement with this universe.

He has been educated as a surveyor. He has been given the name John Jones. And



now people are going to walk up to him and ask him to survey certain areas. You see this? They're going to ask him to ... And he, being John Jones, a surveyor, is going out and survey these areas. And he will be very successful and live to a ripe, old age. No, he won't. He might live to be seventy, but what's that? Let's look under this for the secret, actually, of old age.

But let's look at this setup with a very critical eye here to find out if we might not have our finger very close to – what do they call them – geriatrics. Beautiful name. Obscures ... Ha-ha! They always get these beautiful names to obscure the fact that nobody knows anything on the subject – so much so, that I throw these things aside, even to the point of forgetting them just so I'll be sure someday to know something about it.

Here again we have named something, and we do not add to it or create anything in it.

All right, here's John Jones. If he does not continue to create, at least create new business, he'll perish one way or the other. He's at least got to create *that* much. He's got to go out and beat the sidewalks or something of the sort, or ring doorbells or send out direct mailings.

Well, he wouldn't survive very well really, though, even then, would he? He's just simply being John Jones some more, and so on.

No, I'm afraid that he tries to solve it, if he solves this at all by maybe taking up a hobby. You know, he just leaves the whole problem of survival.

That will now take care of itself – conservation of energy. "This is a community of eighteen thousand people. There are so many surveys have to be made to keep these people happy, and this will always *hurr-hrm-hrr* – *and* I will survive." No, they never survive when they've begun to be dependent upon any standard conversion line.

Let's go in a little more definitely into this, and let's look at what conversion really is. Here's electrical energy being converted into mechanical energy; electrical energy converting into heat; heat converting into electrical energy; mechanical energy converting into electrical energy; mechanical energy converting into heat – cat chasing its tail all the way around, in other words.

Now, how is this done? We have a power plant down here, and this power plant has a wide-open maw, and they open the door and they either throw in coal or they turn on a valve and shoot in fuel oil. And this fuel oil goes roar-roar-roar-roar-roar, and that turns on and heats up some water. And the steam then goes into some Curtis turbines, probably, and that turns some big dynamos. And that puts positive-negative impulses into an electrical current. And it comes down here and it winds this clock round and round. Just as easy as that.

Well, that's just fine. Only there's a loss all the way along the line. Now, what was fed in there for fuel? Let me call your attention to that: what was fed into that furnace for fuel? A bunch of fish or a bunch of ferns, once upon a time, decided that they had arrived. They had a good form. They were doing right. They could now depend upon conversion of energy all the way along the line. And they're now lying there a mile below the surface in a heavy, black mass.

And that heavy, black mass, whether oil or coal, is mined or pumped, and that is now put into a furnace. And you find the present race eating up the energy – created deposits of the last many million years. And eating them up all at a gulp.

How many million years did it take these fish to develop that many ridges? Hm? And that much pressure of earth ... And now all of a sudden we get very mechanically minded and, swish, we dig them all up, see. We dig up these solidified ridges and we throw them in a furnace. And then with numerous heat losses manage to do a vital operation like

turning around the hands of a clock so we'll know what time it is.

Curious business, isn't it? Doesn't look to me like we are on the center there of conversion of energy – there being no such thing as a 100 percent conversion of energy. You can't ever convert 100 percent of energy into any other kind of energy, or use it.

But it looks to me, then, that sometime or another there's going to have to be an awful long time intervene again before this much fuel comes. Ah, you say, "atomic fission." Oh, yes, atomic fission. Now, that's the stuff. You see, after you've run out of all the coal and oil, why, then you've got atomic fission.

Okay, so you've got atomic fission. Atomic fission, whether you believe the Atomic Energy Commission or not, will still depend, to some degree, upon peculiar and special types of mineral of which there are very small supplies, and which again are the result of conversions of energy in Lord-knows-what form and in Lord-knows-what chain of conversion, down to a point of where the energy itself is made so unstable as it's about to leave this universe, or something of the sort; and if you ignite it or slap it together, like plutonium, you have simply made it to the bottom of the spiral.

Okay. So we have a good time, we get clear down to the bottom of the spiral and we find out how we can explode a rock. And this rock can then heat up water, and here we go again.

There are very limited quantities of uranium. You don't suppose if the U.S. government had solved uranium that they would now be paying such fabulous prices for uranium. There isn't much of it.

I'm sure that they have managed to conserve this energy all the way along the line. But the main point I'm making here is, yeah, they got a new thing – with a limited amount of it, see.

Well, when they get through that they will always be able to resort to something else, won't they.

This is the whole dizzy, dizzy spiral – not of the civilization, but of a preclear. This preclear ran around and fell downstairs and grew and ate and created energy, and so forth, when he was a kid. And he got all these nice deposits and engrams and facsimiles out there. Now he gets to be about thirty, thirty-five, forty, somewhere along in this range, and he starts to eat up his engrams. That's what he does.

Instead of going out there and accumulating a few more, you know – let's create something. No, he wants to sit there in the middle of survive. And the second he decides to do that he goes downhill all the way along the line.

Because it's customary to stop moving around after a certain age in the society, we get a constancy for old age. See? You wouldn't have to have any other agreement than that "We are dignified, and we take everything casually, and we don't drive fast cars or anything like that anymore" after a certain age.

If we got an agreement like that we would immediately put a period on a life which will be rather uniform. Actually, it's not uniform. People do not age uniformly.

Here's this old buzzard at sixty tearing around the country and doing this and that. And this kid at twenty who has quit. I mean, you don't have a good comparison like this. You wonder what old buzzard of sixty might be doing this. Well, I call your attention to the old guy, Bernarr MacFadden. He did a parachute jump the other day into Niagara Falls – interesting old character.

But these people *become* something. This has a lot to do, you see, with this. They become something. And the somethingness which they become is an energy-conversion unit in which they have some faith, and so they continue to be the energy-conversion unit.

And a complete beingness could be described as an energy-conversion unit – the becoming of an energy-conversion unit. Now that is a successful, they think, survival identity.

And people who get into a failed survival identity ... You know, this fellow is a janitor in this life and he is failing like mad. But he has these private dreams about this emperor, you know – if he were just an emperor, you know. And he kind of reads books on this subject, and so forth.

He's actually picking up a winning moment out of his past, see. Way back down the track a few million years ago on some planet or another, you see, he had a considerable prominence. And he is holding on to, and is chained by, a time when he was and had been a very successful conversion unit from his standpoint. Beingness could be said to be conversion-unit.

A person who is not obsessed with having to live off other existing energy does not have any trouble with being things. But a person who is obsessed at having to have other energies than his own to live, then becomes, not only obsessed, but he gets to be something and, boy, you can't blast him out of it with dynamite.

The degree that people can be things is the degree that they *are*, over there between create and destroy. You see, they're somewhere on that curve.

Well, you could say the cycle of action is the curve or gradient scale of the ability to be. And when they hit dead center on survival, the exact middle of the curve, they think they have hit an excellent conversion unit. Status: something that can convert energy.

You see, their presence or beingness or position or title or medals will bring them a certain amount of money which converts into a certain amount of food. And as long as they are this thing, they will continue to be able to convert energy – eat, in other words – and so act. That's a successful form.

Now, there's a lot of philosophy back of why the dinosaur is no longer with us. But he sure got the idea he was a successful form, and he didn't change for a long time. And when he did change, it was simply to disappear. He got up there to a successful form and there he is, gone.

You can say, then, that it is the opening chapter of death for a person to reach a successful form. A totally successful form is the first page open of the book of death. Because one can't stay on the middle of that curve. He's going to go over to the destroy side of the curve.

You have to create to some degree in order to live at all. Nobody can ever sit back and relax on this subject. He can never sit back and say, "Now I am something, and I have done this, and I am going to depend upon it from here on out." "On out" is what should have the emphasis.

Therefore, as you look at your preclear you are looking at somebody – if he is having any difficulty – who is a successful conversion unit.

Now let's take a look at some of the somatics of a preclear and find that they are timed. And this is a peculiar thing, the timing of a somatic. Some people have somatics which turn on at five o'clock. Some people have somatics that turn on very precisely in the morning. Some people have somatics that turn on between 1:00 and 2:00 at night. Some people have somatics that turn on regularly in the spring and the autumn.

These are interesting things, this cyclic behavior of somatics. And it would be a fabulous and mystifying thing unless we knew something about geology, biology and physics.

There was a little animalcule once upon a time known as a plankton. And every cell in

your body has a history which goes into the sea. It has a history which takes it into the swamps and lakes, and to that period of time when it became dependent upon sunlight in order to survive.

And that is why you get a timed somatic. It's simply a dramatization, on a cellular level, of the pattern of "I can't survive without outside stimuli."

Now, you've asked many times why these preclears go around with this totally black field. What good is a black field? Well, I'll tell you what good it is: It absorbs light, it will absorb photons and it is part of an energy-conversion-unit pattern.

And to make somebody who is not creating get rid of a black field is to ask him to get rid of the very thing which will pick up photons, or heat units, in his environment and convert them for him. You've just got through asking him to get rid of a conversion unit.

One of the interesting things you can do is to have somebody mock himself up coal black, out in space, so he'll absorb what light there is. And have him do it again and do it again and do it again. And then you will get a change in the black field. You'll get all kinds of wild changes in the black field.

There's another way to do this. You ask him to look around and spot things which are undergoing or being active in conversion. Let's spot mechanical, electrical, heat processes of energy conversion. Let's just look around and spot them. Look around and spot them. It's an interesting process.

You're asking the fellow to as-is out of existence, conversion units. And the funny part of it is, after he has done this for a little while, he will tell you rather independently that he could create something. You move him back up the track.

You show him that he is following the pattern and behavior of all of life as his main activity – you know, this life is all converting. Well, he's set down so he is converting. He's an energy-conversion unit. That's what a body is.

Now, think of the luckless thetan that gets into the middle of a body and depends upon the body to convert all of his energy – convert energy for him so he can live. Think of this guy. Isn't that an interesting state of mind to be in?

He sits in this body, which is a conversion unit, and without creating anything of his own he's going to subsist off this body. The body is just going to go *bzzzn-bong*.

The truth of the matter is the body can't exist unless it's pumped up. It's too much of a conversion unit. It requires creation in order to subsist – exist.

But what a thetan is doing in the first place, thinking that he has to get on some communication line and convert cause as it passes through to effect – you're always *on* a communication line – we're not quite sure what he's doing there, but it must have seemed like a good game at the time. It's the idea of he sets something up to run forever and then sits back to let it run. Of course, nothing like this will happen. What happens is it starts running him, and then it runs down and leaves him stuck with it. That's the course of action of such a thing.

So now, as we look over the common denominators of existence, we find out that a species is commonly – and that its forms are – commonly involved, and particularly involved, in the conversion of energy.

And we can predict how fast they will go over into the *destroy* field by discovering how much creativeness they permit. And where creativeness is permissible, we assume that they are not yet up to the center of survival, and so will not quickly pass over into destroy.

But where they are doing nothing but convert, they are either about to die or dying. And so it is with any preclear you're processing. If he has become totally a conversion

unit, he will then be identified as having fixed beingness.

You'll find such a person with mass, meaning and mobility. But you will find him depending upon an orientation point like Mama. His body still remembers taking food while in Mama. Body still remembers being fed by Mama. And this recall, you might say, or habituation, will assume that Mama is the orientation point, and let the individual assume that he is simply a symbol. And he will go around converting energy like mad.

Actually, to furnish any energy to anything he would have to be an orientation point. He'd have to be a point from which he was looking and creating space.

Any symbol has to have an orientation point to run around. Mass, meaning and mobility is what a symbol has. But we could add something to that as far as its behavior was concerned. Any time you find something with mass, meaning and mobility, you will find it, in this universe, engaged in conversion – and not at all specializing in creation, but very often specializing in destruction.

So you get a whole level across a race, species, so forth, directly marked by the degree that they are creating and that they are being symbols.

Now, there isn't any particular reason anybody has to be or not be a symbol, as long as it's a game. There is nothing wrong about anything, except not knowing about it. That's what's wrong about something.

If a person is being a symbol, dancing on the puppet strings of some old orientation point – if you'll let me mix a couple of metaphors – the chances are this individual is depending upon the amount he can convert for his survival. He will be as healthy, as well, and so forth, as he can create for his survival. This is our main point of attack, then, when we try to understand people.

Now, we could level a lot of hard words. You'll notice I haven't been using hard words as we went along, but I'll use a few hard words now, and you will see how this fits in.

A condenser sitting in an electrical circuit is, of course, converting, one way or the other, energy from one part of the circuit to the other part of the circuit. Now we can simply say it's a converting unit of one kind or another, you see.

But there's a harder word that you could put there. It's parasitic. That condenser in that electrical unit is parasitic.

It is not adding anything to the unit. It is depending for its continued existence and activity on the circuit which it is adjacent to on either side, isn't it? And it's dependent in the final analysis upon the light plant down here, isn't it? And that is dependent in the final analysis upon a bunch of fish that mocked up some black ridges and collapsed and got buried and mined a few million years ago.

This begins to look interesting. It looks like we've got an after-the-fact. Life created once, and now again we can have a condenser being parasitic upon the creativeness of life millions of years ago.

Just trace anything down and you will get its ultimate, in terms of host. A parasite requires a host. Well, somewhere along the line there's a host. See this?

All right, as we look over the pattern of life, we find all through the society, to some degree or another, a person to be in communication with the rest of the society has to depend to some degree upon that interchange of energies, whether food or economics or social. He is depending to some degree upon that to get interest, as far as he's concerned – demand interest from him to get interest from that. In other words, there's going to be an interchange of some sort.

He is only in trouble when he gets to a point where he cannot live without. And when

he can't live without something, he's in trouble – right there – because he has become parasitic, and the host is somebody else. In other words, you have *other cause*.

And every time something elects itself into a parasitic position in life, every time something does, it has elected something else cause. So we get to another process. There's an interesting process along with it, and that process is, simply have the individual either just think over and tell you or point out (however it would fit in) things he is making responsible.

You could say to this fellow, "Elect some causes for your condition." Same thing, you see. "Just what are you making responsible?" "Now, what's responsible for your being here?" is an auditing question which could be repeated over and over and over, with the fellow as-ising continually, as-ising. This is responsibility.

The fellow who is searching through his bank, endlessly, endlessly searching through his bank, is doing the thought-level dramatization which will become at length *a conversion* system. He's looking through the bank to find cause.

It's an engram that's cause, it's this that's cause, it's something else that's cause. It's cause. It's that mystery that's cause. It's the sun that's cause. It's this that's cause. It's that with cause. Something else is cause.

Eventually, this constant and continual running-fire of thought will simply become a solid, mechanical operation of conversion. He will simply ... Instead of trying to find cause on a postulate level, he will start to take energy *from*. And he'll take energy from there and there and there and there and there and there.

And there are a lot of preclears that you're running simply on this kind of a level – that you'll run eventually. They've even stopped trying to find cause; they're just trying to find a new bank to drain some energy off of.

Now, we say that a preclear is as well off as he can accept responsibility. This is an old truism. Well, he's as well off as he can create. He can create as much as he can accept responsibility for. If he can accept responsibility for his life, and for being alive, why, he can create. If he can create then he can accept responsibility for. We can attack it either way.

And what is responsibility? Responsibility is the willingness to be cause. And trying to put responsibility on something else is the effort to make something else be cause.

One of the games a thetan plays continually is trying to make something else be cause. It's a very hard thing for him to do. It's so easy for him to be cause. It's real hard for him to get something else to be cause.

So we get shame, blame and regret. We get jammed banks; we get energy deposits, black ridges and coal mines.

When we look at all of life, we can understand it in the individual by the degree that he is creating and the degree that he is converting. We can understand the individual.

We know that if he's still creating, if he still has new beingnesses, if he's still developing, he'll win. And if we know he's gone over to where he's totally converting, we know that he has become a parasite. And he is nothing more in life than a parasite. And life will kick him around accordingly.

This is the most basic understanding of life there is – for this universe, and this time and place. Okay.

# HYPNOTISM

*A lecture given on  
27 October 1954*

I'm going to talk about a very interesting, intricate, involved and complex process, which has tremendous significance in it, which is a problem to the auditor, a problem to the preclear, and so forth. Of course, now you expect me to say it's some very simple process, huh?

I'm going to fool you. I am going to talk about a complicated process – a real complicated process. It's known as hypnotism.

Now, you didn't expect me to talk to you about that today. Of course, I probably didn't expect to talk to you about it today. But a D. Scn or an expert in Dianetics who doesn't know anything about hypnotism might as well fold up his tent, because herein is wrapped up the entrance point of research and investigation in the entire field of psychotherapy. It was hypnotism which took the Aesculapians into the original psychotherapeutic – allegedly – adventure of Greek psychotherapy.

Hypnotism. It's that thing which has been practiced by witch doctors, temple priests, psychoanalysis, medical doctors, charlatans, bums, medical doctors, psychiatrists, bums, dogs, snakes – now we are getting technical – snakes, medical doctors, psychologists, scorpions, snakes, psychiatrists, since time immemorial, and has never had any success yet.

Why? Why is it at once the entrance into psychotherapy which investigation takes, and turns right around and is the worst flub anybody could have anything to do with?

That's because the whole process of hypnotism is the exact parallel process to the dwindling spiral. And if you wanted to do something for the human race which would clear it instantly, you would simply un hypnotize it. What is the multiple level of agreement but hypnotism.

Now, in the first place, what is hypnotism? You think of it as hocus-pocus. Some people don't believe it is true or, you know, they doubt hypnotism. This is silly.

Hypnotism is that process by which sufficient agreement can be made between an operator and a subject so that the subject will agree that the operator has entire and complete control of his intellectual processes, as well as his sleep, mock-up processes, et cetera, *ad infinitum*. It is that process by which the operator – the hypnotist – takes control of the machinery of the thetan by agreement.

Now, this is merely, then, a heightening of agreement to a point where an operator becomes pan-determined, and where the subject becomes not-determined – nondetermined. That's quite different, you know. There are three stages of determinism: There's nondeterminism, self-determinism, and pan-determinism.

Actually, if you want to get technical, there's really this many levels of determinism, if we look these over. And we'll have to understand this if we understand hypnotism. There are this many levels of determinism.

Maybe you will un hypnotize just while I am talking to you about this. There's this

many levels. There's nondeterminism, see. That's just complete nonentity, nonconscious, nonvolitional, *non compos mentis*, nondeterminism. It's also quite parallel to psychosis. Psychosis is actually a state of individual nondeterminism, without anybody else able to determine anything with the person, either. It's just nondeterminism.

And then there would be self-determinism. And we would consider self-determinism as first-dynamic determinism – this "I can determine my own actions. I can't determine the actions of others or anything else. There is my determinism and other-determinism." Now, the "other-determinism" contained in that sentence would be seven more dynamics, wouldn't it?

So then there would be second-dynamic determinism. Person has gotten up far enough so that he has fair determinism on the second dynamic, you see. Self-determinism and second-dynamic determinism. He could have a state of beingness which would drop out self-determinism to a marked degree and still have second-dynamic determinism markedly. You know, "it," girls; Valentino: darned little self-determinism, tremendous amount of second dynamic. You know, you've seen this around. You might as well say this is it. Some guy has – a person has tremendous sexual allure and no direction otherwise.

All right. So then we could have such a thing as group-determinism – third-dynamic determinism. Well, you could have this independently of self-determinism and sexual-determinism.

We have a fellow by the name of Hitler; had tremendous group-determinism, didn't he? He was a magnificent group determinist. Oh, magnificent. No self-determinism at all to amount to anything. The man would get down and chew the rug and tear up tablecloths. And he'd get so mad that he didn't know whether he was spitting or screaming. And he would just go into a complete fit.

And yet this individual could determine the third dynamic, couldn't he – observably could, because he united a nation and sent it forward to obliterate all other nations so it itself could commit suicide. But nevertheless, he was third-determining, wasn't he?

All right. Then there have been examples of individuals who almost obtained fourth-dynamic determinism. Now let's say, then, if we had fourth-dynamic determinism on an exclusive basis, we would have something which would merely be a species, you see.

But we don't just limit this to man as a species. It could also be the whole species of wolves, see, or the whole species of cockroaches, or the whole species of seagulls. You know, it'd just be a whole species. That is, just one species.

We have had examples of individuals almost achieving this. Christ did a pretty good job of it. Mohammed came up along that level pretty high. I mean, but here you had a fourth-dynamic determinism that was pretty good – without very much third, no second, and with practically no first dynamic.

This is a curious manifestation, right? I'm not saying Christ didn't have any of these first three dynamics, but observably he didn't.

Well, anyway, our fourth determinism, then, could be a fourth-dynamic determinism, which is simply that which would determine the course and existence of a species. And what do you know, there are thetans who run all dogs.

You know, they're the thetans who take care of dogs. Patron saint of dogs. He makes dogs. You don't think this can exist or happen, but that's a fact and it goes on every day and you don't even notice it. There is this sort of thing.

Now, fifth-determinism. Who would take care of the entire animal kingdom of a planet – plant and animal kingdom of the planet. See, you could theoretically get a



determinism, see, that could hold that in.

Actually, MEST has that determinism. Air, for instance, is fifth-determined. It is a fifth-determining factor. Air is a common denominator to anything on this planet.

All right. Let's go up a little higher and see that there could be – now we're just talking in theory, theory only – there could be such a thing as a sixth-determinism. And we see that manifestation. They think of the Creator, and so forth, who made this. He's the overall determinism.

But a fellow who could handle adequately anything in the physical universe, and a fellow who could handle adequately – he could really handle adequately – the animal and vegetable kingdoms, you see, he'd be really fifth-determined.

Now, this sixth-determined – that would be somebody who would be, well, much better skilled than any nuclear physicist we have today, but it'd be a person who was really good on the sixth dynamic. And he could determine the course of the sixth dynamic with great expertness.

Now, seventh dynamic – well, actually we had a whole cult of people back in the eighth century called the magicians who specialized exclusively in handling the seventh dynamic. And they were seventh-dynamic determined. And their studies were so concentrated on the seventh dynamic, that as we go back down the line, we discover that they were very, very poor on the first, second, third and fourth dynamics, pretty good on the fifth, fair – just vaguely fair – on the sixth, but terrific on the seventh. And these were men, even as you and I.

Now, an eighth-determinism – a fellow who had ... If we speak of the Supreme Being, you might think of the ... The Pope, maybe, is very strong on the eighth dynamic. He has good eighth-dynamic determinism. But maybe he's very weak on the rest of the dynamics. In other words, we have this as the exclusive thing.

Now, we've got self-determinism – which we might as well call first-dynamic determinism – second-dynamic determinism, third-dynamic determinism, fourth-, fifth-, sixth-, seventh-, eighth-dynamic determinism, and pan-determinism. But, of course, at the bottom we have nondeterminism.

Now, an individual is as alive, is as awake, is as alert and is going to make as much a success out of things as he finds these various dynamics controllable by himself. In other words, he is able to influence these various dynamics, to work in these dynamics; his urge toward survival is perfectly well channeled along these dynamics.

This individual is as strong as he can determine these dynamics, as he can have an urge toward survival through these dynamics. In other words, an individual is as well-off as his dynamics are free and expressed.

This society frowns enormously on the second dynamic. It must not be freely expressed. There, if you just hold down one dynamic, you see ... That's a very bad thing, to put something like this in a lecture, because we're apparently advocating free love and everything else. But if you just hold down that second dynamic you will adequately and amply suppress the remaining seven.

Now, let's just hold down the first dynamic and we will still suppress to some degree the other seven. Let's hold down just one's love of animals, you see, and we will get the thing echoing on the other seven, because this bundle is interrelated.

Individuals, then, can demonstrate a greater capability on one dynamic than another but will never entirely escape or be free, as long as any dynamic is completely and entirely suppressed, or even harshly suppressed.

All we have to do is suppress one of an individual's dynamics and we have to some

degree made a prisoner out of him; we've chained him down. Some of his urges to survival are not channelable. He can't express them.

All right. What kind of a situation is this where an individual has his dynamics all the way cut down to a point where he is permitting somebody else to express all these dynamics for him in a sort of an hypnotic state, hm?

He's put in a nondetermined category, hasn't he – nondeterminism. And it all goes, as it goes in Asia, according to fate, Kismet, you know – fate, fate, fate; not my responsibility, not my responsibility.

And we get all these eight dynamics, then, very markedly suppressed by asking the individual simply to step off the boat. That's hypnotism.

You get him to agree that he's under control on one dynamic or another and the next thing you know, why, you have him in a state where you can say, "A large dog is now standing in front of you," and by God, he'll see a dog! And this is the immediate result of suppressing dynamics thoroughly.

Well, this practice of hypnotism is an expert, well-channeled, extremely well practiced suppression of as many dynamics as possible where one individual is concerned or where a group is concerned. It's also expressed as mass hysteria. You'll have large masses of people go into an hysteria of getting a similar illness.

It is enough for some fellow to come along and be president of the United States who had a gimpy leg and was moaning and groaning around about polio, to shoot upscale the percentage of polio incident in the United States to a point where it is now quite an alarming illness. See, he popularized it.

But, actually, he was in a position of authority and control, and he all of a sudden could start talking about this polio, polio, and giving himself an object example.

And people who have illnesses are actually simply communicating... Any form, any shape is a communication, by the way. Let me interject that: *any* form, *any* shape is a communication. When a person becomes absolutely insistent upon communication, he starts to take solid form. When a person is entirely insistent upon a communication, he gives it solid form. You understand that? We put it in writing; that's the first thing. The next thing you know, he's wearing a somatic.

This solid-form relay of communication is expressed on sort of an hypnotic level. All of a sudden somebody in power can communicate to everybody that what they ought to have – you know, by just being that – they ought to immediately have themselves a fine case of polio. And sure enough, polio becomes an alarming disease. Adults all over the place are getting polio now. Whoever heard of polio before this?

So the problem of hypnotism is simply the problem of control. It is the problem of determinism. When a hypnotist starts in, he's got an individual there who is to some degree subjugated to his will. And he then, by a process – a gradient scale of agreement – builds up the fact to where the hypnotist has actually taken the place of the subject's will. Control and will has transferred in this case.

And that is the goal of psychoanalysis! And psychoanalysis has no other goal! Now, I'm not talking through my hat on that. I don't know whether you have been issued or not yet at this time your Freudian lectures. Well, all right, when you look that over you'll see that we have to have people transferring around, according to psychoanalysis, before we get anybody well.

If you can just get a patient to transfer over and be the analyst, why, you've succeeded. Think of what you would do as an auditor if every preclear you had was to become you, and that's all. That was your total cure, was to have that preclear become

you.

And now let's you be, not your fairly-good-shape self, but a seedy, rattlebrained guy who is completely overboard on the second dynamic, hm? How about this? Is this psychotherapy or is it hypnotism? It's hypnotism. We're trying to get the patient to transfer into the identity of the analyst. And in old-time psychoanalysis – its worst possible manifestations – a patient would walk miles just to find out whether or not he should go out on a date or eat dinner. If he couldn't get on the phone he'd walk miles to see his analyst to consult him to find out whether or not he ought to spit.

This is the condition in psychoanalysis. It is an hypnotic condition by which one takes a practice and puts it into an hypnotic rapport to such a degree that the practice then sort of moves on an automaton basis, totally on the advices of the analyst. And analysts aren't that good. And individuals aren't that good – and they never will be – so that they can mock up an entire universe for a bunch of inhabitants.

You've got to have some level of work here, whereby people have some individual self-determinism before you make anything work. The way you make everything completely unworkable is to make a complete pan-determinism utterly enforced upon all dynamics, with a nondeterminism in the other individuals – and that is hypnotism.

Pan-determinism is the road out. But does this mean that an individual must seek his own sanity and escape over the hypnotized bodies of populaces? No, it sure doesn't.

One does not and cannot use others as steppingstones for his road up or out. When you use others as steppingstones you will discover that you are suppressing one of your own dynamics, which is one of the trickiest problems that anybody ever faced.

Perfectly all right to go out here and say, "I am going to be the ruler of the world," and get yourself a bunch of machine guns and atom bombs and golf clubs – or whatever they use these days in the highest rulers – and say, "Well now, the way we're going to become ruler of the world is to simply stand everybody up against the walls that disagrees with us and mow 'em all down."

And the individual that does this is eventually mowed down – so that somebody looking at it and not analyzing it all will say that he who lives by the sword dies by the sword.

This isn't true, by the way. He who doesn't live by the sword in a civilization that is living by the sword – he dies much quicker by the sword. The whole problem here is simply how long does one hang on.

But this individual who goes out and machine-guns everybody down, and so forth, is actually suppressing one of his own dynamics. He's suppressing his third and fourth dynamic.

Your military conqueror going out here with a whole flock of machine guns and shooting down the populace, or passing a whole bunch of laws and hiring a bunch of cops to arrest everybody that didn't obey them ... Same thing, only it's just a little slower look. This situation would never result in any greater freedom or progress for anybody. All it would result in would be the depression of the individual who was doing it. "Do not send to find for whom the bell tolls, it tolls for thee." Now, that's a very, very true statement – in spite of Ernest Hemingway's using the first part of it. It certainly does.

Here we have, however, two looks we can take at this. We can have this look where we are all meshed in here together into a great brotherhood which is entirely inseparable – something like a whole bunch of dough poured into a pan where each one of us is just a molecule in this mass of dough. Or this mass of dough can be in something like an

agreement that man has a right to be free, and so the individual particles of it can pull out and separate themselves from the dough or be part of the dough at will. If they can't do that, they never escape from the dough.

So you have man doing the most incomprehensible thing of being the great brotherhood. He does not admit of a soul. He would not even look in the teeth anything like psychotherapy. If there is anything they detest in Eurasia, by the way, it's really psychotherapy. They're terribly afraid of it. It's a superstitious thing: You're not supposed to tamper with somebody else's soul, or something of the sort.

Well, if you're not supposed to tamper with somebody else's soul, you'll never have a chance to set anybody else free. If you can't set somebody else free, don't try to free yourself; you won't be able to.

That's the end product of this thing called hypnotism. If you're going to go around and suppress every intellect so that only you are in control of that intellect, and then you're going to try to be free, I invite you sometime to be in my office or the closet or something of the sort when a hypnotist walks in to me and asks for processing.

These people don't ask for processing, they beg for it! They beg with a desperation which gets them tears in their eyes. They get down on their knees, "Please, please. For God sakes, process me."

It's a fantastic thing. I mean, you've never heard a plea like some old-time, long-duration hypnotist will make. He has enslaved so many intelligences, overtly, that he at last has come to a point where he himself is so enslaved that he can't budge or exhibit free will in his activities and environment. And he gets to a point of where he realizes he's just about down the third time.

And he hears about Dianetics or Scientology, and he thinks, "Oh, boy, this is for me." And then he gets somebody to read the book and process him. And he puts somebody reading the book, or something, under terrific duress, you know. And "You have got to process me as soon as you finish this," and you know, all this. And of course it doesn't work. It's just himself being processed, kind of by a circuit. It'd take a good auditor to do anything for him. A good auditor can.

Well, what about this? If hypnotism is so very, very bad ... ? I'm not saying it's bad; I'm merely demonstrating the condition it results in. And if its condition that it results in is so desperate for both the hypnotized and the hypnotizer, why, then it must be an interesting state of affairs.

So if we look across the whole field we can find that we can induce hypnotism on any dynamic merely by suppressing the determinism of an individual on that dynamic and supplanting that determinism with one's own will.

Now, as I talk to you and teach you in various ways about life, about the mind, about other things, I ask you every time when you look over this information ... I'll teach you a process, yes, with great ardor. I'll teach you a process so that you will do it right. That's because a lot of experience says that's the right way to do a process. But, I never for one moment – never for one moment – ask you to take anything completely on its face value. You do this technique, it makes people well for you. Fine. That's right.

But it isn't making them well for you because I say so. It's because you are dealing with the woof and warp of existence which we happen to be dealing with. And you can see that it makes them well. And if it doesn't, you will be the first one to abandon the process. The time to abandon a process, however, is after you have used it with great expertness.

Now, this then would demonstrate whether or not it was a good process for you or

not. But the six processes which I have given you are working and do work for auditors all across the boards. And all of these processes are devoted to the same goal – devoted to raising the determinism of the individual. Now, I didn't say self-determinism, but raising the determinism of the individual – his ability to decide to make up his mind, to associate or not associate at will. That's the goal of all these processes. And that's your goal, too, under instruction.

You've had a great many curtains, a great many doors, a great many labyrinths stretched out in all directions, all composed of a great many lies. Somewhere out of this there was one or two or three or four ladders, certainly, by which you could stop circulating in the midst of these labyrinths and getting trap doors slapped in your face, and so forth. You could stop this and come out along some kind of an even line and walk out into some sunlight and look at this thing as a fairly clear picture, and view out in front of you. If this does not do that for you, it doesn't do it for you. Just because *I say* it will do it for you is no reason it will do it for you.

It was necessary to locate some of the central threads of truth and weave them together in some fashion so that a ladder was thus created. But we have nowhere along this line gone deeper into, and departed further into, arduous and onerous – more arduous, more onerous – methods of control and duress for preclears.

Yes, an auditor today, because of the velocity of his processes and so forth can be sharper, can be more insistent, and so forth to a preclear than he could previously. But look at where we've graduated from in psychotherapy. In Book One it talks about Dianetic reverie. You realize that Dianetic reverie is the thinnest upper level possible of hypnotism. Here the auditor had to take a certain amount of control over the preclear's bank in order to get the preclear's bank operating at all. And then by knocking out enough held-down fives, why, the preclear would become more awake or alive than previously.

The only excuse we had for doing this, for inducing anything like an attentive state of mind on the part of a preclear, was because preclears were not able, in the main, to do these processes without this. Therefore, the processes themselves were a little too complicated, weren't they? Certainly, if an auditor did them with some inexpertness, they were very complicated.

All right. So we moved out of this level of Dianetic reverie. But remember, my first investigations were undertaken at the deepest levels of hypnotism. I was looking for the unconscious mind. And I found out it was a lie. I found out it didn't exist – that there was no unconscious mind. But I found that during moments of unconsciousness there was a recording mechanism which recorded everything. That didn't look like an unconscious mind, did it? It looked like a mind that was terribly conscious. This was a different look.

The books of Sigmund Freud, as much of an assistance as they have been, are yet filled with the most tremendous balderdash on the subject of the barbaric and inhuman and horrible and savage impulses on the part of man.

This civilized man, to Freud – this civilized man walking down the street in a suit and a necktie and tipping his hat nicely to the ladies, and dropping a dime in the old blind man's cup – was actually a hairy, frothing beast who was very, very barely under restraint. And this horrible nightmare under the surface, you see – he knew it himself – was man. What do you think this is, except just being able to point out to everybody how bad it is over there, huh?

All right. That isn't what man's composed of. Man is in a rather puzzled state of sleepwalk. He's asleep, you might say, to the degree that he is suppressed on any dynamic. How much of a dynamic is alive? Well, as much of a dynamic is alive as is alive. And

where's the rest of the dynamic? It's asleep. Now, you could just say that as a rough truism on the thing, and it'd be more or less right.

As you wake him up, his urge toward survival wakes up. And he is not a savage, hairy, nightmare beast who would much rather strangle the blind man with his necktie than drop a dime in, who would much rather cut a woman to pieces and tear her to pieces than tip his hat to her. This is not man – not man at all.

Man is terrifically suppressed, yes. But – new look – it's his good qualities that are suppressed, not his bad ones. Curious, huh? Curious thing. I mean it was a complete reverse.

As you unsuppress a man, you find of course that he will go up through bands of anger and be upset with the world at large. It's like somebody waking up and finding out that the person left to guard the house had set it afire.

And he, of course, gets resentful about these things. But as far as his cruelty, his bestiality, and so forth – these things I have yet to observe. And I have probably pulled more individuals up through the depths than any other guy here today. And I have yet to observe these savage and bestial characters which were the unconscious, reconscious, up-or-down conscious mind of man. That mind isn't there at all. If a mind is asleep, it's asleep. This is unlike a facsimile. A facsimile can be parked over here someplace and can use you as a target. But boy, do you have to be asleep before a facsimile can operate. And as soon as you start to wake up, you take a look at the thing and you say, "Look at this thing here," and – *pshew!* – gone. You just as-is it as you wake up.

So then, man's waking up is much more important than his going to sleep, as far as therapy is concerned. And yet therapy has been on a 180-degree vector. It has insisted that the only way to make a man well was to put him to sleep; the only way you made a man sane was to put a straitjacket on him. To beat in his anchor points with whips: that was the way to make men sane. And nobody, in all the millennia man has been on earth, has ever made one individual sane or better with straitjackets, whips or any other mechanism which suppressed his dynamics. That's a curious thing.

If they would just open up the front door right now and bring in somebody who had gotten well, who observably was better through having been hypnotized, I would take back at least one one-hundredth of what I've said today.

Yes, you can get a fellow so apathetic that he will no longer register a facsimile. Yes, you can get a fellow so convinced on other-determinism that he's well, that he'll go around like a little automaton saying, "I'm well. I'm well."

One of the craziest preclears I ever had, every time you'd ask this preclear how she was, she'd say, "I'm fine." She'd be sitting there with a broken leg and she'd say, "I'm fine." She was just a phonograph record. You couldn't get any information out of this person, and actually, communication lagged from here to Halifax. And there's your hypnotized case.

So as people go down the dwindling spiral, as their abilities, urges, dynamics in life suppress, they're going gradually to sleep. And they go gradually to sleep on the first, the second, the third, the fourth, the fifth, the sixth and seventh and eighth.

And hypnotism is an activity engaged in by this universe. And the hypnotizing of people is simply the dramatization of the physical universe. This is the universe which helps you all out – makes it unnecessary for you to exhibit any volition or initiative. This universe gives you the promise that all you've got to do is relax and it'll all be done for you. Lots of energy everywhere; no need for *you* to create any.

And people run into brick walls and they get knocked out. And when they wake up again they're not quite as awake as before. Curious business, curious business.

The society at large specializes in putting people to sleep about things. For instance, for some reason or other the American public today has gone to sleep on the subject of the atom bomb. This is about ... Yes, it has. We did a little survey and it was a very curious thing. I finally got one guy awake enough on the first dynamic where he thought it might be ... After I'd described to him the possible plan, well, to avert atomic destruction in the United States and so forth – and all of it very sensible, sort of ... you know, easy; no mad-dog stuff about it at all, just a gentle sort of a discussion about it – he finally opined at the end of a half-an-hour-or-so's discussion that, you know, he maybe should put in the supply of food for himself that is advocated by the civil-defense people.

We'd been talking to him on the fourth dynamic: What's man going to do? See? And this dopey bum – he gets awake enough so that he says, "Well, I'll go out and get a few cans of spinach and put them on the shelf."

Man is very, very null to this thing. It's about as sensible to be completely null to this thing as to go and get yourself a great big black panther, see, and then neglect to feed him. And then put him in your bedroom and forget; go to sleep on the subject that you'd done it. *Duhhh!* That's just about as safe, you know?

And yet, man and individuals everywhere have simply gone to sleep on the subjects of this character. If they're going to live in a world which has various items, such as atom bombs and fast cars that run over people and so forth, it very easily goes to sleep on these subjects. It just doesn't see them anymore. Well, nonperception or nonexistence – the condition of not-iness can simply be neglecting to look.

See, the building is gradually falling in. And you just stand there completely unaware of it. And the bricks are making a horrible sound, and everything is going on there. And obviously, to anybody who could look at all, the building is falling in. And yet maybe you'd just stand there and let the building fall in on you – if you were asleep on the subject of buildings falling in; you wouldn't even notice this building.

There's a little nightmare condition here that might amuse you some night when you can't sleep. It may very well be that this world is full of the strangest beasts. It may be that this universe, or an adjacent universe which impinges directly upon your universe, might be completely overloaded with utter walking horrors which could snuff out your whole existence in an instant, and yet you would be so asleep you wouldn't perceive them. Because the whole subject of perception is actually one of agreement. We agree a wall is there, it's there.

Next time you exteriorize some preclear and he doesn't immediately see the walls of the room, don't you get upset. You'll have to educate him a little bit before he can see them.

Because, did it ever occur to you, they probably aren't there while he's outside? Or maybe as a thetan he's so asleep that he's below the point where he can see them; they're there, but he can't see them at all?

How about the way man has been walking around with all these facsimiles, huh? How about old Fac One? Did you ever run a Fac One on somebody and watch the guy practically come to pieces? Did you ever run birth on anybody and see him come apart? Did you ever throw anybody into a prenatal, and he unwittingly (and utterly impossible to restrain it) simply curled up in a ball on the bed? Hm?

Well, gee-whiz, there was something sitting right there, see? There was something sitting right there – no visibility. Well, the condition there is once upon a time he agreed

that it could sit there, you see, and then he's blinded himself to it. And it can go right on sitting there and affecting him to some degree. But he isn't looking at it. He's asleep about it.

Now, if you start to wake an individual up, these things very often will pop up and disappear faster than he could simply count them. In other words, as he wakes up he again regains control of them.

Now, what do we mean by forget and remember? You can remember those things over which you have some slight control. You forget those things over which you have no control.

What is awake? Awake is a degree of participation or control. Asleep is no participation, no control.

Do you know that you could take a car out here and fix it up in some trick way so when you turned the wheel to the right, the wheel sometimes went to the left and sometimes to the right, that the ignition key turned upside down in order to turn on, the brakes were the clutch, and the gear shift was operated from the back seat.

Now, we give it to an individual and start beating him around – this uncontrollable car – and we just beat this individual around and force him to drive this car and force him to drive it. And of course, it keeps falling apart, and it does this and does that and won't drive, and so forth. And we just keep hounding him about that car as a theoretical experiment.

Theoretically, the car – if you left it to sit in the backyard after you'd stopped the experiment – would become markedly invisible to him. Could still affect him, but it would be invisible to him. Parts of it would be missing.

People lose those things that they doubt their control over. They lose them. This fellow who's always losing his pocketbook – he doesn't think he has any control over the ebb or flow of money. You see, his pocketbook.

People who have failed to solve enormous numbers of problems will lose keys. They do all sorts of weird symbolisms with regard to this.

What is this all about? Is it any big unconscious reaction? Yes, an unconscious reaction. They are no longer conscious of a still-existing problem. They are now blind to this problem. They no longer see this problem.

A very curious manifestation one time: a preclear had been unable to exert any control of any kind over his wife for a long period of time – some years. This person was always completely unpredictable. And by the way, many people will tell you it is very good to be unpredictable. If they're telling you it's very good to be so very unpredictable, they are simply telling you that they're scared. You see, you'd only have to be unpredictable if you were afraid of other forces. And these people think of it as a virtue. They're pretty crazy – people who have to be completely and continually unpredictable. You never know what they're going to say next or do next.

All right. In this particular case, this woman had been utterly uncontrollable for a long, long period of time. Unpredictable is uncontrollable – same thing. You have to be able to predict to control.

And so, the condition had finally come about to where this fellow was almost crazy as far as she was concerned. No place else in the universe was he very badly off, but he was really badly off there.

The woman was always doing something peculiar or odd that he couldn't predict, couldn't control. He couldn't predict her, therefore he couldn't control her. Even to any ... And he couldn't agree with her on anything because she would inhibit anybody agreeing



with her. This was one of her manifestations.

He was living with a psycho, and such a plausible psycho – you know, it all seemed so reasonable – that he kept thinking something must be wrong with him.

And one day he took a look at this woman, and all of a sudden a black curtain simply rolled down across the front of her and she disappeared behind blackness. He couldn't see her anymore. That's right. With his physical vision – just as strong and solid a black curtain as anything that you ever rolled up and down in front of a window.

This is not a peculiar manifestation. I mean, it happens quite often. In this case, he blacked her out. She was so unpredictable, he didn't dare look at her anymore.

And as soon as I ran a process approximating something like this: "Some things about her which you could predict" ... And he finally predicted – with rather some glee, I'm ashamed to say – the fact that someday she would die. This, for sure. He could predict that. He could predict something else, and he could predict something else. Yes, he could predict that tomorrow, some time or another, she'd eat; also, tomorrow, sometime or another, she'd certainly tell a lie; also, this and that, and other things.

Next time he saw her, there was no black curtain of any kind, but she'd gotten a little thin. You know? She was just a little faint. She was not stopping light waves the way she should be. It'd gone the other way, because I'd specialized on one thing: raising his determinism on this person. Do you know that after that he was able to control this woman? So much so, that it was no longer a game, and he left her – no longer a game. I mean, she was totally predictable as far as he was concerned.

He actually got to the point of where he knew what she was going to do. But at the same time I was running this, we were running a number of other dynamics. And we were getting the predictability of each one of these other dynamics.

"What can you predict about the physical universe? What can you predict about it?"

"Well, there's this and there's this and there's this and there's this." "What can you predict about sex?"

"This and this and this and this."

"And what can you predict about yourself?"

"Well, this and this and this and this and something." Predict-control, see?

And, next thing you know, predict-control-determinism; we've got a package there. Next thing you know, this person knew when stoplights were going to go on and when they were going to go off, and when this was going to happen and when that was going to happen – not on a telepathic basis, but a total-knowing basis. He knew what people ... This, by the way, almost drove him batty: He knew what people were going to say couple of paragraphs before they said it! Well, he was listening to them. Life became a little bit upsetting to him, till all of a sudden he found an activity or a game here on earth which was sufficient to his pace. And he did; he got real interested in life in general. Went out to Inyo-Kern. Started fooling around with rockets and all kinds of things that had good, high velocities, you know.

Well, now this is not particularly an isolated case – somebody getting a black curtain across them, and getting perfectly thin and so forth. You actually have this case where a thetan has dropped a curtain across himself and his bank. He can't predict the bank anymore, so he just blacks it out. What he can't predict, he obscures.

Now, the entrance to mystery is unpredictation. And from unpredictability we go into poor perception. And from poor perception we go into the blackness of mystery. As we trace this scale, we'd very often halt as auditors if we didn't know that the blackness was going to dissolve and leave us a thin field, very often, with the preclear – which is going

to be upsetting to him.

If you really pulled his determinism all the way along up the line, he'd have to put the sidewalk there while he's walking down the street before he could walk on it – see, I mean, if he was really all the way up the line. The world is a mock-up; a very, very interesting one, but it's still a mock-up.

All right. Now, the subject of mystery, then, is a subject of confusion of particles – nonpredictable particles. So those things which are unpredictable to the individual are those things which an individual cannot control.

What does hypnotism do? Hypnotism pulls all the pins of prediction out from underneath him – even though hypnotism is sometimes used to make people tell you about the future. You see that? You put a person into a trance and ask him about the future. It's always going to be the wrong future, but we'll neglect that. There's always something wrong with that future. He is going to lose his ability to predict because he has already given over his control to somebody else.

Now, if you give over complete control of yourself, or if you're in an unwitting, non-agreed-upon course of some sort or another that just leads you deeper and deeper and deeper into somebody else's control – so that you're finally finding out what to eat and so forth at somebody else's say-so – you eventually will be unable to predict anything. And life will therefore appear to be a very anxious thing to you, won't it? And eventually, everything will go black and you'll have a preclear with a black field.

Now, you, exerting control as an auditor over the mental phenomena of other preclears and pulling them up out of the mud, are doing something very interesting: You're increasing your own control, you're increasing their control, and from this you could not other than proceed out into a wider control of other dynamics, could you, by increasing control. What does Opening Procedure of 8-C do but wake somebody up?

Well, let's get some kind of a rather sloppy but nevertheless true statement, then, with regard to the human race. We could say the human race consists of a number of individuals who have gone almost entirely to sleep. They are walking around to some degree in a trance. And that trance is absolutely no different from an hypnotic trance. There's no difference. You can induce this same kind of trance.

The way you really knock out somebody's education is to educate him in an hypnotic way: You educate him monotonously. You educate him under duress. You make the punishment just horrible if he were to miss. You install an examination system, whereas at the end of each semester he is supposed to regurgitate what he has imbibed during his semester back onto a piece of paper to the instructor's satisfaction. And when you get through, you will have wiped out an individual's control of the subject he's studying. Let's not miss on this. Let's look over the fate of people who have been ground too hard under too much duress on a subject, and we find out they've lost control of the subject.

They might have gotten A's all the way through school. And they get through school and you ask them, "Would you mind coming over and estimating the number of BTU which will be required to heat this particular tank?" And, boy, they have to start from scratch. Then you have to turn around to a journeyman plumber, or something of the sort, and ask him how many he customarily uses.

What's happened? You've got an obliteration by control. Anytime a school, over a long period of time, insists on a supercontrol of its students, you get no control of the subject studied – contrary to popular opinion.

Yet if you yourself cared to take a review of a number of people who had studied some subject very arduously, and had not had a chance wake themselves up by practicing

it, you would find out that they were almost obliterated on the subject, as far as their memory is concerned.

Now, because they've studied toward it, people expect them to practice it, and they start in practicing it and it's just as though they were running 8-C now. They're being put into the intimate contact of the subject. And they forget or never recall in school, but they will learn the subject all over again from another way.

An ensign trained under terrific duress, terrific control, for ninety days or six months or something of the sort, and then brought on board a ship, is like a sleepwalker. And he starts to wake up the moment he sees the engine-room telegraph, and he looks at this big brass telegraph, and he looks at it there, and he says, "What's that?"

And the quartermaster says, "Well, that's an engine-room telegraph."

"An engine-room telegraph. Well, well, well. What does it do?"

"Well, it tells the engine room how fast to drive the engines."

"Is that so? Hm, engine-room telegraph."

And he walks over, starts to swing it back and forth, and the quartermaster stops him. But his education has started.

Now he has to have and exert control over the actual things in which he was educated. Why the hell wasn't he ever educated to exert exact control over those things in the first place? Why was he retarded for 90 or 180 days in his education and control of objects and ships?

Do you realize what an awful lot of stress it puts on somebody to have to continually override misconcepts of training all the way along the line? Puts a heck of a load on the thing.

All right. What's happened to him? He's been put under terrific duress and control, and he's been made to go to sleep for 90 or 180 days on his subject. Now how long is it going to take him to wake him up on this subject?

If he was fairly alert to begin with, it won't take very long. But if he was real alert, he wouldn't have consented to study it. He'd have been a complete rebel; they would have thrown him out and would have nothing to do with him at all. That's what would have happened to him.

Uniformly, as we look back across history, we find out that there were very, very, very few people who ever graduated, who wrote the history of a subject. Now, why is this?

It's not because it is true that just because an individual is trained he can't function. This is not the conclusion to draw out of that. The conclusion to draw out of it is, is the only way you can train is by successively waking somebody up on the subject in which he's being trained, and give him control over it. And therefore you could train somebody.

Now, I daresay – following this same pattern of training today – if we were teaching you, let us say, to handle tractors, I daresay (knowing what we know) that the pattern of training would have to do with taking the various parts and functions and operations of a tractor, and breaking it down into a schedule, and going out and putting you on a tractor, and making you use or perform that particular evolution until you had entire confidence in performing it. And by the end of the time you'd been trained, you certainly would know practically anything that this would do. And you would be able to control any part of this tractor. And, boy, would you be a tractor operator.

Similarly, if we were teaching you the field of chemistry, and we walked out for any length of time at all, out of the roomful of test tubes, and if we omitted taking you through industrial plants, and so forth, on this level, and made you actually control things in those

industrial plants – if we omitted those steps, you would never get out a chemist.

But if we kept you close to the substance, kept you in control of the various chemical functions of various things and the preparations of things – not to write them down in an examination book and then figure it out and twist the experiment so as to give the instructor the right answer; that's the wrong way to do it – but actually had you going down the line, giving the answer *you got* (that would be the main thing), you would wind up in the end, a chemist.

Oddly enough, one of the greatest chemists in the field of explosions was John Parsons. John Parsons is dead. He got too good. He blew himself off the map here two or three years ago. He was a good pal of mine. But this man was sought out – when they really had a press on – he was sought out by the U.S. government, to tell it what to do about solid fuels when they wanted to knock out Tokyo. Remember the raid, Doolittle's bombers, and so forth? Well, they couldn't get these light bombers off an aircraft without putting a rocket assist, and they didn't have a fuel. So they came and found John Parsons. Very curious thing: The government at first was unable to hire him, in spite of his fame in the field of chemistry and explosives, in spite of his record and his attainments. Why? Because he didn't have any degrees in chemistry! That was a terrible situation, wasn't it?

But do you know how he studied chemistry? He was a bad boy in school. He wouldn't conform in any direction. But an old, mild old English teacher – a British instructor – finally found out that the boy was interested in test tubes. So he simply turned him loose in a room full of them and said, "John, you go ahead."

And nobody controlled him to the slightest degree, and he went to that school some years. He graduated from there the foremost genius in the field of explosives in the United States.

Now, there's an interesting thing, isn't it? It isn't that there's anything wrong with formal education. But there is a great deal wrong in educating somebody so as to put him under control and put him to sleep on the subject – in other words, hypnotize him.

If you want to get results on a preclear, you only depend on one thing: Recognizing that he is in a somewhat-hypnotized state, and depend upon your ability to wake him up out of that state by making him contact at least the physical environment as in 8-C.

If you're going to instruct a student, then you're going to insist that that student learn how to control the field of his instruction. And if you specialize on him as a case, you're done – because you are putting him under control, aren't you? But if you specialize on him, on somebody who *handles* cases, and show him how, you're demonstrating a continuous control over other people, aren't you?

And by getting him to demonstrate his control, by getting him to exercise it and use it, you will wake him up – little by little, more and more. And he'll become more and more alert. And he'll think, "Boy, I sure was a dumb bunny before that course began. But now I really know what I'm doing."

And if you have taught him to take in under his control all those factors with which he's operating, you will have succeeded. And if you have put him into a point or position where you have demonstrated to him he can't control yet, or ever, the factors you're training him in, you'll put him to sleep.

And hypnotism is accomplished simply by demonstrating to a person that he is not able to control, but that somebody else controls him. That's all there is to the subject, and actually that's all there is to training.

Okay.

# WHAT WOULD YOU DO IF... ?

*A lecture given on  
28 October 1954*

All right. Just a little discussion here.

We have an old lady with clumpfugosis. We've only got an hour to audit her.

This is conditions of processing. A little drill, a little question-and-answer here. I'm going to turn one of these microphones around so that it faces you.

And we've only got an hour to audit this character. She's very, very urgent on the subject, for her clumpfugosis is horrible. And actually, the medical profession has delineated her condition as obstetrically orthopedic. And this has worried her a great deal.

And you are the auditor. And she only bought processing to the degree of twelve dollars and a half. Or at best, you're doing it on charity. And you've only got an hour to do this. You only got an hour to do this process.

Well, let's find out what the Hubbard Professional College visitor here has to say. What would you do?

Male voice: I've got an idea.

You've got an idea?

Male voice: Yeah.

That's more than these boys have. What is it?

Male voice: Have her spot a spot in space in the room and move her clumpfugosis into it.

You would, huh?

*Male voice: And then out of it. And then back into it.*

Boy, you guys are being real fascinating. I'll tell you what you'd do with it: you'd *leave it alone*. That's what you'd do with it. You wouldn't monkey with it. That's what you'd do with it. You'd give her *standard auditing*. That's what you'd do with it. And I guess you guys all went overboard on that hook question. Tricky guy, this Hubbard. He's mean.

What would you do with it? Do you realize that she's holding up in life something of *vast* interest and you, you sucker, come along and validate the fact that this is the most interesting thing in the world, this clumpfugosis. And do you suppose she's going to let go of it now? Brother, she's not! She's going to clutch it to her over-developed bosom.

So what do you do with this? I'll tell you several things you could do with it. You could say, how she was and how old she was and how young she was or anything else; you could get her into communication with you. You could ask her what seemed to be her problem in life, or if she's having any problems she would like to discuss with you. And of course, she will tell you about her clumpfugosis.

Now, it'll be a great temptation on your part, at this moment, to keep emphasizing this; be a great temptation. And so you would ask her, "Well, how do your problems seem to you now?" This is a very, very covert method of getting her attention off of this. "How does it seem to you now?" Make her as-is some of it. Do something.

But your mission is to get her talking in a two-way communication. And if you could simply get her talking in a two-way communication, and not mentioning clumpfungosis, she would recover from it. But if you audited it, you would go on talking about clumpfungosis for the next eighty-five thousand hours of processing, if she is maybe sixty or seventy years old. These people have learned how to persist, if they've learned nothing out of life.

Now, do I make my point adequately and amply clear? Hm?

One of the reasons I bring this up at this moment is one of the Instructors this morning came in with a horrible somatic and wanted to know what you would do for a specific somatic – thinking back to those good old days in Dianetics when we let people be interesting – and I validated it for him; it didn't let up. I made my point. Tomorrow sometime he's going to all of a sudden realize that the point was made.

If I had asked him ... If I'd been in a kind, mild mood and felt that humanity included Instructors, I would have had him spot some spots in the room. Because listen, listen here, he couldn't possibly have a somatic unless he were holding it to himself. Do you understand this?

Now let's get this in a much sillier-looking way. This fellow is standing there with a big box. He's got his number twelve glove-sized mitts wrapped around the outside of this box. And he is pushing it in solidly against his chest and he is saying to you, "How am I going to get rid of this box? How am I going to get rid of this terrible burden which I have here in my hands? Because *I'm* not holding on to it."

Do we see something here? He's saying, "I'm not holding on to it. I have nothing to do with it. Not me. All I can notice is the part of the box which is pushing my silly face in. And I haven't got hold of it."

You're standing there and you're looking at him, and he's got his two hands on the outside of the box and *he is* holding it.

Now, of course, if you've got it in a material-universe situation you'd just say, "Well, just let go of the thing. Go on, let go of it."

And he'd let go of the box and maybe it'd hurt his toe or something as it fell, but it would fall.

Now, let's say this somatic, this chronic somatic, is a big box. And your preclear comes into the room, you know, lugging it into the room, you know, and lugs it in and says, "You've got to let me let go of this box, because something is holding it to me." And you could come around here and try to pry their fingers loose, and so forth, and they'd just hold on tighter.

Now, supposing you paid attention to this fantastic fallacy that only one end of the box, the end closest to their face and chest, was known to them. Supposing you just paid attention to the fact and then you tried to erase, in some peculiar fashion, one end of the box. Listen, you'd still have the other end of the box, wouldn't you? Hm?

And that's why chronic somatics don't release – because guys are holding them to their chest.

Now, let's get this fellow with a crooked spine. He's got a crooked spine and he wants you to straighten out his spine for him. That's what he's really interested in. That's the only thing he's interested in.

If you could see this fellow as a large and ambitious thetan with a human body with one hand at the base of the spine, and the other hand up here around the neck, pushing like mad to condense the spine, you are getting a proper look at the preclear. What you've seen is a human body walk in with a thetan holding that spine in a distorted situation.

Now, through the body – a ventriloquist's dummy; a sort of a seeing-eye dog for this thetan – this ventriloquist's dummy says to you, "Would you please do something about my crooked spine?"

The body has no volition with regard to this crooked spine at all. But the thetan – the one you're really talking to – is holding it there in a crook.

And then you could go around and say, "Crooked spine. Well, it sure is crooked." The thetan, you know, he'd say, "Hm. Now I'm doing it."

But you're talking to all there is there. You're talking to all there is. There is no other unconscious motive.

What's happened here is the guy grabbed on to his spine one day – his body's spine, you see – and went *crunch!* and then forgot that he did it. That's really what has happened. He's done this and he said, "That hurt," and it kind of blurred him a little bit and so on, and he went on holding on to it, saying, "If I let go, it'll hurt twice as hard."

Listen, does your face hurt – to give you an explanation of this – does your face hurt when you run into a wall at the moment of impact or when you have withdrawn from the wall? Which place does it hurt? The exact instant of impact or a moment afterwards? Hm?

Male voice: After.

So people get trained response that it is the recoil mechanism which is painful. Letting go is what is painful, not holding on or hitting. The bounce is what's painful. It didn't hurt when you hit the ground, but when you bounced, that hurt. It didn't hurt till you got up. Do you get this as a training pattern? Hm? And that's the way they think of pain: "It isn't the impact that's responsible. It's the fact that I unimpacted; you know, I backed off." "So I'm not going to back off anymore" is the obvious solution. And there's the mechanism that lies under this "chronic somatics." And that lies under all chronic somatics. They turn them on and now they're scared to back off

Now, remember in Part C, letting go: "Make up your mind when you're going to let go and let go; when you're going to touch it and touch it; now when you're going to let go and let go." It's a very curious thing. If you ask somebody to take hold of an object, now to make him take his other hand and make his fingers let go, it's rather fabulous that many guys in excellent condition will do some interestingly cohesive actions with that hand which is holding on.

Now, you see, a hand could go on and hold on to a doorknob forever, unless some volition was administered to make it let go. Hands do not automatically let go. There's always some volition mixed up in it. When one expects them to automatically let go, they won't let go of the doorknob.

All right. How about this guy who's got his spine – base and neck of his spine – and he's just got it crunched, see? He knows better than to let go; that would hurt. Well, the very funny part of it is, it's a facsimile that – of the hold-on – that's what you're looking at; you're looking at a facsimile.

All right. Let's just make him contact some things in the environment and get up to a point where he can make up his mind to let go and let go. We'll get him into present time at the same time, and we'll have him letting go of things. He'll let go of his chronic somatics, too. Do I make a point of that?

Now, if you validate the fact that he's holding on to the somatic and you get very interested in it, he'll just go on holding on to it. Nothing will happen to the case. Oh, you'll get freaks. Every once in a while somebody will have something happen because you were processing directly at something.

But when attention – and all this is, is a problem in attention – becomes terrifically,

harshly fixed on something, the best way to handle it is get the attention off of it, not put more attention on it.

Now, what's wrong with this crooked spine? What's wrong with this box?

Let us say his hands, holding the spine crooked or holding the box to his chest, are simply giving a condensed attention – known as a hand – to the box or spine. You see? That's a condensed attention. When you take the attention off, the box will fall, the spine will straighten. Follow me?

All there is that can exert any pressure – all there is that can exert any pressure – is attention. If you consider as condensed attention the reinforcing steel in a concrete wall or the wall itself, as just condensed attention, then you'll see this thing very brilliantly. You see?

Now, putting more attention on something is simply going to add attention to it. Completely aside from the computation of interest, you're just making the box heavier. You'll say, "Well, grip it harder." See, "Let's put two more hands up there and hold on to it." Now, the auditor is going to put his hands up to the outside of the thing and hold it on. You see?

The moral of this little story is, when they have a chronic somatic, they're holding on to it. They might have grabbed it and then gone to sleep, you see, and so then they might not know they're still holding on to it.

Well, one of the hottest things you ever ran into for release of chronic somatics, and so on, are Parts A, B and C of Opening Procedure 8-C. They're real hot for somatics. Why? They drill a guy in touching and letting go, touching and letting go – bouncing, in other words. They let him bounce off walls and move the body around, and that sort of thing – a fantastically workable process.

Does it take more hours – now, let's be factual – does it take more hours to eradicate a chronic somatic with the Opening Procedure of 8-C than it does to eradicate the chronic somatic with a trick process which eradicates chronic somatics?

Yes, it takes many more hours with a trick process which eradicates chronic somatics – many, many more hours. It takes an *indefinite* number of hours and the chronic somatic is very liable to *return*.

But if you let them really let go and bring them uptone, wake them up on all the dynamics all the way up the line, the chances are it will stay gone.

Now, if you really wanted to get somebody stable and keep him that way for a year, five years, ten years – whatever it is – if you really wanted to snap somebody out of it and get him in good shape, one of the *best* ways to do it would be to run fifteen hours of Opening Procedure of 8-C on him, regardless of what was wrong with him, regardless of whether he could move around the room or not (get him into some state of mobility so that he could do it), and then five hours of Opening Procedure by Duplication. Duplication runs out "It must not happen again."

Now, the other thing he's doing with this hands-on-the-box or hands-on-the-spine – he's doing one other thing: he's saying, "This is so horrible that I must not forget it. Therefore, it mustn't happen again. And the way I'll keep it from happening again is to keep it always present. And that will be a beautiful object lesson to me."

So if you make him have things happen again and again and again and again and again – no matter how simple the motion is, particularly, transferring his attention between at least two objects – why, he will get to a point where he will let things happen again.

You realize that somebody who is saying "It mustn't happen again" is also saying "I



mustn't be happy again"? This just identifies clear through the bank. "I mustn't be young again." Age itself is simply a process of "It mustn't happen again."

So there he sits. "I'm not holding on to it," he says, gripping it firmly in order to demonstrate that it mustn't happen again. And this is what keeps it happening all the time, because it mustn't happen again. It can only happen once. You get the squirrel cage of nonsense that he is involved in – just a squirrel cage.

All right. Let's look over this now, as a problem in addressing a preclear. And let us go over this whole question again. The old lady has epiglutis, a new disease. The old lady has epiglutis and you only have an hour to audit her. What do you do?

*Male voice: Get her attention completely off that epiglutis.*

Well, you see, if you validate it just to the extent of getting her attention completely off her epiglutis by validating the epiglutis, you would have kept her attention on the epiglutis, wouldn't you?

*Male voice: Uh-huh.*

Yeah. What would you do with technique?

*Male voice: What technique?*

Uh-huh.

*Male voice: Well, first, I'm going to get into communication with her.*

That's right. That's right.

*Male voice: Get her talking.*

That's right.

*Male voice: The more she talks, the more she'll realize that the epiglutis is not going to be there or stay ...*

You got a gun? We've got a Freudian analyst in our midst.

*Male voice: Here we go! Number Two, Auditor's Code. Yeah.*

You reduce her comm lag. Let's be factual.

*Male voice: Yeah.*

Not get her talking.

*Male voice: That's what I meant.*

We would get her communicating. Do you know that talking isn't communicating?  
Hm?

*Male voice: I meant ...*

Awful lot of talking. Ah, well now, what you meant and what you said...

*Male voice: Yeah.*

All right. Now, let's go over it again. Now, exactly how are you going to handle this old lady?

*Male voice: I'd get in two-way communication with her.*

That's right. Now, what is a two-way communication?

*Male voice: Two-way communication: cause and distance to effect ...*

That's right.

*Male voice:... making duplication of effect ...*

That's right.

*Male voice:... back through distance to cause ...*

That's right.

*Male voice:... making the cause effect.*

Um-hm. What's this got to do with communication lag?

*Male voice: Well, communication lag from the direct question to the direct answer.*

That's right.

*Male voice: Flatten it out.*

That's right. Flatten it out. Okay. This is what you do.

Do you realize if you had only an hour, it might be that you merely got her into conversance? Well, obviously, just getting her into two-way communication isn't going to do anything for her, is it? You've only got an hour so you'd have to condense the case and change the character of the case so it'll respond like some other case. That doesn't work out quite well, does it?

This comes down to the question – the question – very, very precise and distinct: How many hours does it take to process a case?

*Male voice: It doesn't take any hours. It might only take five minutes.*

Oh, it might only take five minutes. You're right. How many hours does it take to process a case, then?

*Male voice: It takes as long as it takes to get rid of the ...*

Yeah. Oh, good. Good. Now, what kind of processes are desirable on what kinds of cases? Come on, what kinds of processes?

*Male voice: Well, the ... Two-way communication?*

Well, what kind of a case is that desirable for?

*Male voice: Any kind of case.*

You've got a toughie back here; he insists on being right. That's correct.

Now, cases are sometimes worse off than others, and therefore the lowest-ranking processes run on them with great rapidity. But because it runs on them with great rapidity is no reason you wouldn't use them.

You actually do Dianometry, Scienometry, whatever you want to call it, on this case. We mustn't call it a diagnosis; we wouldn't muddy up our sciences with medical terms.

The one thing an auditor can't do, by the way – you can't be trusted to do, clear across all the auditors there are – is diagnose. And it was one of the early solutions in this thing – was to make diagnosis unnecessary. And what do you know, that happened to be in the direction of truth; diagnosis is not necessary.

All right. So we don't diagnose. Now, therefore, our insurance policy, and things like that that we use, has a fallacy in it if we're asking an auditor to diagnose. A very cute one – there is an insurance policy that can be issued with the greatest of ease: If a person doesn't feel happier about life, why, you refund his money. And the guy says, "Well, yeah, but what about guaranteeing my arthritis?"

And you say, "Well, if you have your arthritis are you happy about life?" "No!"

"Well, all right."

That's very legal. That's as legal as the flowers of spring. So diagnosis leads into more than one pit.

But, let's look over this now with some care. I mean, let's take a look at diagnosis. And let's recognize in these six processes everything you need in diagnosis. Somewhere or another the preclear is going to run into trouble. Just say this. You know, someplace he's going to run into trouble.

Now, he might not really run into trouble if he got well on his way on Route 1, but somewhere he's going to develop a comm lag. You'd only know when he got into trouble by his development of the comm lag. See? Comm lag tells you he's in trouble.

All right. Now, let's take the gradient scale of rough processes – I mean, the roughness of processes, the roughness of cases and so forth. This gradient scale is, first, the roughness of processes. The easiest process is two-way communication. A slightly less easy process, a little rougher process, is Elementary Straightwire. And more

complicated Straightwires are even rougher. Now we get into much rougher ground when we get into the Opening Procedure of 8-C. What do we know! That is. It can be very rough.

I had a student the other day, had a discharge out of his ear. He was just doing 8-C. He'd studied it, he'd had it run on him, you know – sort of like, well, "find a wall and a point, and so on," you know sort of ... I don't know how it was run on him. But at the second that it was run on him properly here in the school, all of a sudden his ear went kind of *ping!* and the discharge came out of his ear – a scalding, burning discharge which left the whole lobe of his ear scabbed. That's not a pleasant thing to talk about, but isn't that interesting that he just had a short period on 8-C – well run by a well-trained student – and all of a sudden this happened.

Well now, this man had had many hours of sloppy auditing – Lord knows how many hours. Nothing like this had happened, and he'd never really been aware of the fact that he had trouble with his hearing. But he'd always had trouble with his hearing, and it suddenly occurred to him that he had. And this trouble was busy clearing up as a result of having 8-C run on him.

All right. So 8-C can be *tough*. All right. The easiest thing to do with 8-C is Part A. And a little bit rougher is Part B. And a little bit rougher (so much rougher, by the way, that some psychos can't do it for many, many hours) is Part C – because that has decision in it and that's one thing a psycho can't do; he can't make an independent decision.

You say, "Decide when you're going to take your finger off the wall."

And the guy's liable to stand there whipped. Or he takes it off at the moment you say your last word, several times.

And you say, "Are you making that decision?"

"Well, uh ... Hm."

Now, you won't see this, by the way; you won't see trouble here unless you've neglected Parts A and B. If you've been sloppy with A and B, you'll run into trouble on C. Let that serve as a little motto there.

All right. Now, Opening Procedure by Duplication is much rougher than 8-C. But if a person has an awful lot of trouble with it, he should have been run on more 8-C before he was shoved into Opening Procedure by Duplication. You see this?

All right. The next thing that's rough, and can be extremely rough, is the Remedy of Havingness. Many complexities can occur in the Remedy of Havingness – none of them destructive, but it can be very rough on the preclear. They get all kinds of somatics sometimes.

And if you were just to take somebody cold – you know, grab somebody in off the street, and start remedying havingness on him – you'd maybe get away with it with that fellow, you know. The next fellow you might get away with it, and then all of a sudden this person – boy! Headaches and bells and epiglutis and all kinds of weird diseases turn on just because you're trying to remedy havingness. What you did, the second you started to remedy havingness with them they just got an avalanche, an inflow of engrams, see. It really upset them.

All right. So now, a rougher process than that would be Spotting Spots in Space. By the way, let me say something about that process, because I see you're doing something sloppy with it. Spotting Spots is *a general* process, of which Spotting Spots in Space is a particular part. Now, the most interesting of Spotting Spots is done without ever saying [anything] about "spotting spots": "Give me some places where you are not," and you make the guy spot the places where he is not. See, that's a very indirect, covert sort of a

method of Spotting Spots.

All right. The next thing about it is, is you'd have him spotting Los Angeles, spot the town he's in, Los Angeles, the town he's in, Los Angeles, the town he's in. "How far away is Los Angeles?" That's Spotting Spots. Do you know that that's not as hard to do as spotting a spot in the middle of the room? Hm?

I've seen a guy get violently sick at his stomach when asked to spot a spot in the middle of the room, who just had a ball with me spotting New York and Montreal and London and Kristiansand. He was having a good time, see – nothing happening to him – and I all of a sudden called him up short, you know, and say, "All right. Now let's spot a spot in this room."

"Okay," he says.

"Go over and put your finger on it."

He's sickened – right there, gets sick.

All right. So the Spotting Spots is a whole category of techniques, actually, of which the two major techniques are simply "Point out Los Angeles. Point out this room. Point out Los Angeles. Point out this room. How far away does Los Angeles seem to you now? Are you getting a picture of Los Angeles? Point it out. Point out this room. Point it out. Point out this room." That's the easiest kind.

The next one – a little bit rougher – is to add a specific significance to pointing out Los Angeles. See? We do it this way: "Point out a spot on earth where you were unhappy. All right. This room. Where you were unhappy. This room. Where you were unhappy. This room." Bring both spots up to present time, you see. That's another one on Spotting Spots.

And now the next one on Spotting Spots, you just ask the fellow to "Spot spots in space." You got that as a highly particularized level?

And now, after that, you could have him move his body around into spots in space. And you could do all sorts of things like this. But that's a pretty rough process. So if a guy had trouble with it, why, he would have trouble with it.

All right. Now let's take those processes and let's look them over again. I'm not telling you how much you don't know, I'm telling you something now that you do know. There are some preclears that are rougher than others. Now, let's take this gradient scale whereby some processes are rougher than others – you know, the gradient scale of roughness of processes. Now, let's take the gradient scale of roughness of preclears, and we find out one scale is inverted to the other scale. The roughest preclear takes the easiest process.

So we would find the roughest preclear in there with a two-way communication. That two-way communication might not be verbal, you know. You're just tapping him on the knee until he taps you on the knee. There's the roughest case, you see, and there is the easiest, least-rough process. It fits right with him, you see.

Now, your next case up the line – who is not quite so rough, but pretty rough, you see – he could do two-way communication all right, but he would bog on Straightwire, see.

Now, the next less-rough case would probably fit in very nicely with Opening Procedure of 8-C. You know, he'd – pardon me, he'd bog on that, but he wouldn't have any trouble at all with two-way communication, and so forth. He wouldn't have any trouble with two-way communication and Elementary Straightwire – no real trouble. And all of a sudden you get him into 8-C and *chug!* See?

All right. Your next case level, not quite as rough, would have no trouble with 8-C, Elementary Straightwire, Opening Procedure 8-C, none of these things. And the place

where processing really gets rough for him is Opening Procedure by Duplication.

Now we get the next level of case, and this case is a real ... Oh, he – everything's a breeze, you know? He can do Opening Procedure, Duplication. You know, very little trouble; I mean he's easy to process. These ... What little lags he develops, they straighten out very, very nicely.

And you get him in there and you all of a sudden would start remedying havingness with him, or something on this order, and he gets an uncontrollable avalanche where all the planets of space suddenly start pouring in on him, or something weird starts happening, or he can't quite get anything *in*, you know, and it sticks. And, boy, he's having a furious amount of trouble right there.

All right. You get him over this trouble very nicely and he would be all right. But his case was not rough until he got clear up there to a very rough process – Remedy of Havingness.

Now let's go to a rougher process and discover that a much better-off preclear would have no trouble anywhere up the line until he started to spot some spots in space.

Now, the test is, if an individual could do all of these six things without developing any particular comm lag at all, believe me, it would not take you very long to discover this, would it? Hm? You'd just run them off, one right after the other, and you'd say, "Be three feet back of your head."

Now, if you wanted to play processing on the safe side, remember that all of these processes – all of these six processes – which is two-way communication, Elementary Straightwire, 8-C's Opening Procedure, Opening Procedure by Duplication, Remedying Havingness and Spotting Spots in Space – all of them will result sooner or later, in exteriorization. None of them hinder or harm exteriorization. Remember that. You cannot harm a person with these processes. His ability to exteriorize is not harmed by doing these processes.

See that?

Well, supposing you did all these things – you really wanted to play auditing on the safe side: You'd simply start in at the beginning with two-way communication, go right on through the list. Try to find someplace where he would get into trouble, something of this sort – where he'd bog. And if he got all the way through and he could do all these things, you'd say, "Be three feet back of your head." You've got a very confident, exteriorized preclear, you see; he's real confident.

Now you'd simply go into Route 1 and go right on down the list of Route 1, and you'd work yourself right on up toward an Operating Thetan – because you'd turn over to Route 2 then, and make him do everything on Route 2 while exteriorized. And you could go right straight on through in this fashion. In other words, there's a safe way of going about it.

What's diagnosis?

You'd say, "This preclear was a bog on Elementary Straightwire." This would tell somebody immediately that you had a neurotic on your hands. You see?

"This person was a bog on two-way communication." That would tell you instantly that you have something like a psychotic on your hands. See?

"This person was a bog on 8-C." Well now, that would not be too horrible.

But the fellow would be – he would not be very successful in life, believe me. You could categorize just this way.

Now, we used to have steps in the Standard Operating Procedures. Remember these steps? And we'd say this person was a Step VII or a Step VI. Supposing (just throwing

that old classification out of the way; and this is not a proposed classification, it just is an example here) we called these processes, two-way communication, number one; Elementary Straightwire, number two; Opening Procedure of 8-C, number three; Duplication, number four; Remedy of Havingness, number five and Spotting Spots, number six. This would be a reversal procedure, you see, to what the other one is.

We used to say Step I ... I'm not trying to give you nomenclature. We would say this preclear was, not a Step I but a Bog I, see? That would just completely describe the preclear to another auditor. He was a Bog II, see; something on that order. What you do say, right now – the way you handle this – you normally say, "Well, this person couldn't do two-way communication"; somebody else knows that you're talking about a psycho, see. Get how this would be?

So here's your categories – categories of cases. What is the test? The test is not whether or not this worried him or whether or not he thought about it or any other thing than communication lag.

In other words, two-way communication runs all the way through these processes, and somewhere he's going to develop communication lag. Opening Procedure by Duplication, he'll develop communication lag in physical action. In 8-C, he develops it in physical action.

I had a fellow who thought he was running 8-C just fine. And he didn't know that the fellow who would go over to the wall, you know, and put his finger within an inch of the spot and then suddenly dive at the spot – that there was anything wrong with this fellow. He just thought that was routine, not that this fellow was doing it peculiarly, and so forth.

Now he knows enough that he would be very alert to the two-way communication he had with this preclear, and he'd find out that it'd never been flattened – he wouldn't really have been in communication. There's a holdup here. Any physical manifestation of that character is a comm lag.

So we run comm lag all the way through. The auditor is not looking for difficulty, he is looking for ability. But the difficulty, if he runs by this system, will simply come up and slap him. All of a sudden it'll slap the preclear and the auditor will be aware of the fact that he is not proceeding.

Now, the auditor, when he is aware of the fact that he's not proceeding, has done what?

Actually, he did not flatten entirely an existing communication lag of the prior process.

Let's say he ran into a big bog on Opening Procedure of 8-C; just ran into *a big bog* on Opening Procedure of 8-C. There must have been something awfully wrong with Straightwire. This individual couldn't possibly have remembered something real. So if this is the case, why, he must have been in trouble with two-way communication – you know, the fellow probably was not even talking about the same thing. See? You could actually track back, usually to an oversight.

Otherwise, what would happen would be this: very slight communication lags would develop, would be readily flattened and the preclear would go on winning, see. He'd get an Elementary Straightwire communication lag and that would be amusing to both himself and the auditor. And the auditor would go right on ahead working and flatten that communication lag. He'd find the individual with the next indicated process having no trouble.

That's theoretical. It does not hold good in all cases because you have very specialized cases. But here is, more or less, a rule of the thumb that you can go by.

If you've done a process of these six processes real well on a preclear – in other words, done it expertly and flattened every comm lag with it – you will be able to, generally, arrive in the next process with considerable success.

This doesn't mean, however, that you would go on running Elementary Straightwire. The only curve there is on this whole line is Elementary Straightwire. It's not necessarily true that Elementary Straightwire belongs at point two. It's just by experience we have snapped enough people out of neurosis with Elementary Straightwire, and so forth, that we don't dare abandon it. It doesn't quite belong after two-way communication because it validates the past. But actually, it goes two-way communication, Opening Procedure of 8-C – straight.

But there's another little hook at this number-two point that you must be aware of. There's another little hook there. And that is the fact that if a fellow has no comm lag to amount to anything on ARC Straightwire, he'll exteriorize like that. And you just go on – you save time – just go on and run him on exteriorization drills.

And there again, you have to throw in Elementary Straightwire as a test. And there again, the very, very safe thing to do: simply do the first six processes. See, that'd be the safest thing to do rather than snap him out of his head at that moment.

All right. So you have some choices along the line. But the general rule is, just as we started out with this lecture – let me ask the question again: A kid named Willie and he has a broken arm and you only have an hour to process him. Now what are *you* going to do?

Male voice: Well, I would run him the same as you would run anyone else. I'd just start him on two-way communication, ask him if he has a present time problem, flatten the comm lag, go into "Problems you could be," flatten the comm lag ...

Mm-hm.

*Male voice: ... so on. And flatten the comm lag on that.*

Mm-hm.

*Male voice: And go into Elementary Straightwire, maybe some ARC Straightwire.*

Mm-hm.

*Male voice: Flatten the comm lags on those.*

Mm-hm.

*Male voice: Go on to 8-C. Flatten the comm lags on that. Keep going. Duplication. Flatten the comm lag on that, so on.*

Right. Good. That's absolutely correct. All right. You guys know that now? Hm?

Now, remember that there are some stunt processes where you just take potluck. They're called Assists. They're stunts. They sometimes only take five, ten minutes and do some fabulous things.

Don't expect the results of stunt processes to remain stable. When you process from two-way communication right on through to Spot Spots, you're processing in the direction of stability. When you get that person up to that level, by God, he's going to remain stable at the level that you have yanked him up to. On a stunt process – which is Laying On of Hands, Places Where the Condition Is Not (something of this level); remedying the havingness quickly of broken arms (that's a stunt process; very spectacular!) – don't expect it to remain stable. The guy's going to feel better right away. But somebody's going to have to get in there and pitch in a couple or three days with some real processing. That's a curious one, isn't it?

On the contrary to what you think you're doing with Assists, actually processing somebody when he's pretty anaten is a tossed coin. It might be good and it might be bad.

I only start processing somebody, when he's terribly bad off, if he's actually in danger of kicking the bucket. And then I'll – anything is valid, you see. It gets down to an emergency basis. Let's say this fellow was lying there in a terrific, stiff, cold shock, you know. He might lie down and remain alive, but if he got moved around very much, such as thrown into an ambulance going ... Oh, I don't know; how fast do ambulances travel these days? I think they travel at the rate of about five decibels of sound, don't they? Or something of the sort.

You always see these ambulances running around with the sirens going. Do you know that there's probably not, in one year, any necessity for an ambulance to travel over about twenty-five miles an hour? Do you know that it does the patient more harm to travel at a fast rate of speed – much more harm to travel at a fast rate of speed – than to take it easy? In the first place, there's almost always an intern with the ambulance who's already sutured the arteries. And something on that order has occurred, so all of this speed and so forth is just somebody having a good time showing off. They used to say in Washington, DC, when one went by, "Well, there goes an intern out for a pack of cigarettes."

Anyhow, here's a man in cold shock. The man can lie down and stay alive, but if he were moved around very much he would probably die. Certainly if he stood up he would die. That's a strange and peculiar thing. Blood lakes in the middle of the body; various things happen. Very often – until they really learned this in the war – a man would be shot, wounded, apparently only slightly, and then get up, you know, and walk or run. People would let him get up. One of the things that they don't do now – they just don't let the guy stand up, don't let him unbalance that blood situation in his body, and wait till somebody gets some plasma to him and overcomes the shock.

Because the blood has left the arteries and veins, and he isn't running on any blood at all. And if you wanted to complete his death you'd simply have him stand up, that's all. Just stand up and there he goes – bang! Dead! – such a case as that.

You might do something for somebody. What would you do?

The best thing you could possibly do would put him in contact with his present-time environment, which would reorient him in time and shove him out of the instant of impact. But, again, this is best done by two-way communication. Again, we really haven't violated the rules of the game.

But sometime, if you really wanted to be spectacular on somebody's sprained ankle, use Laying on of Hands. You know, "Look at my fingers. Look at my fingers. Look at my fingers. Put your attention on my fingers." And just put it around the vicinity of a sprained ankle and watch the sprain go down. This will work unless he's in horrible condition. But if he's got a bad, bad, bad two-way communication lag, he's in horrible condition. You might be reducing his havingness with that laying on of hands. You might be doing a lot of other unpredictable things.

The safe thing to do is two-way communication, Elementary Straightwire, Opening Procedure of 8-C; even if he's lying in bed. You know how you do 8-C with a guy lying in bed? You just point out spots in the bed for him to contact.

And Opening Procedure by Duplication ... San Francisco area, recently, they started to run – very funny; they're always getting new techniques – they started to run Group Duplication on individuals. The only time this is warranted is when you're operating on a group. Group Duplication simply is to take an object in your right hand, take an object in your left hand and then inspect these objects, one after the other – weight, color and so forth – silently. This is Group Duplication, and that's all it is. And it is *nowhere near* as good as Opening Procedure by Duplication as you know it. It's a stopgap because you run



it on a group. Well, they've started running it on individuals and they found out that it worked. But they would also have found out that Opening Procedure by Duplication worked, if they'd tried it. See, of course this works. But Opening Procedure by Duplication done very, very correctly works much better.

All right. These new techniques that come up – this one is very much to the point. Here we have, in Group Duplication, a manifestation where the auditor is really taking ... he's taking a nice chance by running anything as *rough* as Group Duplication. Just as they did in the congress; here and there in the audience, somebody teeters outside and falls on the neck of one of the auditor attendants. You know, they just go *nyaaow*, doing this Group Duplication.

So any one of these processes could be of vast benefit to a person, you see. Let's say you just specialized in Remedy of Havingness and that's all you were going to do to anybody; you were just going to remedy their havingness. Oh, you'd be fabulous. I mean, you'd get all kinds of results – except, maybe 60, 70 percent of the people you ran into, and life would look more interesting for a while than otherwise, but you'd probably get away with it. You'd probably get away with it; yeah.

Supposing you did nothing but spot spots in space. You wouldn't get away with it. That one you wouldn't get away with – if that's all you did to anybody who came to you.

You'd probably get away with it very, very well if all you did was Opening Procedure of 8-C, and never did anything else. You'd probably do fairly well. You'd probably do pretty well; you wouldn't get into trouble clear across the boards. But once in a while a case would evade your grip or understanding – definitely. You'd find some losses. And certainly it would take you longer if that was all you were going to use. There's a disadvantage in that.

Supposing all you had was a two-way communication as a process. You would find out that although it took you an enormously lengthened course of processing, you would probably, however, eventually arrive with the process, because this process is a common denominator of all processes. See that?

Spotting Spots, that would not be workable on everybody; but actually, two-way communication would.

But here (in the interest of time, and the interest of alignment and experience, and the number of things that could be wrong with somebody; the number of things you can overcome), you've got six processes – stacked in that line, done in that line, you'll discover, will shorten the length of time that a person is being audited, and it will give you a very, very, very high batting average.

I don't expect any auditor to get 100 percent batting average. Too many other things enter in. The preclear goes home, he's feeling pretty good. Somebody calls you the next day and tells you he's in terrible condition, and so forth. And you say, "What have I done to him?" And then we don't hear very much more about it, and it sort of drifts out of our mind, but we chalk up a failure.

You didn't chalk any failure up. When he went home his wife knifed him. He went home, he was feeling very overt and the whole family jumped on him, see. A lot of terrific environmental factors can enter in. And every once in a while some preclear starts to get well and his family becomes infuriated with you. And they will not rest until they have broken off all further appointments with you. All kinds of interesting things occur which knocks it down from 100 percent.

But I'll tell you something that is not knocking it down from 100 percent today. If the preclear will report for his appointments, or if you can see the preclear during certain

appointed, regular hours in the absence of tremendously influencing exterior stimuli, why, you will get 100 percent results. See? But you see what knocks it down from 100 percent? You would have to control the entire environment and his entire family and everything that could influence this preclear in order to bat 100 percent.

Well, actually, these – the incidence of loss of preclears or loss of good results is even getting lower. Why? Because we make them well faster.

Now, that's the other thing I want to tell you: make them well fast. Don't dilly-dally around. If a fellow actually has a good two-way communication, don't sit there like a bump on a log, feeding him a two-way communication process. He's doing well with it, he can handle it. See? So let's not waste time on it.

Same way with Elementary Straightwire. We just hit "Something you wouldn't mind remembering; something you wouldn't mind forgetting," and we flatten this out. "Time that's really real to you. Time you were in good communication. Time when things were in good communication with you." You know? And we find out he's very flat on this, and he's okay.

We run him through Opening Procedure of 8-C. He does A like a breeze.

He stumbles a little bit and then recovers and does B like a breeze. He stumbles a couple of times while doing C, but he does that just nicely, finally, and you get it nice and flat. You think that's just swell. Go into Opening Procedure by Duplication, and this is the only place you should watch out.

Opening Procedure by Duplication requires some duration. I would never do it, *never*, *never* do it less than an hour, because the preclear who's been kidding you, that somehow or other skidded by – who, by straining every faculty and ability he had, to be social, to be nice, to be a good preclear, to measure up, to do what you said – can't take it.

That's the trap that'll catch him every time – Opening Procedure by Duplication. He won't be able to take it. He might be able to take fifteen minutes of it, see. He might be able to take a half an hour of it; he might even be able to take forty-five minutes of it. He won't be able to take an hour. That's according to my experience.

So I'd play it on the safe side and give it at least an hour, preferably a couple of hours. That's the point I'd really be sure about. Because it'd knock his body back into balance, and his body therefore wouldn't be arguing with you at the time when you want him to exteriorize and behave himself. Sudden energy masses won't move in after you've done this one well. So there is a time limitation on that process. Maybe there shouldn't be, but there happens to be.

And as far as Remedy of Havingness, unless he can handle energy masses and so forth, his case won't remain stable.

And as far as Spotting Spots, unless he can spot spots in towns at a distance, significances in spots, and spot spots in the room, in space – unless he can do all of these things, he isn't going to exteriorize either and remain exteriorized.

There's many a guy who's been exteriorized that couldn't spot spots in space. This is a real cute one. And so, of course, he reinteriorized immediately. He all of a sudden noticed, after he'd been out for a half an hour or something like that, that he was actually being a spot in space or something like this, and this alarmed him greatly and *smack!* he went back into the body.

So it'd be something that you would straighten out. And your percentages would go up very markedly, very interestingly. And that's what we're shooting for. We're shooting for the 100 percent as far as you're concerned. Trying to get you to be 100 percent right as far as delivered processing is concerned. This doesn't mean 100 percent of the cases

processed, because, as I say, there's environmental factors will occasionally enter in – not as often, because the processes are faster.

The faster you can process a preclear, actually, the better off you are. And the better off you are as an auditor, because you process him up rapidly up the line, and the environment can't get at him before he's high enough to handle it.

A slow process puts him a leg up, and he goes home and the wife puts him two legs down. Or she goes home and the husband puts her practically under the sod. It's a losing process, you see. You're processing too slowly, the gains are too slow.

So you want a fairly rapid gain if you can get one. And if you could get a preclear to sit still and go through all of these processes in, let's say, eight hours before he went back and saw his loved ones, and you got him nicely and stably exteriorized before he went home – boy, that would be a nice accomplishment. That would be just dandy. He'd have a far better chance of remaining stable.

Supposing you got him, though, halfway through Opening Procedure by Duplication, and he was going to come back for his next session. *Mm-mm*. See, he goes home, the world falls in on him. He can't handle it.

Now, the world will fall in on him anytime that he appears to be more overt and more dangerous than he was before. Many people are very afraid, so the increase in ability on the part of an individual becomes a great concern of theirs. They're running on a reverse computation. And this reverse computation is simply that the freer a person gets, the more dangerous he is. If they said, "The freer a person gets the more powerful he is," they would be correct. But that does not mean that the freer a person gets the more dangerous he is to somebody else. That is not true.

Man, being combative, is something on the order of a cornered rat. And if you beat him around enough he will eventually fight, he will eventually get mean enough to be a cop. See? You get him in a corner and he will eventually fight.

Supposing there were a guy like Michael the Archangel around, I don't think the fact that somebody spoke nasally or had a bad accent or made an incorrect statement, and so forth, would alarm him. Would it? It wouldn't worry him a bit, as a matter of fact. It would be nothing to him. So what would he have to fight about?

He could be very, very tolerant of things which he did not think could harm him. And if a person doesn't think things are going to harm him, he can be awfully tolerant. It's only the fellow who knows things can harm him that has to be intolerant. And if he knows things can harm him, why then, boy, does he get intolerant.

So sending your preclear back into the society with his case only half-run is always dangerous. You will always be doing it, but remember it's always dangerous.

All right. Now, let's start in here just where we were before, and so on. And now, what would you do with an old lady who had very, very poor eyesight and was very upset about her eyesight? How would you start processing her? And by the way, you've only got an hour.

*Male voice: Well, get in two-way communication with her. Some ARC Straightwire.*  
Would you let her discuss her problem at all – about her eyesight?

*Male voice: No.*

You wouldn't validate it.

*Male voice: No.*

You'd let her talk about it.

*Male voice: Well, yes but I ...*

But you wouldn't ask questions to validate it.

*Male voice: ... later on.*

That's right. Good.

*Male voice: And then do 8-C. Get ... reducing comm lag on 8-C with a little Step A, Step B. And ...*

All right. Now, are you answering this question (which you're answering absolutely correctly) simply because I told you to answer it this way or because you see some good reason to do this?

*Male voice: Well, I've seen, in what happened here, and I feel these steps are necessary.*

Yeah.

*Male voice: For myself.*

For yourself.

*Male voice: For myself.*

You've seen this working on.

*Male voice: Yes.*

Okay. That's the right answer. That's what you'd do. You'd go on and process a preclear. And anytime they start stringing up this vast emergency to you or some *freak* setup like "She has cancer. She is about to die. And you've got to get her exteriorized, you've just got to get her exteriorized so that she will at least be able to leave her body and be happy after she's dead." I've heard that one. What would you do with that case?

*Male voice: Same thing.*

Same thing. That's right. This terrific emergency that they run in on you is actually sort of a destructive mechanism all by itself, by which you're supposed to fail.

There isn't any such emergency in the first place. You could tell her someday, maybe tell her with great experience on your own part – but you could tell her for me right now that she will be able to back out and go her way after she kicks off. And whether processed or not, by the time she's eighty feet from that body, her level of concern for that life will not be anywhere near as great as her relatives so fondly and introvertedly suppose.

Now, that's very good. All right. Let's take our visitor here today. What would you do if a lady was supposed to be dying over in the hospital and somebody called you up immediately and rushed you over there. What would you do?

*Male voice: In that case, I think I'd just use emergency measures.*

What would be your emergency measure?

*Male voice: Well, make some attempt to do the best I could to establish two-way communication with her by whatever means possible.*

Mm-hm. But again, we're on two-way communication even with Laying On of Hands, aren't we?

*Female voice: Uh-huh.*

The first thing you'd have to do is get her in communication with you. Let me tell you a trick on this. There was a lady lying in a coma, expected to die, and an auditor was summoned over to take care of her. The auditor did snap her back. But you know how he did it? He found out that she would answer a pressure on her arm with her hand. In other words, he could touch her arm and, holding her hand, would touch her on the arm and she would close her hand and he would say, "All right. Two for *yes* and one for *no*," and ask her questions. And the first thing you know, she was coming out of it.

He was driven off by the medical doctor in charge of the ward – now, this is the same case I've mentioned before; mentioned it in a PAB – and the lady went out of

communication then and died.

But this was a successful case. As I say, this doesn't interfere with the 100 percent just because somebody came along and shot the preclear – that is, the rest of the world is going on too.

All right. That's absolutely right. Now let's look at this again. What would you do if you were called over to the hospital and somebody was dying?

*Male voice: Establish a communication with this person.*

Go on, what would you do? This is what you're *going* to do if this situation ever comes up. I mean, you will do what you will do. Well, tell me actually, honestly what you would do.

*Male voice: By whatever means I could, establish communication with this person.*

That's right. That's right. Get them in communication with their environment is a better statement of it.

Okay. Got that? All right.

Supposing an Instructor walked into the kitchen and he says, "I have a terrible chronic somatic. Now, isn't there some way to process this chronic somatic?" What would you tell him? Supposing he was an Instructor, which means, of course, you'd want to be mean to him. What would you do? What would you do if you really wanted to be mean and overt?

*Male voice: Grant some attention.*

You'd process the chronic somatic, wouldn't you? Hm? And what would you do if you wanted to be effective and efficient about it?

*Female voice: Have him spot a spot on the wall.*

Sure. That's right. You got that? I want you to see this work out in life. I want you to look at this in life.

There is such a thing as Descriptive Processing – never forget it. If you can make a person discuss long enough and arduously enough and answer enough questions about any part of their body, they'll practically as-is it into nothingness. And they'll certainly as-is any kind of chronic somatic connected with it. You see that?

And there are significances which are more punchy than others. But, actually, they should be run on somebody who can spot spots. There are punchy significances that do terrific things for a case. The Unimportance from Mystery to Know is a fabulous process – Unimportance from Mystery to Know; oh, that's a terrific process.

All right. There are all these things that you could know, that you could do, and so forth, but amongst all of them I only want to teach you one lesson while you're around here, just one lesson, and that's *be effective*.

Okay.

# ABOUT THE AUTHOR

L. Ron Hubbard is one of the most acclaimed and widely read authors of all time, primarily because his works express a firsthand knowledge of the nature of man as a spiritual being – a knowledge gained not from a lofty study of ancient "mysteries," but by ceaseless work and research in direct contact with mankind in all walks of life.

As Ron said, "One doesn't learn about life by sitting in an ivory tower, thinking about it. One learns about life by being part of it." And that is how he lived.

He began his quest for knowledge on the nature of man at a very early age. When he was eight years old he was already well on his way to being a seasoned traveler, covering a quarter of a million miles by the age of nineteen. His adventure included voyages to China, Japan and other points in the Orient and South Pacific. During this time he became closely acquainted with twenty-one different races in areas all over the world.

After returning to the United States, Ron pursued his formal studies of mathematics and engineering at George Washington University, where he was also a member of one of the first classes on nuclear physics. He realized that neither the East nor the West contained the full answer to the problems of existence. Despite all of mankind's advances in the physical sciences, a workable technology of the mind and life had never been developed. The mental "technologies" which did exist, psychology and psychiatry, were actually barbaric, false subjects – no more workable than the methods of jungle witch doctors. Ron shouldered the responsibility of filling this gap in the knowledge of mankind.

He financed his early research through fiction writing. He became one of the most highly demanded authors in the golden age of popular adventure and science fiction writing during the 1930s and 1940s, interrupted only by his service in the U.S. Navy during World War II.

Partially disabled at the war's end, Ron applied what he had learned from his research. He made breakthroughs and developed techniques which made it possible for him to recover from his injuries and help others regain their health. It was during this time that the basic tenets of Dianetics technology were codified.

A year later, in 1948, he wrote the first manuscript detailing his discoveries. Ron did not have it published at that time, but gave copies to some friends who copied it and passed it among their friends who then passed it on to others. (This book was formally published in 1951 as *Dianetics: The Original Thesis* and later republished as *The Dynamics of Life*.) The interest generated by this manuscript prompted a flood of requests for more information on the subject.

Ron attempted to make all his discoveries available to the American Psychiatric Association and the American Medical Association. Despite the fact that his work would have benefited them and thereby society immensely, his offers were refused. These same vested interests decided that Dianetics could harm their profits, which were and still are based on the amount of illness and insanity in our culture and began to attack Ron and his

work. He therefore decided to write a comprehensive text on the subject and take it directly to the public.

With the publication of *Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health* on May 9, 1950, a complete handbook for the application of Ron's new technology was broadly available for the first time. *Dianetics* created a wildfire of public interest. The book immediately shot to the top of the *New York Times* bestseller list and stayed there week after week. More than 750 Dianetics study groups sprang up within a few short months of its publication.

Ron's work did not stop with the success of *Dianetics*, but accelerated with new discoveries and breakthroughs, a constant, normal occurrence. In his further research he discovered the very nature of life itself – the life static – and its exact relationship to this universe. He found that the physical universe is the result of considerations mutually agreed-upon by all beings, and from this he developed processes which make it possible to restore to thetans the power of their own postulates over the mechanics of the physical universe.

By 1954, Ron's research was progressing at a tremendous rate, as was his issuance of new materials. In this year alone, he conducted six Advanced Clinical Courses where he personally trained auditors on the techniques and principles he was developing; issued a flood of written material on the application of Scientology and new discoveries; gave nearly 500 lectures and wrote four new books.

One of the lecture series Ron gave in 1954 was the 8th Advanced Clinical Course, given between 4 October and 12 November of this year. He called in auditors for advanced training in the theory and application of the phenomenal techniques he had developed and which he was just writing up for the book *The Creation of Human Ability*. As well as the subject of processing, the principles Ron discussed in these tapes have tremendous importance in understanding and living life.

The number of Ron's books and lectures continued to grow for more than three decades as he ceaselessly continued his work. Today his works – including an astounding number of books, taped lectures, instructional films, writings, demonstrations and briefings – are studied and applied daily. Dianetics and Scientology techniques are used in hundreds of Scientology churches and organizations on every continent.

With his research fully completed and codified, L. Ron Hubbard departed his body on 24 January 1986.

Ron's work opened a new door for mankind, out of the trap of the MEST universe. Through his efforts, there now exists a totally workable technology by which the native abilities of beings can be restored and rehabilitated.

Millions of people all over the world consider they have no truer friend.

# GLOSSARY

- A=A=A=A:** anything equals anything equals anything equals anything. This is the way the reactive mind thinks, irrationally identifying thoughts, people, objects, experiences, statements, etc., with one another where little or no similarity actually exists. Everything is everything else. Mr. X looks at a horse knows it's a house knows it's a school teacher. So when he sees a horse he is respectful.
- Abnormal Dianetics:** a book written in 1948 by L. Ron Hubbard which presented the basic causes of human behavior and the resolution of mental aberration and psychosomatic illness. It was later published as *Dianetics: The Original Thesis* and today is entitled *The Dynamics of Life*.
- ad infinitum:** (*Latin*) endlessly; forever; without limit. It literally means *to infinity*.
- Adler, Alfred:** (1870-1937) Austrian psychiatrist and psychologist.
- Advanced Clinical Course:** one of a number of theory and research courses delivered by L. Ron Hubbard which gave a deep insight into the phenomena of the mind and the rationale of research and investigation. Abbreviation *ACC*.
- Aesculapian:** of or relating to medicine or the art of healing. (Aesculapius: Roman Mythology. The god of medicine and healing.)
- agglutinousness:** condition of uniting or fastening, as with glue.
- Alexander the Great:** (356 B.C. – 323 B.C.), king of Macedonia, an ancient kingdom located in what is now Greece and Yugoslavia.
- algae:** group of related organisms, mostly aquatic and often independently mobile, containing chlorophyll but lacking true stems, roots or leaves. Some algae are single-celled and form scum on rocks; others, such as seaweed, are multicellular and may be very large.
- Allied:** referring to the Allies or countries that fought against Germany in World War II, specifically, Britain, France, the United States and U.S.S.R., which jointly occupied Germany after its defeat.
- analyzer:** the analytical mind: that portion of the mind which perceives and retains experience data to compose and resolve problems.
- anaten:** an abbreviation of analytical *attenuation*, meaning diminution (lessening) or weakening of the analytical awareness of an individual for a brief or extensive period of time. If sufficiently great, it can result in unconsciousness. (It stems from the restimulation of an engram which contains pain and unconsciousness.)
- Anaxagoras:** (c. 500 – 430 B.C.) Greek philosopher. He believed the earth to be a flat disk and the present cosmic order to have evolved from an original chaos. He argued that all forms of organic life are animated by the soul and cosmic intelligence in varying degrees and that perception results when the sense organs are irritated.
- anchor points:** dimension points which demark the outermost boundaries of a space or its corners. Anchor points, along with the viewpoint, are responsible for space. An anchor point is a dimension point that stays rather still, to keep the space created.



**animalcule:** a microscopic animal.

**anthropoidal:** of the nature of man or resembling man in nature or structure.

**antithesis:** the direct opposite.

**apex:** highest point; tip.

**appetite over tin cup:** a pioneer Western U.S. term used by riverboat men on the Missouri; it means thrown away violently, like "head over heels," "bowled over."

**archangels:** chief angels; angels of high rank.

**ARC Straightwire:** a recall process which gets the preclear to remember times of affinity, reality, communication and understanding.

**as-ised:** viewed exactly as it is, without any distortions or lies, at which moment it vanishes and ceases to exist.

**assists:** simple, easily done processes that can be applied to anyone to help them recover more rapidly from accidents, mild illness or upsets; any processes which assist the individual to heal himself or be healed by another agency by removing his reasons for precipitating (bringing on) and prolonging his condition and lessening his predisposition (inclination or tendency) to further injure himself or remain in an intolerable condition.

**atavistic:** having to do with the appearance in an individual of some characteristics found in a remote ancestor but not in nearer ancestors.

**A to Izzard:** from beginning to end. *Izzard* is an archaic word meaning the letter z.

**atomic fission:** the splitting of the nucleus of an atom accompanied by conversion of part of the mass into energy. This is the principle of the atomic bomb.

**Auditor's Code:** a collection of rules (do's and don'ts) that an auditor follows while auditing someone, which ensures that the preclear will get the greatest possible gain out of the processing that he is having. It was evolved from years of observing processing.

**Auditor's Handbook:** *Scientology: Auditor's Handbook including Intensive Procedure:* a handbook published in 1954 which contained a combination of all the procedures of major workability developed and tested during a series of seven Advanced Clinical Courses given at the time. Many additional processes and materials were later added to the book by Ron and it was republished as *The Creation of Human Ability*. See also **Advanced Clinical Course** in this glossary.

**Auditor's Manual:** a book about Dianetics processing published by staff in 1952.

**automaticities:** things set up automatically to run without further attention from the person himself. There are three kinds of automaticities: those which create things, those which make things persist and those which destroy things.

**automatic transmission:** an automotive transmission requiring either very little or no manual shifting of gears.

**avidity:** eagerness; greediness.

**Axioms:** statements of natural laws on the order of those of the physical sciences. For a full list of the Axioms of Dianetics and Scientology, see the book *Scientology 0-8: The Book of Basics*.

**Babylon:** ancient city which was the capital of Babylonia, an ancient empire in southwest Asia in what is now southern Iraq. It flourished between 2100 and 689 B.C.

**Bachelor of Scientology:** a graduate of professional auditor training courses given in 1953 and 1954.

**banks:** lateral inward tilts of a vehicle or other moving object when taking curves.

**Battle of Jutland:** (31 May – 1 June 1916) the greatest naval battle of World War I,

involving the British and German fleets in the North Sea off the western coast of Denmark. The result was indecisive. The British lost three battle cruisers, three armored cruisers and eight destroyers, while the Germans lost one battleship, one battle cruiser, four light cruisers and five destroyers. The British lost 6,097 men to the German loss of 2,545. Though the Germans claimed victory, pointing out the greater losses of the British fleet, the German fleet was driven back to its own ports and rarely, in the two remaining years of the war, was it able to leave them.

**Beatty, Clyde:** a world-famous circus performer, known for his acts with wild jungle animals.

**beingness:** the assumption or choosing of a category of identity. Beingness is assumed by oneself or given to oneself or is attained. Examples of beingness would be one's own name, one's profession, one's physical characteristics, one's role in a game – each and all of these could be called one's beingness.

**Beingness Processing:** a process by which a person who cannot exteriorize easily, because he is below the level of being a body, is brought up to a level where he can be a body so he can exteriorize from it.

**Bible Belt:** those regions of the U.S., particularly areas in the South and Middle West, where fundamentalist beliefs prevail and Christian clergymen are especially influential.

**Bierce, Ambrose Gwinnett:** (1842 – 1914?) American satirist, short-story writer and journalist. One of the many stories written by Bierce is called *The Damned Thing*. In this story, he writes "As with sounds, so with colors. At each end of the solar spectrum the chemist can detect the presence of what are known as actinic rays [the violet or ultraviolet parts of the spectrum]. They represent colors – integral colors in the spectrum of light – which we are unable to discern. The human eye is an imperfect instrument; its range is but a few octaves of the real chromatic scale. I am not mad; there are colors we cannot see. And, God help me! the DAMNED THING is of such a color."

**big brother:** of or characteristic of the head of a totalitarian regime that keeps its citizens under close surveillance. (From George Orwell's novel, *1984*.)

**birdmen:** aviators.

**black field:** some part of a mental image picture where the preclear is looking at blackness.

**Black Five:** a heavily occluded case characterized by mental pictures consisting of masses of blackness. The term *Black Five* came from application of SOP 8, wherein the auditor tests the preclear at each step of the process to find a step the preclear can do and begins processing at that step. A preclear who had to be started at Step V of the process was called a "Case V." This level of case could not get mock-ups but only blackness. *See also* **Standard Operating Procedure 8** and **blackness** in this glossary.

**blackness:** a state or condition of being black, in terms of facsimiles or masses the preclear is looking at. *See also* **Black Five** in this glossary. **blather:** talk or utter foolishly; talk nonsense.

**Boeing:** aircraft manufacturing company, founded in 1916, which produced a wide variety of civilian and military planes.

**boil down:** to amount to when briefly stated.

**Bolitho, William Ry'all:** British journalist and author. His work *Twelve Against the Gods* was a biography of twelve famed personalities, including Alexander the Great,

Mohammed and Napoleon.

**Book One:** *Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health*. For further information, see the bibliography of this volume.

**boot:** a navy or marine recruit, especially one in training camp.

**bop:** theta bop, a small or wide steady dance of the needle on an E-Meter.

**bouncers:** action phrases which send the preclear up the track toward present time. (Get up, get out, don't touch me, leave me alone, I've got to get ahead.)

**Brahmin:** a member of the highest or priestly class among the Hindus.

**breed of cat:** kind or type of thing.

**BTU:** (*physics*) British thermal unit, the amount of heat required to raise the temperature of one pound of water one degree Fahrenheit.

**bubonic plague:** a very dangerous contagious disease, accompanied by high fever, chills and swelling of the lymph glands. It is usually carried to human beings by fleas from rats or squirrels.

**bum:** of poor, wretched or miserable quality; worthless.

**battered all over:** a condition whereby a thetan is unknowingly in contact with a large part of a universe. In his effort to control, a thetan spreads himself further and further from the universe, and in his failures to control, withdraws from things he has attempted to control but leaves himself connected with them in terms of "dead energy." Thus we get the manifestation *battered all over the universe*.

**buttons:** restimulators, words, voice tones, music, whatever they are – things which are filed in the reactive mind bank as parts of engrams.

**Caesar, Julius:** (100 B.C. – 144 B.C.) Roman general and statesman. After ten years of military campaigning across Europe, in which he conquered all of what is present-day France and portions of Germany, he returned to Rome, seized power through military action and effectively wiped out opposition to his rule.

**CalTec:** California Institute of Technology, a private engineering university in Pasadena, California, founded in 1891.

**cat-foot:** move in a cat-footed manner; go furtively like a cat.

**CECS:** Committee of Examination, Certificates and Services, a committee of five Doctors of Scientology which was the principle authority and court of appeals of Scientology in 1954, and controlled the certificates of Dianetics and Scientology.

**chain fission:** (fission means a splitting apart, dividing) larger atoms such as atoms of uranium can fission (split) into smaller atoms such as atoms of Iodine and Bromine. This process can be designed so that each fission will cause another fission, thereby setting off a chain reaction. The atomic bomb is an example of a chain fission.

**Chaldea:** province of Babylonia, the ancient empire in what is now southern Iraq.

**Chanel Number 2:** a perfume marketed by French fashion designer Gabrielle "Coco" Chanel (1882 – 1971).

**Chart of Human Evaluation:** a chart organized in very early 1951 by L. Ron Hubbard. It has various columns and gives behavior characteristics. It is plotted out mathematically on the basis of ARC; a very good chart to use in order to predict people. (For further information on this chart, read Ron's book *Science of Survival*.)

**chemistry:** the science dealing with the composition and properties of substances, and with the reactions by which substances are produced from or converted into other substances.

**chimerical:** unreal; imaginary.

**chronic somatic:** any "illness" generated by an engram or engrams. The word *somatic*

means bodily or physical. Because the word *pain is* restimulative, and because the word *pain* has in the past led to confusion between physical pain and mental pain, the word *somatic is* used in Dianetics to denote physical pain or discomfort of any kind.

**circuitry:** having to do with a circuit, a part of an individual's bank that behaves as though it were someone or something separate from him and that either talks to him or goes into action of its own accord, and may even, if severe enough, take control of him while it operates. A tune that keeps going around in someone's head is an example of a circuit.

**clink:** a jail; prison.

**closed terminals:** the phenomenon of things collapsing into each other. In Scientology, this is also called closing or snapping terminals (people, fixed masses, etc.). The mechanics of this are: That which you fear, you bring to you. Why? Because all you have to do is be it and it is no longer possible for that to hurt you, or even be bad. But the second you run away from it, if you have anchor points in it you bring the anchor points in, too, and that collapses the terminal on you, so you become something bad.

**co-auditing:** the action of two people auditing one another. It is an abbreviation for cooperative auditing. It means a team of any two people who are helping each other reach a better life with Dianetics or Scientology processing.

**cockeyed:** (*slang*) foolish; absurd.

**Code of a Scientologist:** a code which governs the activity of a Scientologist in general. For the entire code, see the book *The Creation of Human Ability*.

**Columbia University:** a large private university in New York City, founded in 1754.

**comm lag:** abbreviation for *communication lag*: the length of time intervening between the asking of the question by the auditor and the reply to that specific question by the preclear. The question must be precise; the reply must be precisely to that question. It does not matter what intervenes in the time between the asking of the question and the receipt of the answer. The preclear may outflow, jabber, discuss, pause, hedge, disperse, dither or be silent; no matter what he does or how he does it, between the asking of the question and the giving of the answer, the *time* is the communication lag.

**congress:** an assembly of Scientologists held in any of various cities around the world for a presentation of Dianetics and/or Scientology materials. Many congresses were addressed directly by Ron. Others were based upon taped LRH lectures or films on a particular subject. A congress also sometimes included seminars and co-audits for attendees.

**conservation of energy:** the principle that in a system that does not undergo any force from outside the system, the amount of energy is constant, irrespective of its changes in form.

**consideration:** thinking, believing, supposing, postulating. Consideration is the highest capability of life, taking rank over the mechanics of space, energy and time.

**cropper, come a:** experience a sudden or violent failure or collapse.

**Curtis turbines:** steam engines widely used for electric power plants and marine propulsion, developed by Charles G. Curtis (1860 – 1953), in the 1890s in the United States.

**Dear Souls area:** the term used to describe an area of the whole track dating back to trillions of years ago. The Dear Souls area was a saccharine-sweet sort of a universe, characterized by lots of enforced ARC. The beings in this area (called the "Dear Old Souls") educated one to be religious and to love one's neighbor and so on.

**DED:** an incident the preclear does to another dynamic and for which he has no motivator, i.e., he punishes or hurts or wrecks something the like of which has never hurt him. Now he must justify the incident. He will use things which didn't happen to him. He claims that the object of his injury really DEserved it, hence the word DED, which is a sarcasm.

**DEDEX:** an incident which happens to a preclear after he has a DED. It is always on the same chain or subject, is always after the DED. It means the DED Exposed. It is covered guilt.

**demon circuitry:** mental mechanisms set up by engrams which take over portions of the analyzer and act as an individual being. A bona fide demon is one who gives thoughts voice, or echoes the spoken word interiorly, or who gives all sorts of complicated advice like a real, live voice exteriorly.

**denominations:** characteristic or qualifying names given to things or classes of things.

**denyers:** action phrases which deny existence of phrase(s) or incident(s). (No, don't, I won't, I can't tell, you mustn't, it's not here, never, impossible, unknown, unthinkable, you know [no] everything.)

**Descartes, René:** (1596 – 1650) French mathematician and philosopher. Known as the father of the modern scientific method and originator of analytical geometry.

***Dianetics: The Evolution of a Science:*** the first broadly published work on Dianetics written by L. Ron Hubbard. It was published in the widely read magazine *Astounding Science Fiction* shortly before the release of *Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health*.

**Dianometry:** "thought measurement." The term is derived from the Greek for thought and the Latin for mensuration. It is that branch of Dianetics which measures thought capacity, computational ability and the rationality of the human mind.

**Dirty 30:** an auditing procedure in which the auditor first gets into two-way communication with the preclear and keeps up this communication to get an idea of some sort of present time problem, if the preclear has any, and tackle this problem, if found, head on. The auditor and preclear would tackle any possibility that this individual was unable to duplicate a command many times. Then the auditor runs three processes: first, *Opening Procedure by Duplication*; second, *Straightwire* on the subject of *problems* using the question "Give me some problems that you don't have to solve at this moment"; and third, *Granting of Beingness* using the question "Who would grant beingness to ... ?" And in the blank may be placed anything the auditor might think of, each time until the preclear replies without communication lag. Also called *Procedure 30*. See also **present time problem; Opening Procedure by Duplication; Straightwire; Granting of Beingness; comm lag** in this glossary.

**discombobulated:** confused or disconcerted; upset; frustrated.

**dives:** sudden movement of the E-Meter needle to the right.

**dog off:** adaptation of the phrase "dog it," meaning to avoid work; shirk responsibility.

**Doolittle's bombers:** bombers under the command of General James "Jimmy" Doolittle (1896 – ) which conducted the first American bombing raid against the Japanese mainland in April, 1942, during World War II.

**down pat:** mastered or learned perfectly.

**D. Scn:** *Doctor of Scientology*: around the time of these lectures, a degree awarded after a Bachelor of Scientology had completed a series of cases and had completed a paper demonstrating his application of Scientology.

**Dutch, in:** (*slang*) in trouble or disgrace.

**Effort Processing:** there are three distinct levels of processing. The first is *thought*, the second is *emotion*, the third is *effort*. Effort Processing is done by running moments of physical stress. These are run either as simple efforts or counter-efforts or as whole precise incidents. Such incidents as those which contain physical pain or heavy stress of motion, such as injuries, accidents or illnesses, are addressed by effort.

**eidetic recall:** recall of mental images that are unusually vivid and almost photographically exact.

**eight dynamics:** there could be said to be eight urges (drives, impulses) in life. These we call dynamics. These are motives or motivations. We call them the eight dynamics. These are urges for survival as or through (1) self, (2) sex and family, (3) groups, (4) all mankind, (5) living things (plants and animals), (6) the material universe, (7) spirits and (8) infinity or the Supreme Being.

**Einstein:** Albert Einstein (1879 – 1955), German physicist, U.S. citizen from 1940: formulator of the theory of relativity; Nobel prize, 1921.

**electrons:** any of the negatively charged particles that form a part of all atoms, and can exist on their own in a free state.

**encyst:** to enclose or become enclosed in a cyst, capsule or sac.

**End-of-Cycle Processing:** an additional process to Remedy of Havingness and is an effective way of remedying havingness. An End-of-Cycle process run subjectively would be, "*What are you willing to destroy?*" "*What are you willing to have destroy you?*"

**erase:** to cause an engram to "vanish" entirely, at which time it is filed as memory and experience and ceases to be part of the reactive mind.

**E-Therapy:** a squirrel technique of setting up a circuit in the mind called "the examiner" and then trying to have this circuit run out engrams. It was called Examiner Therapy or E-Therapy and did not work.

**Euphrates:** river flowing from east central Turkey generally southward through Syria and Iraq.

**evaluate:** to impose data or knowledge upon another. An example would be to tell another why he is the way he is instead of permitting or guiding him to discover it for himself.

**exorcists:** people who drive evil spirits out or away with ritual prayers, etc.

**Expanded GITA:** a process whereby the preclear is first tested to see if he can get a mock-up that he can see, no matter how vague, then is made to *waste, accept under duress, desire* and finally be able to *take or leave alone* each of the items on a list of certain isolated factors – these factors being those which are more important to minds than others. The term *GITA* comes from *GIve* and *TAke* processing. *See also mock-up* in this glossary. For more information on Expanded GITA, see the book *Scientology 8-8008*.

**Fac Ones:** *Facsimile One:* the first proven-up, whole track incident which, when audited out of a long series of people, was found to eradicate such things as asthma, sinus trouble, chronic chills and a host of other ills. It was originally laid down in this galaxy about one million years ago. Fac One was an outright control mechanism, invented to cut down rebel raids on invader installations. For further information, see the book *Scientology: A History of Man*.

**Fifth Invader Force:** one of two invader forces attacking earth in the neighborhood of 1135 B.C. – 1230 B.C.

**figure-figure:** a particular type of aberration which consists of always having to have a

"reason for" or a significance. Given a fact, there must always be a reason for the fact.

**fits and starts, by:** irregularly starting, stopping, beginning again, and so on.

**fluid:** able to change easily; not fixed or firm.

**fluxes:** (*physics*) rates of flow of fluid, particles or energy.

**flying wires:** external bracing wires, usually of streamlined shape, which carry the weight of the fuselage in flight. Also called *lift wires*.

**foible:** a minor weakness or failing of character; slight flaw or defect.

**Fort Knox:** a military reservation in Kentucky, location of U.S. federal gold depository since 1936.

**Fort McDowell:** military outpost located in Arizona in the late 1800s. It was located near several Apache trails, making it possible for troops from McDowell to make fast expeditions whenever there was trouble with the Indians.

**frauleins:** (*slang*) young, unmarried German women.

**Freud, Sigmund:** (1856 – 1939) Austrian neurologist, founder of psychoanalysis.

**frieze:** a horizontal band, often ornamented with sculpture, between the cornice (ornamental molding that projects along the top of a wall, pillar or side of a building) and architrave (main beam resting on the top of a column or row of columns).

**Fromm-Reichmann, Frieda:** (1889 – 1957) psychoanalyst, psychiatrist and author: pioneered in psychotherapy with schizophrenic patients. *See also* **schizophrenic** in this glossary.

**fulcrums:** supports on which levers turn or rest in moving or lifting things. G's: units of force exerted on a body by the pull of gravity. The force exerted on a body at the earth's surface is 1 G. An accelerating body may experience a force of several G's.

**gallstones:** pebblelike masses, chiefly of cholesterol and mineral salts, that sometimes form in the gallbladder or one of its ducts. When one or more gallstones stop the flow of bile, there is usually pain, and sometimes jaundice results.

**gamma:** a high-frequency, penetrating type of radiation emitted from radioactive atoms.

**Geiger counter:** a device which is used to measure radioactivity.

**general semanticist:** an adherent or professor of *general semantics*, a philosophical approach to language, developed by Alfred Korzybski, exploring the relationship between the form of language and its use, and attempting to improve the capacity to express ideas. *See also* **Korzybski, Alfred Lord** in this glossary.

**Gibbon, Edward:** (1737 – 94) English historian, noted for his masterpiece *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*. **gimping:** limping; walking in a halting manner.

**glee of insanity:** a specialized case of irresponsibility. A thetan who cannot be killed and yet can be punished has only one answer to those punishing him and that is to demonstrate to them that he is no longer capable of force or action and is no longer responsible. He therefore states that he is insane and demonstrates that he cannot possibly harm them as he lacks any further rationality.

**Gordian knot, cut through this:** to act quickly and decisively in a difficult situation; solve a problem boldly. Refers to an intricate knot tied by Gordius, legendary king of Phrygia, to be undone only by the person who should rule Asia. Alexander the Great cut it through with his sword.

**Götterdämmerung:** (*German Mythology*) the day of the great battle between the gods and the forces of evil, signaling the end of the world. Literally, twilight of the gods. Also, an opera (1876) by Richard Wagner, the last of his tetralogy of *The Ring of the Nibelung*.

**Gott mit uns:** (*German*) God with us.

**gradient scale:** a scale of condition graduated from zero to infinity. On the scale of right and wrong, everything above zero or center would be more and more right, approaching an infinite rightness, and everything below zero or center would be more and more wrong, approaching an infinite wrongness. Absolutes are considered to be unobtainable. Also called a *graduated scale*.

**grant beingness:** to grant life to something; to permit or allow other people to have beingness.

**Granting of Beingness:** a process which rehabilitates the preclear's ability to *grant beingness*. See also **grant beingness** in this glossary.

**groupers:** engramic commands (such as "I have no time," "Put them all together," etc.) which collapse the time track and bring many incidents together. See also **time track** in this glossary.

**gullets:** throats.

**Gunther, John:** (1901 – 70) American journalist and writer, European correspondent for various newspapers (from 1924); author of such books as *Inside Europe* (1936), *Inside Asia* (1939), *Inside Latin America* (1939), etc.

**hair, take down our:** to speak candidly or frankly; remove or reduce restraints.

**Handbook for Preclears:** a book written by L. Ron Hubbard in 1951 to fill the need for an advanced personal workbook for auditors and preclears.

**hang fire:** be slow in beginning; be delayed; wait.

**HASI:** *Hubbard Association of Scientologists International:* around the time these lectures were given, the HASI was an organization which provided professional training and processing services also handled the publication of materials, and additionally functioned as a research and investigation unit.

**HCA Course:** abbreviation for Hubbard Certified Auditor Course, an exactly laid out course of theory and practical learning which qualifies an auditor to deliver certain types of processing to preclears. Today, the HCA Course is known as Academy Level II and is available in Church of Scientology Academies.

**HDA:** *Hubbard Dianetic Auditor:* a person who has completed auditor training specializing in Dianetics theory and application in the Phoenix Certification Course in late 1954. Today, an HDA is a person who completes the Hubbard Dianetics Auditor Course.

**Hebrew:** of or concerning Judaism, the religion of the Jews, which teaches belief in the same God as Christianity but holds that the Messiah is still to come.

**held-down fives:** jammed thinking because of a misunderstood or misapplied datums.

**hellebore:** any of several poisonous or medicinal substances obtained from plants of the genus *Helleborus*.

**Hemingway, Ernest:** (1899 – 1961) American novelist and short-story writer. His novel *For Whom the Bell Tolls* (1940) takes its title from the quote "Never send to know for whom the bell tolls; it tolls for thee," from John Donne's poem *Devotions upon Emergent Occasions* (1624).

**hepped:** (*slang*) in agreement or willing to cooperate; going along.

**Hercules:** (*in Greek and Roman myths*) a son of Zeus; a hero who possessed such great strength and courage that he was able to perform twelve extraordinary labors imposed on him by Hera, wife of Zeus.

**Hindus:** adherents of Hinduism, a religious and social system, especially in India, with belief in reincarnation, worship of several gods, and caste as a basis of society.



**Hippocrates:** (460? B.C. – 370? B.C.) Greek physician, known as "the father of medicine."

**Hitler, Adolf:** (1889 – 1945) dictator of Germany from 1933 to 1945. In rising to power in Germany, he fortified his position through murder of real or imagined opponents and maintained police-state control over the population. He lead Germany into World War II, resulting in its nearly total destruction.

**hookers:** (*slang*) concealed problems, flaws or drawbacks; catches.

**Hudson:** an automobile company which existed from 1909 to 1957, when it merged with American Motors.

**"I Will Arise" Burial Society:** made-up name for a group.

**immutable:** never changing or varying; unchangeable.

**insouciant:** free from concern, worry or anxiety; carefree; nonchalant.

**Intensive Procedure:** standard operating procedure of 1954; a sequence of steps to be taken by an auditor for the resolution of all cases. The goal of Intensive Procedure is to bring about a complete tolerance and comfort on the part of the preclear for the physical universe, his exteriorization, and general rehabilitation.

**internal-combustion engine:** an engine in which power is produced by exploding a mixture of fuel and air inside the engine itself, usually inside cylinders. Gasoline engines and diesel engines are internal-combustion engines.

**invalidate:** refute, degrade, discredit or deny something someone else considers to be a fact.

**ion:** atom or group of atoms having a negative or positive charge as a result of having lost or gained one or more electrons.

**iron curtain:** an imaginary wall or dividing line separating the Soviet Union and the countries under Soviet control or influence from other nations after World War II.

**Journal, The:** *Journal of Scientology*, publication of the Hubbard Association of Scientologists International, Phoenix, Arizona, from 1952 to 1955.

**Jung:** Carl Gustav Jung (1875 – 1961) Swiss psychiatrist and psychologist.

**Kaiser Bill:** William II (1859 – 1941) emperor of Germany (1888 – 1918). (*Kaiser is German for "emperor."*) Through inept handling of his power and authority as emperor, he helped cause the circumstances leading to World War I and thereby the deaths of millions of men on the battlefields.

**keyed in:** restimulated. The environment around the awake but fatigued or distressed individual is itself similar to the dormant engram. At that moment the engram becomes active.

**kick:** (*slang*) cause for complaint; complaint; objection.

**kinetics:** branch of physics that deals with the effects of forces in causing or changing the motion of objects.

**Know to Sex Scale:** a scale of behavior, patterned on the Tone Scale, which starts at the top with Know and goes downscale to Sex. This was an earlier version of the Know to Mystery Scale. *See also Mystery to Know Scale* in this glossary.

**Korzybski, Alfred:** (1879 – 1950) American scientist and writer; president and director of the Institute of General Semantics, Chicago, 1938 – 50. *See also general semanticist* in this glossary.

**lock:** a mental image picture of a nonpainful but disturbing experience the person has had, which depends for its force on earlier secondaries and engrams which the experience has restimulated (stirred up).

**lock-scan:** perform *Lock Scanning*, a process which starts the preclear from a point in the

past with which he has made solid contact up through all similar incidents without verbalization. This is done over and over, each time trying to start at an earlier incident of the same kind, until the preclear extroverts on the subject of the chain.

**Look magazine:** American weekly pictorial magazine published between January 1937 and October 1971.

**MacFadden, Bernarr:** (1868 – 1955) American publisher and physical culturist. At one time MacFadden published over a dozen magazines, including *Physical Culture*, *True Romances*, *Liberty*, *True Detective Mysteries*, etc.

**matter:** something of consequence.

**Maupassant, Guy de:** (1850 – 93) French short-story writer and novelist. His short story "Piece of String" concerns an old man in a Norman village who sees a piece of string one day as he was walking along. As he bends down to pick it up, he sees an old enemy of his, and not wanting the enemy to know what he is doing he surreptitiously picks up the string. When a pocketbook of money is reported lost in the village, the old enemy informs the authorities that he saw the old man picking something up on the road and suggests the old man found the pocketbook and kept it. The old man is questioned and shows that he didn't have the pocketbook or the money and is let go. He starts telling the story of finding the string, but no one believes him. When another pocketbook disappears, again the villagers think he took it. He continually repeats the story of the piece of string. As he has in the past been very skilled at deception, no one will believe him. He soon realizes that there is no way that he can prove that he did not find the pocketbook, that all he found was a piece of string. On his deathbed a few years later he softly mutters "a piece of string, a piece of string."

**Mayo Clinic:** a clinic in the United States, located in Rochester, Minnesota, which in the early 70s had a staff of about 500 physicians. It was established by three generations of the Mayo family, who were pioneers in the practice of group medicine.

**McCarthy:** Joseph Raymond McCarthy (1908 – 57) U.S. Senator who dominated the early 1950s by his sensational but unproved charges of communist subversion in high government circles. Working alone and as chairman of the Government Operations Committee of the Senate, and of its permanent subcommittee on investigations, McCarthy became the main protagonist in a nationwide, militant anticommunist "crusade." On 2 December 1954 in a rare move he was officially censured for unbecoming conduct by his Senate colleagues, thus ending the era of McCarthy-ism. The term McCarthyism was used to describe his methods and the atmosphere he created.

**MEST universe:** the physical universe; the universe of matter, energy, space and time.

**Middle West:** region of the northern central U.S. between the Rocky Mountains and the eastern border of Ohio, north of the Ohio River and the southern borders of Kansas and Missouri.

**Miles, General:** General Nelson Appleton Miles (1839 – 1925), American army commander, engaged in frontier Indian fighting (1869 – 80), leading campaigns against Apache and Sioux Indian tribes.

**mock up:** (*verb*) knowingly create a mental image picture that is not part of the time track; get an imaginary picture of.

**mock-up:** a self-created object which exists as itself or symbolizes an object in the MEST (physical) universe. It is something that the thetan puts up and says is there. We call a mental image picture a mock-up when it is created by the thetan or for the thetan and does not consist of a photograph of the physical universe.

**modus operandi:** mode of operation; way of doing or making; procedure.

**Mohammedan:** of the Moslem religion.

**motivator:** an aggressive or destructive act received by the person or one of the dynamics. The reason it is called a motivator is because it tends to prompt that one pays it back – it "motivates" a new overt.

**Mystery to Know Scale:** a scale which includes: Not-Know, Know, Look, Emotion, Effort, Think, Symbols, Sex, Eat, Mystery, Wait, Unconsciousness. Everything on the Mystery to Know Scale is simply a greater condensation or reduction of knowingness. (Also called the *Know to Mystery Scale*.) For further information, see the book *Scientology 0-8: The Book of Basics*.

**mysticism:** a doctrine of an immediate spiritual intuition of truths believed to transcend ordinary understanding, or of a direct, intimate union of the soul with God through contemplation or ecstasy.

**Napoleon Bonaparte:** (1769 – 1821) French military leader. He rose to power in France by military force, declared himself emperor and conducted campaigns of conquest across Europe until his final defeat by armies allied against him in 1815.

**necromancy:** magic; sorcery.

**neurotic:** the state or condition where one is insane or disturbed on some subject (as opposed to a psychotic person, who is just insane in general).

**Nietzsche, Friedrich Wilhelm:** (1844 – 1900) German philosopher and poet. He denounced all religion and promoted the "morals of masters," the doctrine of perfecting man through forcible self-assertion and glorification of the "superman." His theories are regarded as having influenced the German attitudes in World War I and the Nazi regime.

**non compos mentis:** (*Latin*) not of sound mind; mentally incapable of managing one's affairs.

**noumena:** things that seem real but cannot be truly understood, although people have some intuitive idea of it, as God or the soul.

**nuclear physics:** *nuclear* means pertaining to the nucleus, or central core of an atom. Nuclear physics is the branch of physics dealing with atoms, their nuclear structure, and the behavior of nuclear particles. *See also physics* in this glossary.

**off the beat:** (*slang*) off the main topic.

**olfactory:** of or relating to the sense of smell.

**"only one":** an individual just above zero on the Tone Scale who must have no effect on self and total effect on everything and everybody else. He is in the category of "only one." Such a person can never communicate on a team basis.

**Opening Procedure by Duplication:** a process which has as its goal the separating of time, moment from moment. This is done by getting a preclear to duplicate his same action over and over again with two dissimilar objects. In England this process is called "Book and Bottle," probably because these two familiar objects are the most used in doing Opening Procedure by Duplication.

**Opening Procedure of 8-C:** a process which consists of having the preclear move his body around the room under the auditor's direction until (a) he finds he is in actual communication with many spots on the surface of things in the room, (b) until he can select spots in the room and know he is selecting them and can communicate with them, and (c) select spots and move to them, decide when to touch them and when to let go. For further information, see the book *The Creation of Human Ability*.

**Operating Thetan:** a state of beingness. It is a being "at cause over matter, energy, space,

time, form and life." Operating comes from "able to operate without dependency on things," and Thetan is the Greek letter Theta ( $\theta$ ), which the Greeks used to represent thought or perhaps spirit, to which an n is added to make a noun in the modern style used to create words in engineering. It is also  $\theta^n$  or "theta to the nth degree," meaning unlimited or vast.

**overt act:** an act by the person or individual leading to the injury, reduction or degradation of another, others or their beingness, persons, possessions, associations or dynamics. It can be intentional or unintentional.

**overt-act-motivator sequence:** when a person commits an overt, he will then believe he's got to have a motivator or that he has had a motivator. For instance, if he hits somebody he will tell you immediately that he has been hit by the person, even when he has not been. *See also* **motivator; overt act** in this glossary.

**PABs:** abbreviation for *Professional Auditor's Bulletins*, a series of bulletins from Ron to professional auditors containing technical and promotional material to assist the auditor. (Started 10 May 1953.) Some were compiled from Ron's research papers or lectures.

**pan-determinism:** the ability to regulate the considerations of two or more identities, whether or not they are opposed. A much broader concept than self-determinism, since the latter makes a randomness of anything not considered "self."

**para-:** related or similar to.

**Parris Island:** a U.S. Marine Corps base, recruit depot and training station located in southeastern South Carolina.

**Part C:** the third portion of *Opening Procedure of 8-C*. *See* **Opening Procedure of 8-C** in this glossary.

**pax vobiscum:** (*Latin*) peace be with you.

**perceptics:** sense messages.

**perception:** the process of recording data from the physical universe and storing it as a theta facsimile.

**Perfect Duplication:** a process by which a preclear is gotten to create a perfect duplicate of an object. A perfect duplicate is an additional creation of the object, its energy and space, in its own space, in its own time, using its own energy.

**petcock:** a small faucet inserted in a pipe or cylinder for draining liquids, testing or reducing pressure, etc.

**photons:** units of light energy; photons are considered in physics to be massless particles.

**physicist:** a scientist who specializes in physics. *See also* **physics** in this glossary.

**physics:** the science which deals with relationships between matter and energy, including subjects such as mechanics, heat, light, sound, electricity, magnetism, radiation and atomic structure.

**physiognomies:** the facial features that show the qualities of mind or character by peculiarities of configuration or cast or characteristic expression.

**plankton:** small organisms that float or drift in water, especially at or near the surface.

**postmaster general:** the executive head of the postal system of a country. **postulates:** those self-determined thoughts which start, stop or change past, present or future efforts; conclusions, decisions or resolutions made by the individual himself to resolve a problem or set a pattern for the future or nullify a pattern of the past. Postulates are self-created truths.

**potty:** (*British*) slightly crazy.

**precession:** the wobbling of a spinning body on its axis due to outside forces, such as

gravity. This occurs with the earth, for example, which completes one such full wobble on its axis each 26,000 years. Such a movement brings about an apparent change in the positions of stars and planets in the sky due to a different position in space of the earth. For example, in another 12,000 years earth will have a new "North Star" due to this phenomenon.

**Prelogic:** (also known as a Q) Qs: knowledge is a pyramid, and knowledge as a pyramid has a common denominator which evaluates all other data below it. At the top point of this pyramid is what could be called a Q, and it could also be called a common denominator. It is in common to every other datum in this pyramid full of data. The Qs are the highest echelon from which all other things are derived. Q comes from *quod* in Q.E.D. (*quod erat demonstrandum*), meaning "which was to be shown or demonstrated," used specifically in mathematical proofs. The Qs can be found in the book *Scientology 0-8: The Book of Basics*.

**present time problem:** a special problem that exists in the physical universe "now" on which the pc has his attention fixed. It is any set of circumstances that so engages the attention of the preclear that he feels he should be doing something about it instead of being audited.

**Procedure 30:** same as *Dirty 30*. See **Dirty 30** in this glossary.

**protoplasm:** essential living matter of cells.

**psychoanalysis:** a system of mental therapy developed in 1894 by Sigmund Freud. It depended upon the following practices for its effects: The patient was made to talk about and recall his childhood for years while the practitioner brought about a transfer of the patient's personality to his own and searched for hidden sexual incidents believed by Freud to be the only cause of aberration. The practitioner read sexual significances into all statements and evaluated them for the patient along sexual lines. Each of these points later proved to be based upon false premises and incomplete research, accounting for their lack of result and the subsequent failure of the subject and its offshoots.

**psychosomatic illness:** *psycho* refers to mind and *somatic* refers to body; the term *psychosomatic* means the mind making the body ill or illnesses which have been created physically within the body by derangement of the mind.

**psychotic:** an individual who is out of contact to a thorough extent with his present-time environment and who does not compute into the future. He may be an acute psychotic wherein he becomes psychotic for only a few minutes at a time and only occasionally in certain environments (as in rages or apathies) or he may be a chronic psychotic, or in a continual disconnection with the future and present. Psychotics who are dramatically harmful to others are considered dangerous enough to be put away. Psychotics who are harmful on a less dramatic basis are no less harmful to their environment and are no less psychotic.

**pump carburetor:** a carburetor is a device which atomizes the fuel of an internal-combustion engine and mixes it with the proper amount of air required for proper engine operation. A pump *carburetor* is one equipped with an accelerator pump. This is a pump operated by the throttle for extra fuel during acceleration.

**Quantico:** a U.S. Marine Corps base and development and education command in northeastern Virginia, on the Potomac River.

**quantum mechanics:** a physical theory that describes the motion of objects by the principle of quantum theory, a theory that energy is not absorbed or radiated continuously but discontinuously, and only in multiples of definite, indivisible units.

- R1-1, R1-2, R1-3:** The first three steps of Intensive Procedure: (1) get into two-way communication with the preclear, (2) discuss the present time problem if any, and (3) get the preclear into session with ARC Straightwire. For further information, see the book *The Creation of Human Ability*. See also **Intensive Procedure** in this glossary.
- R2-16:** the number of the process Opening Procedure of 8-C. See **Opening Procedure of 8-C** in this glossary. For more information, see the book *The Creation of Human Ability*.
- R2-58:** a process which deals with the manifestations of loss. For more information, see the book *The Creation of Human Ability*.
- R2-60:** a process which deals with all the aspects of hidden communication, hidden knowingness and their manifestations. For more information, see the book *The Creation of Human Ability*.
- rack up:** to tally, accumulate or amass as an achievement or score.
- razzle-dazzle:** a flashy display intended to confuse, bewilder or deceive.
- reactive bank:** See **reactive mind** in this glossary.
- reactive mind:** that portion of a person's mind which works on a totally stimulus-response basis, which is not under his volitional control and which exerts force and the power of command over his awareness, purposes, thoughts, body and actions.
- reductio ad absurdum:** a reduction to an absurdity.
- remedy havingness:** apply the process called *Remedy of Havingness*, a process that has a preclear mock up a mass in front of him and shove it into his body, and mock up another mass in front of him and throw it away, over and over. When the process has been done thoroughly and completely, the preclear should be able to reject or accept, at his own discretion, anything in his environment as well as anything in his engram bank. See also **mock up** in this glossary.
- repeating rifles:** firearms capable of discharging a number of shots without reloading.
- restimulation:** condition in which part of the bank has been "triggered" by something in the person's environment (a restimulator) causing some greater or lesser degree of reactive behavior or condition; doing something unknowingly, unwittingly and without any understanding of what one is doing.
- reverie:** a light state of "concentration" which the preclear is placed in, not to be confused with hypnosis; in reverie the person is fully aware of what is taking place.
- ridge:** suspended energy in space. It comes about by flows, dispersals or ridges impinging against one another with a sufficient solidity to cause an enduring state of energy.
- Route 1:** a series of drill and familiarization processes employed on a preclear who has no noticeable communication lag when run on ARC Straightwire. The first command of Route 1 is "*Be three feet back of your head.*" For further information, see the book *The Creation of Human Ability*.
- Saint Christopher:** patron saint of travelers.
- Saturday Evening Post:** a large American monthly magazine, founded in 1728.
- savvy:** (*slang*) to understand; get the idea.
- Scale of Substitutes:** See **R2-58** in the book *The Creation of Human Ability*.
- schema:** an outline, diagram, plan or preliminary draft.
- schizophrenic:** (*psychiatry*) originally meaning *split mind*, it has come to denote a psychiatric classification of people whose thoughts and emotions are disassociated from each other.
- Schopenhauer, Arthur:** (1788 – 1860) German philosopher who maintained that the desires and drives of men, as well as the forces of nature, are manifestations of a

single will, specifically the will to live, which is the essence of the world. His philosophy was one of pessimism and could be summed "Defeat it all and die, for only by dying can you defeat it."

**Schutzstaffel:** (*German*, literally meaning "defense echelon") an elite military unit of the Nazi party that served as Hitler's bodyguard and as a special police force. Abbreviation: SS.

**Science of Survival:** L. Ron Hubbard's complete work on the Tone Scale and its application to auditing.

**Scienometry:** IQ and personality testing, coordinated with an E-Meter. The results are more accurate than psychological tests.

**Scientology 8-8008:** a book written by L. Ron Hubbard in 1952 which is a complete treatise of the anatomy of universes and the role played in them by a spiritual being. The definition of 8-8008 is the attainment of infinity by the reduction of the apparent infinity and power of the MEST universe to a zero for himself, and the increase of the apparent zero of one's own universe to an infinity for oneself. It can be seen that infinity stood upright makes the number eight: thus, 8-8008 is not just another number, but serves to fix into the mind of the individual a route by which he can rehabilitate himself, his abilities, his ethics and his goals.

**screen:** a thing that functions to shield, protect or conceal like a curtain.

**scruff:** the nape or back of the neck.

**Self Analysis:** a book written by L. Ron Hubbard in 1951 as a simple self-help volume of tests and processes based on Dianetics discoveries.

**self-determinism:** the condition of determining the actions of self; the ability to direct oneself.

**service facsimile:** a computation generated by the individual to make self right and others wrong, to dominate or escape domination and to enhance own survival and injure that of others. This computation will cause the individual to deliberately hold in restimulation selected parts of his reactive mind to explain his failures in life. For example, a person may keep an old injury in restimulation so that his family has to look after him.

**shake out:** to straighten out by shaking.

**shaman's:** belonging to a priest or medicine man of shamanism (shamanism is the religion of certain peoples of northeast Asia, based on a belief in good and evil spirits who can be influenced only by the shamans).

**short circuits:** usually accidental low-resistance connections between two points in an electric circuit, resulting in a side current that deflects most of the circuit current from desired paths or in excessive current flows that often cause damage.

**Significances:** a process in which one has the preclear take a picture or object and assign innumerable significances to it. For further information, see the section on R2-32 in the book *The Creation of Human Ability*.

**sonic:** the recall of something heard, so that it is heard again in the mind in full tone and strength.

**spectrometer:** an instrument used for measuring spectral wavelengths.

**spot spots in space:** apply the process *Spotting Spots in Space*, a process in which the goal is to bring the preclear to a point where he can spot locations in space which do not have color, mass or shape but which are simply locations, and spot that same location repeatedly without variation.

**squared around:** became straight or right.

**Standard Operating Procedure 8-C:** Standard Operating Procedure 8 modified for clinical, laboratory and individual human applications. The goal of the system of operation is to return to the individual his knowledge, skill and knowingness, and to enhance his perception, his reaction time and serenity. For further information, see the book *The Creation of Human Ability*. See also **Standard Operating Procedure 8** in this glossary.

**Standard Operating Procedure 8:** SOP 8, a Scientology auditing procedure which emphasizes positive gain and the present and the future rather than negative gain of eradication of the past. The goal of this procedure is the rehabilitation of the thetan.

**status quo:** the way things are; the existing state of affairs. In Latin it means literally *the state in which*.

**statute of limitations:** (*law*) a statute defining the period within which legal action may be taken.

**stopgap:** something that fills the place of something else that is lacking; temporary substitute; makeshift.

**Straightwire:** the name of a process. It is the act of stringing a line between present time and some incident in the past, and stringing that line directly and without any detours. The auditor is stringing a straight "wire" of memory between the actual genus (origin) of a condition and present time, thus demonstrating that there is a difference of time and space in the condition then and the condition now, and that the preclear, conceding this difference, then rids himself of the condition or at least is able to handle it.

**surfeit:** feed or supply to excess.

**teeth of, in the:** straight into or against.

**tenuous:** slender or fine, as a fiber.

**terminal:** anything that can receive, relay or send a communication (most common usage); also, anything with mass and meaning.

**thetan exterior:** a thetan who is clear of the body and knows it but is not yet stable outside.

**Throvmagog:** a made-up name for a god.

**Tibetans:** members of the Mongolian people native to Tibet, an autonomous region of southwestern China occupying a high plateau area north of the Himalayas.

**till, tapping the:** stealing or taking money dishonestly, especially in small amounts over a long period of time, from the drawer or tray in a store or bank counter in which money is stored.

**time track:** the consecutive record of mental image pictures which accumulates through a person's life or lives. It is very exactly dated. The time track is the entire sequence of "now" incidents, complete with all perceptics, picked up by a person during his whole existence.

**Tone Scale:** a scale which shows the emotional tones of a person. These, ranged from the highest to the lowest, are, in part, serenity (the highest level), enthusiasm (as we proceed downward), conservatism, boredom, antagonism, anger, covert hostility, fear, grief, apathy.

**to rights:** in or into proper condition, order or the like.

**traction:** public utility transportation service (as electric railways and trolley lines).

**turret:** an adjustable device on a camera for holding various lenses.

**Twelve Against the Gods:** See **Bolitho** in this glossary.



**twenty-three skidoo:** a mild expression of recognition, incredulity, surprise or pleasure, as at something remarkable or attractive; also used as an expression of rejection or refusal, sometimes as "Go away! *Twenty-three skidoo* was in male use (c. 1900 – 1910), originally among students and sophisticated young adults, often without any specific meaning.

**two-way communication:** a two-way cycle of communication. For example: Joe, having originated a communication and having completed it, may then wait for Bill to originate a communication to Joe, thus completing the remainder of the two-way cycle of communication. Thus we get the normal cycle of a communication between two people.

**Unimportance from Mystery to Know:** a process where the preclear spots spots where he considered everything on the Mystery to Know Scale important, emphasizing words, sounds, sights, blackness and energy. By running this process one can expect a considerable regain of education on the part of the preclear. For further information, see R2-55 in the book *The Creation of Human Ability*.

**Unit:** a division of instruction centering on a single theme.

**valences:** personalities. The term is used to denote the borrowing of the personality of another. A valence is a substitute for self taken on after the fact of lost confidence in self. A preclear "in his father's valence" is acting as though he were his father.

**Vatican:** the government, office or authority of the pope.

**vectors:** physical quantities with both magnitude and direction, such as force or velocity.

**Veda:** the collective designation of the ancient sacred literature of India or of the individual books belonging to that literature.

**Vedics:** of or relating to the Vedas (the most ancient sacred writings of the Hindus) or the period or culture that they represent.

**verboten:** (*German*) forbidden; prohibited; illicit.

**Victorian:** having the characteristics usually attributed to the Victorians, especially prudishness and observances of the conventionalities.

**Virgin Mary:** mother of Jesus.

**visio:** the recall of something seen, so that it is seen again in the mind in full color, scale, dimension, brightness and detail.

**Wagner, Wilhelm Richard:** (1813 – 83) German composer most noted for his operas, including the tetralogy *The Rings of Nibelung*, of which *Götterdämmerung* was part.

**whirling dervish:** a member of a Turkish order of dervishes, or Sufis, whose ritual consists in part of a highly stylized whirling dance.

**whole cloth, out of:** out of thin air.

**woozy:** befuddled, muddled or dazed, as from drink, drugs, a blow, etc.

**Wright planes:** planes built by Orville (1871 – 1948) and his brother Wilbur (1867 – 1912) Wright, American inventors and pioneers in aviation, the first men to design and fly a powered man-carrying airplane.

**Yahweh:** a name of God in the Hebrew text of the Old Testament; Jehovah.

**Zeus:** the chief god of the ancient Greeks. He was the ruler of gods and men and the god of the sky and weather, son of Cronus and Rhea, and husband of Hera. The Romans called him Jupiter.