

ROUTINE 1A - PROBLEMS AND SOLUTIONS

A lecture given on
4 July 1961

Thank you.

Well, I'm very glad to see that you're all still alive. I personally didn't think this was going to happen. And I'm sorry for it. It's an accident. We have a great many processes, though, that we still could use. And furthermore, we could let them be used by somebody that read the bulletin and thought it was written in Chinese. That's about the only way.

We've just heard, from your part of the world, that Routine 1, on two cases, is showing absolutely no change or gain of any kind whatsoever. And this means what?

This means some gross error. I mean, a Security Check is being run backwards or . . . it'll be a gross error, believe me, you know. I mean, it'll be big. And it is so unimaginably big that the Instructor, in this case, doesn't imagine that it could be that big, so doesn't look for anything like it, you see.

Like Herbie, the other day . . . he's telling us, well, he's having a terrible time. And can't he omit all the rudiments from a Security Check because his auditors just are spending nothing . . . getting nothing done but the rudiments in a Security Check.

And I tell him a third-of-a-dial drop . . . thinking it's something else. And then he, of course, on the ground and able to observe it, finds out what? His auditors don't know what a third-of-a-dial drop is.

So they've been setting it for anything, you see? But he never imagined this. See, he thought there was something basically wrong with the process or something of the sort.

Now, you're going to find out . . . you're going to find out that the mistake which causes Routine 1 not to operate is something like a Security Check is not being done. Be no Security Check that you would call a Security Check, see?

The auditor, you know, doing something weird, you know? And it isn't happening as a Security Check. And then you'll find that Routine 1 is probably operating with the CCHs all out.

You know, they got the idea that the CCHs actually must bite . . . this was a mistake they were waking . . . making a week or two ago . . . the CCHs must . . . each one must be made to bite before you leave it. And that doesn't matter if it takes an intensive to get CCH 1 to bite, you go on running CCH 1 until it bites. And you're only entitled to leave the thing if it has bitten. You see?

Totally missing out the idea that if a thing is flat, it's flat. And twenty minutes worth of it, it's flat, and that's it. So they never . . . nobody ever got any CCHs run.

So you'll find out, somehow or another, the CCHs aren't being run. And somehow or another, a Security Check isn't being done, and then Routine 1 doesn't work.

Female voice: Hmm. Maybe they don't know what CCH is.

Hm?

Female voice: Maybe they don't know what CCH is.

Well, I understand that just a couple of weeks ago there was a terrific yickle-yackle on the subject of all the HGC had to go over to the Academy, if they found out the Academy was teaching and running them entirely different. And then somebody else had an entirely different idea of how they were run. And they

were all trying to straighten out and get some agreement. Well, I understand they did come to an agreement. But are these the CCHs?

Female voice: Sure.

You see, that would be . . . you see, that's the gross error that you come up against with something like this.

Somebody tells you suddenly that some process doesn't work on a pc. "All right," you say. "That's fine. That's fine." But the first thing we do is to find out if it was that process? Was it in any way being used? That's the first thing we ask for.

Rather than, "Ah, what process is going to run on this pc?" That could be an interesting thing. Okay. Enough of that.

We've got Routine 1A operative here, haven't we?

Female voice: Yes.

Hm?

Female voice: Yes.

Is it working on anybody?

Female voice: Yes.

Female voice: Jolly good.

Male voice: Sure is.

You like that? You like that.

Male voice: oh, yes.

Well, of course, who would think in the midst of . . . only I would be able to get a simplicity on the subject of problems. Because, of course, I just realized that any time anybody has looked at the idea of auditing problems, of course it has been a problem . . . how you did it.

I actually worked for a very long time with problems to get some kind of an anatomy of them. And we have a fantastic array of technology, as I gave you yesterday. That's why I wanted to give you that lecture yesterday, so that you had the gen on problems.

And it's an interesting thing that anything could be as much of a problem to man as the problems of man, you see, had an anatomy. That's what's interesting. Or it was undoable or had any understandingness about it.

It's the way we first entered the game on psychosis. We had to assume that the main thing about a psychotic was that it was all incomprehensible. Everything was incomprehensible. And then if you had everything incomprehensible, of course, why, that was it. And everybody was trying desperately to understand psychosis. And that's the only mistake the psychiatrist has made.

He hasn't actually done anything about psychiatry . . . "psychiatrosis." He has labeled it, he's identified various types and forms, and then he has applied an extraordinary emergency remedy. Extraordinary! Just fantastic!

I mean, it's something on the order of, well, this fellow's . . . this fellow . . . his leg keeps itching. His leg keeps itching. And, well, he has to scratch it.

And this is the order of remedy of psychiatry, you know: "We'll cut it off !"

So they cut his leg off, see? Keeps itching. Now they have no remedy. They're done, you see, right there. That's the way they're treating insanity.

When you use these heroic measures which are all out of proportion to the condition, of course that's what you always wind up with. There's never a second trench. There's never a second ditch. There's nothing to go into. After you've electric shocked somebody, what can you do? And after you've given somebody a prefrontal lobotomy, well, he can go pick up another body. That's about it. you know, that kind of action.

But oddly enough, in Scientology now, we have actually been able to do something about this. We've been doing things about these, if anybody wanted to sail in and do something about them.

The common denominator of the psychotic, of course, is problems.

The understandingness of problems winds up, eventually, to an understandingness of insanity. When all the solutions become the problems, and all the problems become the solutions, of course you have your ne plus ultra $A=A=A=A$.

All right. Now, there's an additional condition. There's a further reach of this. When the problems can't be the solutions . . . you know, the problems are the solutions, that's one level; now let's go down a stage and let's invert it . . . and the solutions and the problems no longer can be matched or associated, then we get a tremendous number of solutions which themselves are the problems but which are not matched up to any problem.

And this I think, if you look it over, describes psychosis. The person is being a whole bunch of solutions to non extant problems. Think it over.

You see a psychotic in an institution; he always carries a roll of toilet paper with him. And that's to wrap it around door knobs so that he won't have to touch any of the door knobs. You'll see them doing this quite . . . it's quite an ordinary mechanism.

Freud observed a lot of things like this. He added quite an enormous amount of observation to the field. He's now busily . . . he was taken over, you know, by psychiatry. And now he's being repudiated by psychiatry. And now, the next thing we're going to find out . . . according to Marilyn who just wrote me something on it . . . we're going to find out that the only psychiatry there is, really, is Pavlovian.

That could happen to us one day, you know. I mean, somebody takes over Scientology, you see . . . tries to take over Scientology; somebody tries to take it over and then, when they've got full control of it, invalidate it, see? And then knock it out, and then say there's nothing left but brainwashing.

Well, the hope is there that they could do that, because they continually are trying to come around and say that we do brainwashing See the . . . so the hope must be extant. It's a psychotic forecast of what their future . . . they would like to have their future be.

There's always something you must know about these things, though, before you consider or give them tremendous dangerousness. Don't assign dangerousness to these things.

The psychosis is a solution to a non extant problem. The problem doesn't exist for the person who is solving it. The person is living the solution to a nonexistent problem. I see I'm not reaching you too well here, you know. And when you see a psychosis, after it's all described . . . after this (quote) psychosis (unquote) is all described . . . there's a missing datum in the description, so of course it's incomprehensible. See, it's been objectively described. They haven't described what problem it is that this behavior is a solution to. So of course the main part of the data is gone. See, you haven't got the problem, so it's gone. you got it?

Male voice: Maxim.

See? So therefore, you couldn't understand psychosis by observing behavior. It's incomprehensible because it's 50 percent missing. It's like trying to understand an electric motor, you see, that has no guts . . . has no leads, terminals or guts.

Now you walk along, and you say, "What is this thing?" Well, maybe somebody did a futuristic shell, you see? You see. See, it's just the observed thing, but there's . . . the rest of it is not there. So of course you couldn't . . .

Frankly, the cure of a psychosis, by addressing the psychosis, is . . . listen carefully now . . . not possible. You cannot cure a psychosis by addressing the psychosis. Now, you cannot cure an aberration by addressing the aberration. Why?

Because you're running the still in the middle of the motion. You're running the solution in the middle of the confusion. The stable datum and the confusion. You're trying to cure the stable datum. And it is held in place by an existing confusion.

And you're not looking at the confusion. You're looking at the cure. You're looking at the stable datum. You're looking at the motionless fact. But of course, it won't move out unless you get the motion off of it.

Now, you get an idea of a whirlpool with the center of the whirlpool motionless. But without that center, the pool wouldn't whirl, you see? But for some reason or other the center of the whirlpool is motionless but all else is moving. And that motionlessness continues to be motionless only because it has motion around it.

So you get the idea that, yes, if we could pluck out this motionless piece, the whirlpool would cease to exist. We get this idea.

But I'll tell you something. Practice, empirical practice, in my efforts to do various things and combinations over a very, very long period of time, have demonstrated that it is not possible to take the motionless piece out of the whirlpool. You can take the whirlpool off the motionless piece, but you cannot take the motionless piece off the whirlpool. Because the thing is being motionless only because the whirlpool isn't being confronted, to put it into mental terms.

So here you have confusion and the stable datum. Here you have motion and no motion. Here you have sound and silence. Here you have absolute location and change . . . change surrounding a location which is motionless. Here you have all these things.

Now, the solution is analogous to the motionless point in the middle of the whirlpool. That's the solution. And you can't pull the solution out and have the whirlpool disappear . . . that's mentally. It just . . . just take my word for it; it can't be done. Because if you leave the whirlpool there, all that's going to happen is, is a new motionless point will arise, and you can pick off an endless . . . an infinity of motionless points off this motionlessness. You could just go on forever picking up no-motion. Just forever.

But to pick the motion off of it, ah-ha!

It's a very funny thing that everything that is wrong with a thetan is what is right with a thetan. Anything that is on the way upper Tone Scale that is right with a thetan, in a fixed, aberrated state at the bottom of the Tone Scale becomes what is wrong with the thetan.

At the highest upper level, a thetan can be motionless. And at the lowest level, he has to be.

It's a matter of determinism. On the higher levels of the Tone Scale, he can determine motionlessness. But at the low level of the Tone Scale, motionlessness is being determined for him. And when this gets into the field of mechanics, of course motionless is not being determined by another postulate; it is being determined by the mechanics of motion.

If you want to see somebody stiffen and go still . . and actually, this test, by the way, this is . . will amuse you, but it doesn't work as a test. It's the perfect lecture room test. Theoretically, you see, this thing is perfect. I'll tell you why it won't work in a moment. As a demonstration, people don't get it. Because I'm . . so I'm not going to do it. I'm just going to tell you about it.

You stand a fellow up and you shake your hands in front of his face. You're going to demonstrate confusion and the stable datum, you see? You're making him the stable datum and you shake your hands violently in front of his face. Not threatening him, particularly, but just a lot of motion, you know . . fingers shaking, and so forth, in front of his face.

And you . . say, "Now" . . you say, "Now, there you are, and there was the motion." And point out to the rest of the class and the observers that he stood still.

And you'll see it every time. He actually freezes. You know, the person will sort of tend to freeze. You know? He goes still on you. you show him the motion. He goes still.

And now . . you say, "Now, isn't this a wonderful demonstration?" And nobody gets it. They've all gone still.

And this stillness is a stupidity. So the person you have demonstrated it on doesn't get it at all. It's the most marvelous thing you ever tried to demonstrate.

I tried it up here at London HASI several years ago. And I just couldn't get it across to the staff auditors, you know. I kept showing them, you know, one after the other. I kept . . and they just kept getting stupider and stupider and stupider.

Because then, of course, you're dealing with the absolute basic woof and warp of what happens to people: that they withdraw from this motion, and they get into a fixed stillness, you see? Well, they won't confront the motion, and yet they can't not confront the motion, so they put up a barrier against the motion, which is stillness. And they think that if they become still enough, the motion will duplicate them or something and become still. That's the last resort.

And then after that they just butter themselves all over the universe because they're trying to move out of a stillness and be a stillness without, of course, actually confronting the motion. And eventually, they go into violent motion. They eventually have no place to even butter themselves anymore. So they themselves become motion.

You'll find out in Goals Assessment that it is the commonest thing in the world to have a preclear come up with a whole string of goals of "get in motion." They come up with this whole long string of goals. It doesn't matter whether it's in space opera or any other field they come up with . . race driving or something like that. They come up with this long string of goals: get in motion, get in motion, get in motion, get in motion, see?

What they're actually trying to do is avoid the motion. And they go back into the motion. Kabibliu-boom! See?

Now, after they're audited for a while and so forth, they'll go on a reverse course. They're liable to go into an obsessive stillness for a while. You know, not want to go out or something like that, when they're out. And then all of a sudden they will go into motion. Only this time they're in control of the motion. See, they become cause over the motion.

But at the time they give you this, usually, as a whole string of goals, they're sure being the effect of motion to such a degree that they're the effect of stillness. You see? They're driven out of a stillness. They can't be still, and they themselves become the motion. They're the particle on the line, the leaf in the breeze, the pilot in the cockpit of the fighter plane. He's got to go, man, go. That's his motto: "Go, man, go."

Yet you look at this fellow's life in general and he hasn't been going. You say, "If you like speed that much, well, why aren't you . . . why aren't you doing any race driving?"

You see, in actual fact, they've moved out of the motionless spot into the motion and are being the motion. But factually, the step upgrade is motionless from that spot. So they do an awful lot of motionlessness, which is very hard to understand, hard for everybody to understand.

The person who can't leave the house . . . well, there are certain motions around that are just too motion, see? And they mustn't go out and confront this motion. And they're doing a no-confront of the motion which, of course, fixes them with the stillness, and so they don't leave the house.

That is all this odd aberration is called, you see, of motionlessness. This odd aberration of not leaving the house all it could be called is, you see, is a no-confront of motion.

And we have a case up in London who's been a guinea pig. I've done my best for this case, and so forth. I've given auditors direction on the case, and so on. But this case's motionlessness has now been audited for very close to eight years with the very best processes and the very best auditors. And the case still stays in the house. Now, you get what I mean?

Now, the practice on the line demonstrates that every time. I haven't any other reverse cases. Whenever motionlessness is audited and motionlessness is audited and motionlessness is audited, and you audit nothing but the motionless . . . "All right. What silence would you be willing to be?" See? Any process of that character. All you do is stack up a bunch of motionless points, and the bank looks like it's jamming.

Now, you can slightly differentiate the difference between motions, but you cannot easily differentiate the difference amongst stillnesses. So stillnesses identify more rapidly than motions.

Now, let's look again at psychosis. The person is being one of these stills, even while they're being driven out into the agitation. See, they're being a still, of some kind or another. Well, what kind of a still is it?

Well, the worst kind of insanity there is, is catatonia, not an agitated insanity. It's the insanity of total motionlessness. Catatonic state. Now, that's deemed to be incurable. Why, it isn't incurable at all. I'm sure there are many things that you could do.

But you recognize that the fellow who's sitting there writing checks without a checkbook, without a pen, in his cell in the institution . . . he's sitting there writing checks. And he gives these invisible checks to the jailer, and he gives invisible checks to this one and invisible checks to that one. And he's always mailing them off in invisible envelopes. It's quite an interesting activity. Well, when people try to cure him, they try to find out all about these checks, you see. Well, factually, he probably was simply a business executive that's been driven mad by Internal Revenue, you see. And the thing that's wrong with him hasn't anything to do, really, with sitting still writing checks. What's wrong with him, is this was a level of stillness to him, at some time or another, which became a fixed solution to some other very motionful problem.

Now look . . . just try to throw your imagination across this, and you could see easily that there could be a thousand problems to which sitting still and writing invisible checks would be a solution to.

Some writers, when they finally, finally go around the bend . . . it's right . . . immediately after they . . . they usually wind up, as their last ditch, is writing for The Saturday Evening Post and Reader's Digest. And they take off from there, and they want to watch out from that point there on, because that's just one step, you see, close to no writing at all. They almost wiggle in the chair and they move over into no writing at all.

Well, that fellow had better watch it because he's liable to be out in the park one day and all of a sudden pick up an invisible pen, you see, or invisible typewriter and start typing an invisible story. And there he is, you see?

And matter of fact, there are many cases of this. That's very common. Very common. A fellow sitting still writing an invisible story on invisible paper. Very common.

Well, that's what the fellow gets for writing for the Saturday Evening Post and Reader's Digest. That's all I say. It's good enough for him.

Now, those are the great organs of mediocrity. The great organs of mediocrity. I absolutely despise a publication that intends to achieve nothing but mediocrity.

It's like, I respect a skid row bum if he has set out to be the bummiest skid row bum that anybody has ever heard of. you see, he's really willing to work at it. I'll respect him. I'll respect him.

But if he's just trying to be a mediocre skid row bum, why, I'm afraid I don't have much respect for him. But if he starts to work at being a mediocre skid row bum, I'm afraid my contempt knows no bounds. I wouldn't even confront him in Steinbeck.

Now, the substance of this is, the fellow has added up all skid row bums, see? So he's got an average skid row bum. So he's not trying to be one skid row bum, you see? He's trying to be all skid row bums.

Now, that's a very interesting state to be in. And it's like this magazine, The Saturday Evening Post, which doesn't even come out on Saturday evening and wasn't founded by Benjamin Franklin.

And it's sort of trying to be all magazines at the same time, you see? And there it is, working hard to be all magazines. And never publishing anything brilliant, really, you see? Never publishing anything bad. And never publishing anything good.

It has a stated editorial policy, if you please, that it has stated . . . and released statements on . . . that it wishes never to publish a brilliant writer or a bad writer, but just a mediocre, medium writer, because that's what really appeals to everybody. And that's their editorial policy.

Well, when somebody is going out to be average, he isn't really being himself at all. He's being everybody. So of course you've got one of these buttered-all-over-the-universe cases. See, he's promptly being everybody. He wants to be an average. What the hell is this?

There are individuals. There can't be an average individual. There could be an individual who has the same IQs or characteristics as other individuals, but there can't be an average individual. I'm not quibbling with the thing.

There can be, however, a fellow who is trying to be an awful lot of other individuals and therefore is buttered all over in terms of beingness. Now, that fellow will be obsessively in a still. That's for sure. The stills which you will run off of that case are fabulous. And he's right next door to going around the bend. Don't kid yourself.

The operations which this universe uses to make a person assume the average and try to convince him to be the average are so numerous that they appear not odd to you, you see . . . or nothing reprehensible about this. They've been completely dulled down on this particular subject, because the operations are so innumerable.

You know, "You mustn't really stick your head above the crowd." You know? "And you mustn't get down underneath the crowd's feet, either. You must just be the crowd."

Now, how the hell can you just be the crowd? I'd like . . . wish somebody would tell me something. And this thetan is going to occupy all of these bodies, called a crowd, simultaneously, huh? Well, that means, of course, he isn't occupying his own body. And that's the first thing you'd find out about in processing. The one thing he isn't occupying is his own body.

So what can he do? If he thinks of himself as being everybody else, then every time he breathes wrong, he will have qualms. Because of course he's made everybody else breathe wrong. You got the idea?

So if he thinks an abstruse or an obtuse . . . obtuse thought, in any way at all, this is liable to have terrible consequences because some child going to school in China might be thinking . . . might have to think this thought, you see? And that would be terrible, because . . . not because of anything else but that he'd be thinking the thought, but he'd be thinking the thought in China. You get the idea?

It's not that he . . . you find out, in the final analysis, that he has specialized in murdering children in China, see? But he, actually, is not worried about the child in China. He's worried about the fact that he is in China, you see? See, he's actually the most self-centered person in the world, while being buttered all over the universe.

All right. Insanity is right next door to that.

So a person is never himself, and therefore, by addressing the solution which he is being . . . and let's put a definition in right here: Insanity is a solution. It's the adaptation of a solution. The obsessive adaptation of a solution, to the exclusion of all other solutions, in the absence of a problem. Got that? There's no problem there, but the fellow sure got a solution. And he can't be any other solution.

Now, the one thing you can't do to this insane person is say, "Well, now, why don't you put these three rocks that you must put on your window sill every evening before you go to bed . . . why don't you put these three rocks on the chair?" You say, "Now, I'll help you out, because they keep falling off the window sill and waking you up, you see?" The person keeps brushing them off "We'll put them on the chair."

And the person will go along with this, merely because he can't do anything to you. And you put them over on the chair. And then you leave the room and you come back and the rocks are on the window sill, see? You'll explain to him that "This is what is waking you up and why you can't sleep, you see," and so forth. And you'll always find the rocks on the window sill.

Now, this looks pretty daffy. But what problem is he solving? And that's the question you must always ask of insanity. What problem is this fellow solving?

Because he's obsessively being a solution to a problem which he doesn't know about and cannot confront. To the exclusion of ever changing, to the exclusion of ever really looking at any problem. Because if you'll notice, the number of problems which they create are just innumerable.

If they would just go on through life being this solution to the problem, we wouldn't argue about it or worry about it very much. But they're not content with this. Because they're the one solution to a nonexistent problem, all problems with this person are on automatic. And the number of problems which occur in their vicinity, practically can't be counted.

Well, they . . . all they have to do is get into an automobile, and the motor doesn't start, and all of a sudden the battery goes down and two tires go flat.

And you say, "What on earth is this all about?" It looks absolutely telepathically, teleportationally mysterious beyond all mystery. You'll find there's probably, a very logical connection between this, or something. But that's the truth with them. They're just surrounded all the time by problems.

You sign them . . . one of the things Registrars should know, in Central Organizations, is when they hand the person a writing pen to sign a contract, and the pen doesn't write, take the pen back and take the contract back.

This is not your average condition. These are pretty extreme. And they're very recognizable.

You'll find out that when you put one of these in an HGC, for instance, that all of a sudden, clear up on the third floor of the building next door, you've got problems. You've got problems, man! You've got problems out on the front walk and you've got problems in the basement and you've got problems every place. Problems you never dreamed existed around there.

And not only that, they've got most of the people in their family on full automatic on problems. And you'll have all those on your neck giving them . . . giving their versions of all these problems, you see?

You'll find out you cannot even mail them a letter. Try and do it. They've given you the address and everything. And you stamp it carefully and so forth, but my golly, by the time you get through, this letter will have gone to Tanganyika. And just nothing can . . . nothing can permit . . . this letter just won't ever arrive, that's all.

But in the process of not arriving, man, does it sure carom off a lot of places! Don't be surprised if you have the whole postal department down there on your neck, you know, trying to find out why this letter, see? Why, you see?

And yet you look at it, and apparently it's just an operation of you wrote a simple letter. And you put it in an envelope, with the proper address, and put a stamp on it and put it in the postbox. And it looks to you like it ought to be, then, picked up by the Post Office Department and eventually delivered to this person. But that is not what is going to happen, I can assure you. That is not.

And you can look through the files of Central Organizations, where they have come into collision with a person who should have been institutionalized long since, and you will see some of the weirdest, oddball communication curves you ever have . . . cared, read. It is very funny.

You see, the person confronts no problems of any kind. So in the final analysis, of course, all problems are on automatic and they just happen. The person takes no responsibility for any action of any character except being a solution. And the person goes on being this solution. It's just one solution. That's all. And it'll be at the bottom of everything.

Now, there can be a million problems. There can be a million problems, but there's only one solution. See that?

Now, when you're doing a Goals Assessment, you're actually covertly getting a person to look at problems. That's why they go null. So it's a pretty good reach.

Furthermore, you're getting them to look at what they haven't been doing Which is to say, while being A they were trying to be B and so never as-is-ed anything about A. So you keep dropping them back and around, and moving them on the track, to all those areas where they weren't being what they were being but were being something they weren't being; so we got no as-is. And that's what happens in a Goals Assessment.

Now, the lower harmonic or even, perhaps, the more direct approach is in Routine 1A.

Now, if you wanted to see somebody go through the roof or out the window or down the spout, run Routine 1A on a spinner. I haven't advocated that you do that. We don't have very many people that are edgy. And we certainly don't have any psychos.

You lack experience with psychos, I can tell you that. They . . . when I say "psycho" . . . the word "you're crazy" is used so carelessly in English language that . . . so careless that people lose sight of the fact that there are these conditions, that they do exist, and that in the United States something like one out of every fifteen people . . . including Menninger . . . have been in an institution at one time or another. And before they take them to an institution, they have to be pretty bad off, or mixed up in politics, one or the other.

And factually, a tour through an institution sometime . . . Put your collar on backward sometime, or hang a cross on your chest and take over your ministerial rating or something, and go down to console the poor dead screamers that are inhabiting the local or some private sanitarium.

They usually won't let you into a private sanitarium. They're holding down Grandma, and so on, so they can collect the family fortune in there. Usually the people are in there for usual economic reasons.

For instance, we have a professional pc who caroms around in Scientology like this. And her brother . . every time he needs some money, he gets her pronounced temporarily insane. And then, according to somebody's will, he has the family fortune at his beck and call.

And this girl simply gets put in institutions and electric shocked. And then the family is no longer interested, since they've got what they wanted for the moment, or something of the sort. And then she gets out of the institution. She's allowed to drift around for a little while. And then there's some economic bind comes along, and they put her back into the institution.

This has been going on for years. She's been breaking auditors' hearts. She even showed up one time in England, here. And promptly, of course, from various quarters and so on, pressure was put on authorities, and she was promptly put into an institution here in England. And she walked out the front gate of it and turned around twice, and so help me Pete, was back into it. I don't even know where she is now. I've gotten . . I've lost track of this particular character.

We've rescued her out of too many gray walls, you see. But the gate there . . there seems to be a strong wind blowing from outside and through that gate. But it's economics.

And . . but you go to a public institution . . and the best thing to do . . to go near is a public institution. And . . like Menninger's fills up all the time. And . . well, Menninger has his own clinic on one side of the river, and after they all run out of money, then he ferries them across the river to the state institution on the other side. I'm not kidding you. That is his modus operandi.

And practically nobody ever walked out of Menninger's front gate. They go down and go across the river, and they get put into the state institution where they don't cost anybody anything.

But state institutions are great . . are the great neglected . . state institutions. And you'll find lots of people in there that . . they're real psychotics. And it is actually something to look at a real psychotic. It is something to look at. Wow! Wow! Very impressive.

Years ago I used to worry about them. Long time ago, I thought this was something remarkable. The only thing remarkable about it is the psychiatrist with his solution. And of course, your psychiatrist is not Q-and-Aing with any problems. So therefore, he never tries to solve insanity. He Qs-and-As with what this psychotic is being . . a solution. And when the psychiatrist Qs-and-As with the psychotic, the psychiatrist comes up with an obsessive solution.

You wouldn't even stand a chance getting electric shock relieved in the United States. You couldn't even legislate against it. Everybody would be pouring in there, telling you, "This is the solution."

And you say at the same time, "Has this ever cured anybody?"

And they say, "No, it has never cured anybody."

And you say, "Well, why are you doing it?"

"Well, it's what you're supposed to do."

"Who said you're supposed to do it?"

"Well, it's what you do!"

"Yeah. All right. Has it ever cured anybody?"

"No. As a matter of fact, if we didn't electric shock anybody, they'd get out of here weeks before."

"Well, now look. Then therefore, that's costing the taxpayer money, isn't it?"

And they say, "Well, yes, but it's the solution!" you see?

And if you wanted any greater proof than this . . . I wouldn't think you would want any greater proof than this, that what is the psychiatrist going to Q-and-A with? He's going to Q-and-A with a psychotic, that's for sure. Because he has no answers to amount to anything. So you just . . . now examine the psychiatrist's fixation on the idea of a solution. You give him an unworkable solution and he's very happy. And he'll never change his mind. That is the solution, and that is it.

And you talk to a psychiatrist and you try to tell him all about Scientology, see? And you say it'll do this and do that. Oh, yes, he agrees with you. He probably thinks it does. He doesn't think that it doesn't work.

What you're going up against is the fact that he is himself being an obsessive solution. See? He is a solution. What kind of a solution is he being? Well, he's a psychiatrist.

You say, "Yeah, well, all right."

This is what gets on your nerves all the time. The guy can't cure insanity. He can't do anything about psychosomatic illnesses. And yet, continually, many commandments there really were. you know, there's pages of them. And everybody keeps talking about the Ten Commandments.

And some versions of the Bible have Qed-and-Aed with the fact that there are supposed to be Ten Commandments, and they dragged in Ten Commandments. And they got Ten Commandments in them.

But a full Bible has just got commandments, commandments, commandments, commandments, commandments. Man, you don't know whether you're coming or going, when you finally get to the end of all these commandments . . . because you take any group of five, and at least two contradict. Confusing, man.

These are all solutions. The only thing they've listed is solutions. And that's why you don't like moral codes. Because moral codes are solutions to problems which aren't announced. And you can therefore define a moral code, technically. A moral code is a series of solutions to problems which have not been confronted or analyzed. And you get upset about moral codes. "Thou shalt not drink pitchers of milk after three P.M. before thy parents," or something like this.

Do you realize that almost all of those commandments which are in the Bible at this particular time, that we call the Ten Commandments, are prompted by some obsessive crimes that existed at that state of the game, and that several of these commandments are solutions to venereal disease? Isn't that interesting? I think it's fascinating.

I see those archbishops now, standing up there with the little choirboys all singing and the harps drumming or whatever they do, and swinging incense burners around their head like slingshots, and going through it all, and everybody dropping nickels on the drums and so forth because they're solving venereal disease. I think that's terribly interesting

Why didn't they invent penicillin? Look what we would have been spared, man.

I've actually managed to shock even you a little bit. Look them over. Look them over. you think I'm kidding you. The next time you run into a copy of this thing, read them over and find out how many of them are solutions to venereal disease.

You see, that was a problem that descended on them that they could know nothing about. That was a problem that descended on them from various quarters of the world, and finally descended upon them from the New World. And they didn't know what the devil cooked here. But they got a lot of solutions. But they never looked at the problem.

And the problem, of course, was inherent in the basis that there were some (quote) "no sexual practices." They had enormous numbers of practices whereby, there was supposed to be no sex. They were already preventing sex, don't you see? So they turn around on the other side of the picture, and they say, "We'll

leave all those in place, and now we will solve this other thing While leaving all of the things that are causing the problem, you see, in place, we will now get some new solutions.” That’s the one thing they didn’t need, man. Yeah.

They already had about forty too many solutions. They had actually prevented morality, at an ethical level, see, and then invented an immorality with a whole bunch of new morals.

I’m telling you this, not because I’m yip-yapping about the Christian church.

But solutions. Solutions. The more you have to do with solutions in straightening out human conduct the less gain you’re going to make. And that’s all there is to that. That’s all I’m trying to tell you. The more you have to do with solutions for the third dynamic, the less third dynamic you’re going to have. Because solution, by definition, is a nonconfront of the problem. And you get a fixed confront of the solution.

Well, if everybody is facing inboard while the enemy is attacking the gates, all hell is going to break loose, I promise you. Everybody faces the courtyard, you know, the inner keep. All the soldiers on the walls do nothing but look at the inner keep. And there it stands, stony, silent, massive, impressive. And they say, “Well, that will take care of us. That will take care of us.” With their backs, you see, to the wall; and the walls are being stormed.

Now, what do you suppose is going to happen to all these soldiers? They’re going to get a solution. That’s for sure. They’re going to get somebody else’s solution in a hurry, aren’t they?

So later on, this is proven so unworkable . . this becomes so unworkable, at length . . they try various means of this. They face inward, and eventually they take the keep, you see, and they make it have face, and they have arms, and you have stone idols. And if you just look at this enough, you see, you’re all set. And don’t go look that way, look at the stillness, you see, and that’s good.

Now, the next one that happens after this sort of thing, of course, is that even though there isn’t a war on, everybody’s looking at the muezzin in the minaret. And he’s saying, “Aly-al-Allah,” or something of the sort. What does that mean? Father of evil?

Anyhow, they pray to this minaret, see? And everybody has to face in certain directions at certain times. And of course, this is a good solution. It’s a good solution. Particularly for thieves in the market.

And you see, we get more and more of these “Face the motionlessness,” “Contemplate the motionlessness, contemplate the motionlessness, contemplate. . .” “Look at the stillness. Look at the stillness.” “Face inward; don’t look outward.”

Does that sound like any religions you ever heard of? “Meditate.” “Now, if you just contemplate stillness enough, you’ve got it made, son.”

It’s an operation. It’s the basic operation of the track. I don’t . . I’m not anti-Christian. I’m just anti-operation.

I believe it’s perfectly all right to do anything you want to to people. I believe this is perfectly all right. I run on a very odd code. It’s very peculiar for this universe. It’s all right to do anything you want to, as long as you don’t say it’s something else, or try to convince people you’re doing something else. That’s where the crime comes in. The entrance of the not-know.

Or say you’re doing something for some very wonderful purpose, you see, when as a matter of fact, you’re doing it for quite another purpose, which is not wonderful at all. This, you might say, is evil. And this is practically the only evil there is that drifts on down the line.

And I don’t . . there’s a qualification to that: is as long as . . you can do anything you want to, as long as other people aren’t being completely plowed under by it. Greatest good for the greatest number of dynamics. But that allows you an awful lot of latitude, believe me. There’s an awful lot of latitude in there.

But fighting in the dark, up in a black alley with a poniard . . nah, nah, nah, nah. That's no way to live, man. That's no way to live. They pick you out of the burning ghat. And . . you don't go to hell. you have to live with yourself . . which is about the only hell there is.

Now, where you have solution, solution, solution, solution, solution, solution, and nothing but solution, and nothing but solution, and nothing but solution; and you never have problem, problem, problem, problem, problem . . you never see any of these problems; these problems are never disclosed; you never see any part of them; nobody's ever asked to confront any of them, and so forth . . of course, the person winds up eventually just bthaaa solution, you know? He's a walking solution. But he doesn't even know what he's a solution to. That's what's grim. It's the not-know.

Now, when that stage is reached, that's definition of an obsessive solution. It is reaching the stage when one does not know what one is a solution to. And those are obsessive solutions, or being an obsessive solution.

Or when one is being terribly still, he doesn't know what he is being still to counteract the motion of . . what. See? He doesn't know what motion he's trying to counteract by being still. Then . . only then does obsessive stillness enter.

So you've got not-know, you see, running through all of these things. That is the bug factor.

Now, where you have an individual solving problems, you don't have an evil. There is nothing wrong with solving problems. Quite the contrary.

But an individual who has put all problems on automatic, now can't solve problems. If he does solve them, it'll be with some fantastic liability. Fabulous liability to the solution of a problem. He's liable to cave in, terror stomach turn on. Oh, my God, all the things that'll happen to him if he solves a problem.

So he's glumping down the street, you see. And he doesn't know where to go for the night. And he doesn't know what to do, and so forth.

And you say, "Well, why don't you go down to the YMCA?"

The first thing you get back is, "Oh, no."

Well, it never occurs to you to ask him, "Do you have another solution?" But it should, because he hasn't. He doesn't dare solve a problem. He just doesn't dare. They're not crazy, you know. That's not insane. It's just they don't dare solve a problem.

When you have somebody around who's a workman or something who is in this particular state, everything sort of goes into a fabulous decline of some character or another. And you can't quite figure out what is happening here. You'll find every job in the place gets half done. Everything is half done. And eventually, the whole place is just torn to pieces, and it's in complete ribbons.

He isn't being evil. He knows he's supposed to be working. So he's trying to work without solving any problems. Because the terrible consequences of solving a problem weigh down upon him mightily.

Now, you go up another stage, and you get a fellow who can solve problems of a minor nature but can't solve problems of a major nature. And we very often hire them as executives. Not in Scientology, but we very often see these people around in organizations trying to be executives, you know? And all they can do is swell themselves up and practice pomposity or be mean to their juniors or something like this. Because they for sure don't dare really solve a big problem.

The little problems about the ink wells, yeah, all right. But the contract with Blitz & Company, do we accept it or do we reject it? Brrrr, no, no, no, no. "Let's have a board meeting" is the usual answer, isn't it? Let's hang everybody else with the responsibility for this thing.

Now, they know this is so dangerous that they will very often try to protect you by preventing you from solving a problem. And they'll keep feeding you all sorts of extraneous data to the problem that has nothing to do with the problem at all. But they're merely trying to protect you; they're not trying to confuse you. Because they know what's going to happen to you if you solve a problem. Because they know what would happen to them, if they solved a major problem. The consequences of it are fantastic.

Now, we move up the line; we find a fellow who can relax on this particular subject.

Now, the level of aberration of a problem, the level of aberration . . . what it takes to be an aberrated solution, you see . . . we mustn't get the idea that all of it is very mild, you see, and this all runs at a very low level. We only see that when they're accumulating as locks.

Actually, the problems they have tried to solve and the problems they have failed on and the problems they have proposed and the things which they couldn't confront that they did solve are pretty magnitudinous. Such as "Shall we wipe out this planet?" You see, the problem was "The planet is getting overpopulated and people are having a rough time. Now, the solution is, shall we wipe out this planet or shall we practice immigration or what shall we do?" . . . see, to this problem of it's all overpopulated and things aren't going very well, and nobody's very happy. And this person took their finger off their number with magnitude, see? Big magnitude.

And they said, "Well, the thing to do, I guess, is to wipe out the planet. I know it's a bad thing, but it's the only thing we can do." And they did. And there they are now, down in the spin bin, see?

This kind of thing, you see? They make this . . . they didn't confront the problem. Either through laziness or stupidity or irresponsibility or something, they didn't confront this problem, and it influenced more dynamics than just themselves, and influenced them very heavily. And they did some great wrong by not confronting the problem. And they did some great wrong.

And after that the idea of "Problem? Ha, ha, ha, ha, ha. No, there are no problems around here. Everything is going along just fine." you know, the machinery is all busted down and the papers are all over the floor, and they're using the account books out there for a doormat. But "Everything is going fine. Yes, everything is fine."

And that's why you sit . . . see these guys . . . see these guys sitting in the middle of absolute . . . well, you wouldn't call it an office, you'd call it a catastrophe, see? And you'll see a guy sitting there, and there's just stuff running out of the walls, practically, you know? Man, they wouldn't dare touch any part of it. See? That itself would be a . . . they'd have to face this confusion. They'd have to see the condition they're in.

And when you see somebody living like that or somebody working like that, one of two things are true. Either the stuff is avalanching in faster than they can cope with it . . . but in that particular case they're coping with it; they're getting something done, so they can then straighten it out . . . or you've got somebody that doesn't even know it is there, doesn't even know it's cascading in on him. And you'll go into this person's quarters or office or something, and you look at him and you say, "Why don't you straighten this place up?"

And the person says, "What?"

Well, that's the essence of what I've been trying to show you. They don't even see the papers cascading all over the floor and the account books being used as a ledger. See? Which happens to be, strangely enough, a doormat. It's not . . . it's not there. It's something . . . they just got it all not-ised.

And if you can get the idea of this fellow sitting in this terribly untidy, completely twisted-up office without even knowing he has a confused office space, without even knowing he has the papers scattered all over the place, without even knowing that he's got the floor dirty, see, and without even noticing that the lights don't go on and off anymore, you've got an idea of a thetan sitting in his bank.

And he says, "It's all orderly and it's all straight and there's nothing here and there's nothing confused." You get the idea? And there he is. "It's all right. So it must be wrong with them over there. Couldn't have anything here. Because I've got it all straight."

And you look at it, and you say, "You do? You do? How very interesting."

But of course because you can't see the clutter that he is not taking any exception to, why, you just put it down to an odd behavior pattern. And you say, "Well, he's behaving oddly."

Well, no. He's not behaving oddly. He's confronting no-ly. He's got a big not-is going on it all.

Now, when you're running anything, you run it in an orderly fashion. And you will at once get something done. In the first place, you're giving the person an orderliness to confront. And he confronts this orderliness, and he finds out that there is some motion that can be confronted.

And then he'll confront a little disorderliness, and you'll get a somatic going through. And then he confronts your orderliness of your process, and then he confronts the disorderliness. Got the idea? And he'll confront a little bit more and a little bit more and a little bit more.

Now, where you have individuals who are totally insane, you have, of course, got no confront of problems. So don't expect 1A to work. It won't. 1A does not, anywhere near, go as far south as the CCHs.

But it'll work on most people. But some of the phenomena it brings up is going to startle you. It's going to startle you. This fellow's got it all tame. He's making it just fine.

Of course, he's sick whuu-whuh-whooh gat-an-sau, an-sooo and so forth. But he's doing all right. And therefore he doesn't need any auditing.

I always feel like taking a violin out of my pocket and playing maybe so, I really don't know, your story sounds so queer.

All right. You start running problems on this guy, see? And you say, "Recall a problem. Recall a problem," or "Think of a problem," or "Confront a problem," or anything you want to say. "Recall a problem" is the one you're running, and the best one.

And the individual says, "Suuuuh. I'm not sure about this." And this'll happen to almost anybody who's a member of the human race, right now, if you ran this particular process on them, see?

"What has Ron been talking about all these years? He's been talking about these things called ridges. Ridges. Oh, well, really! Ridges. People have ridges."

It's an interesting indictment of psychology that they don't believe there are any masses in the mind. "Ridges? Ridges? There are no ridges?"

And you run them on "Recall a problem. Recall a problem."

"Where the hell did this come from?" you see? And the bank starts going solid. And little avalanches occur. And little things occur. And somatics.

Well, you're just calling to his attention the fact that there were some problems around that were confusions, and they were in motion. And therefore the problem motion, of course, in counter positions . . . oppositions of confusion, naturally, add up to ridges and masses and so on. So these things really start showing up.

This is the first time, I can tell you truly, that we have a good cure for this type of mass, and so forth, that we run into in the mind. It's good. It's really good. It bypasses the liability of curing it.

We're doing the darnedest things, here in Scientology. I mean, the things we're doing are absolutely incredible, see?

I can tell you absolutely, straight to your faces, that you mustn't solve anything, don't you see . . . I mean, that's what somebody would add this lecture up to, see . . . all the while, telling you you can solve it. And then you run it and you find out you can get away with it. That's pretty weird, you know. That's pretty weird, if you think it over.

In other words, we're enough on top of the mechanisms of existence and so on that we can pull the overt-motivator sequence without its consequences. Well, what the hell, you know? I mean, the guy that dreamed up that operation in the first place, that's defeated, you see. The problem-solution sequence, you see? And we say, all right, you can sit there, as an auditor, and solve all this pc's problems.

By the way, there's another index in psychiatry. They do sit there and solve all the patients' problems for them. Aaaah. Yep, this is right about craziness. That's for sure.

And the individual . . . we tell him, "All right. Solutions? Man, the only thing that's wrong, the only reason people go crazy, is solutions. Now go ahead and solve the pc."

But the fellow says, "But how? How could you possibly do that, you know? I mean, if you go crazy solving . . . gosh! Uh, hm. Must be something very evil about this."

Yeah. Yeah. Only the road out, of course, has no barriers. You see? That's the one thing that nobody ever looks at particularly, you know?

You go out through all the gates of a park and you go through the gates of the park. And other people trying to leave the park keep walking over shrubs and getting branches in their faces and coming up against barbed wire and stone walls. So that proves to them conclusively that you'd better never go out of the park.

And we come walking along, and we're walking along this gravel path and admiring the view. And we see the gate up ahead that we're going through, you know. Walking along and we're moving out the gate.

We look at these people floundering over here in the brush, and we say, "What the hell is the matter with them?" We said, "Hey! Hey! There's a walk over here. why don't you come over here and walk out the gate?"

And they know . . . they know the truth. There is neither any walk nor any gate. Don't you get in that frame of mind.

Okay.