

REALITY IN AUDITING

A lecture given on
7 September 1961

Ah well, first time I ever missed a Thursday bulletin, I think. I didn't write a bulletin today. I was up all last night till about six A.M. looking at pictures that had just come back from a production on Tahiti. Looking at rushes. And had to write a whole picture last night and this morning, and I more or less did, so maybe that takes my mind well enough off things and changes the scenery enough that now I can get to work again.

You know, every once in a while I get stuck on your mind, you know. Let's see, "What problem could Ron have about my case?" Why don't you run that? My attention will free up.

Okay. What is this? The 6th?

Audience: 7th.

Seventh? Seventh of September AD 11.

Well, it sort of seems like old times telling you how to get pcs into an engram. It just seems like old times. We're back at the old stand. I mean there's the brass rail there, and there's the dusty bottles back of the bar, and there we stand amongst the spittoons discussing this ancient problem.

Well, it works like this. Engrams never ran with the pc (quote) out of valence (unquote). You could run a pc who was out of valence for just ages and ages and ages. And all long engram running stems from the pc being out of valence.

Now, there's two things to keep in mind about this. And one: "when pc is in own valence" . . . this is a misnomer. We merely want him in the body he was in when the incident occurred, but this doesn't put the pc in his own valence. You see, he's Joe Jinks. He's being Joe Jinks in that particular life. The primary swine merchant of lower Chicago, see. And there he sits. At least, for God's sakes, if he's Joe Jinks have him the body of Joe Jinks. You got the idea?

That's what we meant by "in valence." Simply in the valence he was in when the engram occurred. Understandable?

Now, when we say "out of valence," we mean simply and entirely the pc was not in the body he was occupying during the incident. But as Joe Jinks, the swine merchant from lower Chicago . . . he has trouble this lifetime, he keeps going oink, ung, oink, and so forth. He only killed seven or eight billion swine in that lifetime, you see. And he says he couldn't possibly have done it because he did it all from a mahogany desk, you see. So he didn't kill any swine, so it doesn't have anything to do with him. you get the detachments about that?

So anyway, there he is with a picture, see. You've got your pc with a picture. So he picks up this reprehensible life . . . not only reprehensible since he came from lower Chicago but reprehensible on the basis of being a swine merchant, you see . . . and he wants nothing to do with any part of this.

So we pick up pictures of Joe Jinks, a body, sitting at a desk. And he is always over there. And we try to run the life of Joe Jinks, and if the auditor's not aware of these things, and he hasn't got good subjective reality on what can happen in the bank, he does all kinds of weird, oddball things, like said, "Well, go through the incident again." So the fellow looks at the picture again. It's way over there, it's very thin, there's not much to it, you know. Doesn't bother him.

So he goes through the incident again, and that's hun-hum. Well, not only does it have anything . . . nothing to do with the pc, but that is the basic postulate in it: It has nothing to do with him. That is his solution to the problem.

And that's what we mean by "out of valence." He's always seeing himself from the area of the reception couch, or he's seeing himself from the chandelier, or he's seeing himself from someplace else, and the picture's very thin, and the body that he was in that lifetime is over there. You see, there is no virtue in being in valence, but the pc has to be in valence in order to run a picture.

And I repeat, this does not mean that he is being himself. Pc in valence and pc being himself are two entirely foreign, different statements that have nothing to do with each other, because as long as he is occupying a body and thinks of the body as himself, he is of course not being himself but is being a body, and that body, of course, is a valence. Do I make my point?

All right. So you're running him "out of valence." That is, it has gone to this reductio ad absurdum and complete abstranormity . . . extremity that not only is he not being himself, but he is also out of valence. Now, how does this express itself when he sees a picture?

Well, it's sort of thin and there isn't much to it, you know. And it's a little thing and it's over there and it's pretty black, you see, and nothing to do with him. And it doesn't have any somatics in it. "This stuff Ron talks about about somatics, ha-ha-ha-ha-ha! I never had any somatics, and so forth. Actually, my lumbosis is a physical illness. This thing that is gouging me in the back, you see, has nothing to do with engrams, you see, because I'm not in any engrams, you see. There's that thing way over there. It has nothing to do with me," you see. This is quite remarkable.

Now, if the auditor is not aware of the phenomena of this character, he can make some of the most classic errors ever made. That is, he runs a pc this way and he runs the pc that way, and he goes through this and asks the pc, "Do you have a picture?"

And the pc says, "Yes, I have a picture."

And the auditor never says, "Well, what do you think a picture is? Well, where are you viewing this picture from? What mass of meat are you occupying during the script of this picture?" See?

That's interesting, isn't it. you never ask this, so of course, obviously, the pc is running off his pictures, and obviously the pc is handling his bank, and obviously it's all going all off all right, right according to textbook.

And we say, "Well, do you have any pictures?"

"Yes. I have a picture."

"Well, what's happening in the picture there?"

"Well, there's a fellow standing there with a headsman's ax, and he's about ready to chop off the . . . my head, and so forth."

"All right. Does the ax fall?"

"Oh, yes, yes, the ax fell. It's all right. Everything's fine."

And the auditor says, "Boy, are we really making knots." And he just never finds out that the fellow with the headsman's ax . . . well, he's sort of thin, you see. He's actually kind of an idea of a fellow with a headman's ax, and is way over there where it's good and safe. Way, way over there. Fascinating.

Of course, nothing happens with the picture. Why? Because you were not running the picture the pc saw. you are merely running some cooked up, safe version, you see. And the safe version, of course . . . it isn't that the text is different. The text'll be the same, but the safe version is, we never view it from the same viewpoint that it was viewed from. And if we don't do that, the thing never anises. So pcs who are run in that condition, no matter whether it's some old process or Routine 3, apparently never get anyplace.

Don't pay any attention to a picture . . the pc is not in his own valence. It's not a picture. Won't do him any good. you could run them by the hundreds of billions. It won't do him any good. You're not running engrams. It has nothing to do with it. He won't even be able to get off grief charge.

Now, the funny part of it is that all this phenomena I'm telling you about is very old and very well known. Way back. But it has never been punched up. Never been punched up. Because we haven't connected the pictures and anatomy of Dianetics with the conceptual processes of Scientology.

Now, the conceptual processes of Scientology have this magnificent virtue. They will move a guy straight back into the picture he is in that is charging up the chain he is stuck in that make him out of valence from that point there on. And no matter what pc you're running, no matter how many pictures he sees, and so forth, eventually he will wind up in his own valence. And now if the auditor doesn't know his business, he won't make him handle it.

Now, we've run and run and run, and all of a sudden the person is in a picture, and he is in his (quote) "own valence," don't you see, meaning some body that he's in, with eighteen valences stuck inside of it, don't you see. But as far as the picture is concerned, he's at the point of view from which he viewed the picture while it happened. See, that's important. And he runs back to this, and he goes zoooooomp! and out of there. "Ha-ha-ha-ha. Well, I got out of that." Well, of course, he did exactly what he did before. The way to get out of that was never again to be in that body. That was the solution to the case as far as he was concerned, and so we don't then try to persuade him in some particular fashion, by directing his attention mainly and only, to stick with it, until the process you're running knocks it out. Because they don't sort out endlessly. They don't do it. That is all there is to it.

Now, there are several approaches to this if you understand it. Actually, you can build up little cardboard models and demonstrate this to students if you wanted to. you could show . . oh, I don't know, get some of these kid cutouts of some kind or another, and you say, "Well, in own valence is the thing viewed from inside this body and the pc was occupying this body and therefore if you get the idea there, you look and you will see that everything he sees is from the viewpoint of this body here. Now, of course if you are trying to run this engram with the pc's viewpoint up here, while he was actually viewing it from down here, of course you are not running anything that ever happened. See? You're running an entirely dislocated thing."

Well, all right. That's fine. you could make a very graphic representation of this. It becomes very simple. And make sure that you say, "Well, the pc is not himself if he is in any valence. So don't confuse being himself with being in a valence or having his own valence."

You see, anybody who's sitting there looking at the scenery from inside of a body has a valence. That's for sure, but the pictures he is making from where he is looking at them, of course, is the track. That is the track. And trying to run a bunch of branch railroads . . you see, where he's never looking at things in pictures from where he looked at them in the actual incident itself, of course this is just running branch railroads. This is running the shunt line from south Birmingham to north Colchester, you see, which had nothing to do with the railway, and you won't get anything even vaguely resembling an erasure. And so these things last forever.

This is the secret of a hanging engram. Of course, it isn't a hanging engram. The auditor never asked anybody about it. It isn't an engram. It's a picture of an engram. And you're running a secondary situation . . misuse of the word secondary, but you're using a removed situation. You're trying to erase a picture that never occurred.

Of course, the incident that the picture is of occurred, but the only safe thing to do about this is to get off someplace when he sees it in the bank, you see, and be way over here someplace and look at it very safely. It's not going to erase.

Well, how many ways would there be to remedy this situation? Well, actually, practically countless. I'll tell you one of the oldest methods of re . . of handling this situation, and then you can see a little bit more about the mechanics of it.

Maybe I ought to tell you the simplest method first. That'd be best. I'll tell you the simplest method.

You say, "Have you ever seen a picture from inside the body that you were in at the time the thing was occurring?" You know, explaining own valence to the fellow. "Have you ever seen a picture of this character? Have you ever had one during processing?"

And very often some pc who has been a long time in processing will say, "Aye, aye, I have. I have. Yes."

"Well then, which ones are they?"

"Well, there was one there when I was in this automobile, and there was this road and . . out in front of me, and the other car hit us. And I ran into that one."

"What did you do at the time?"

"Well, I ran into that one, and that was . . hasn't very much to do with the case, you know. Ha-ha-ha-ha!" Hasn't had anything to do with it since. Great.

And now, what that was, is a restimulated engram. And of course, the restimulation died out in a few days, but he still remembers this.

All right, and you say, "Well, were there any others?"

"Well, I had an . . I had a thing that really upset me. I was very shaky on the subject of past lives till one day I was sitting on this horse, you know, and this chariot ran on from the right, came in from the right and knocked me off the horse. And that was quite real."

And you say, "Well, what was the picture exactly? Were you seeing the picture from where you were sitting on the horse?"

"Oh, yes, yes! That was what was upsetting about the whole thing. Ha-ha."

And you say, "Well, all right. That's good. That's good now. What did you do during processing about that?"

"Well, I answered the auditing question. That was it."

Ah-ha! We've got two of them in the pc right now. We've got two of them that we can lambaste and finish up. All right, let's take the earliest one. That is always the best thing to do unless it's too early . . you know, like the rock or something. Take the early one, and . . which is the guy sitting on a horse. And you say, "All right. Now, do you remember the auditing session in which this occurred?"

"Well, yeah, vaguely, dimly."

"Well, I don't want the exact date. But you do remember that? All right. And do you remember anything about the auditing question that you answered for that? Good."

"Yeah. Well, so-and-so and so-and-so."

"All right. Well, what is unknown about that incident about the horse?" and so forth.

"I . . well, just what you asked me. I really don't know what auditing session it was."

"All right. Good. And what else is unknown about that incident with the horse?"

And "Well, the auditing command. I actually haven't really remembered the auditing command."

“All right. And what else is unknown about that incident with the horse?”

“Well, it’s uh . . . Zzzzzzzzzz. You know, if you keep this up, I’m going to have a horse over here.”

“Well, don’t worry about that, you know, don’t worry about it; everything will be all right. Now, what else is unknown about this?” Crash! See. Aaaaaaaaaaaaaa.

Man, he’ll be out of present time. And don’t you do a bad job of auditing right at that point, see. Just run the incident . . the command I was giving you just flat. “What else don’t you know about that incident with the horse?” see.

“I don’t know this, and I don’t know that, and I don’t know something else, and I don’t know something else, and I don’t know something else, and I don’t know something else.” And in a very few minutes, that’d be flat. But also he will find out something: that he’d skipped out on it; that it did exist; that it was there; and not only that, but has been with him ever since, and has always been with him, and he’s never been anyplace but sitting on this horse. This will dawn on him eventually if you run it good and flat, with just Unknown. You can also run, “What shouldn’t be known about it?” and “What should be forgotten about it?” or any other variation of the Not-Know, see.

And you’ll have yourself quite an incident there. And it’ll build up 3-D and scare him half to death. And remember, boy, will he be out of present time. That’s the time to do real smooth auditing, and yourself have a pretty good reality on the fellow actually in a thenness which isn’t a nowness. And it will keep you from collapsing his thenness onto nowness by adjusting the cans of the E-Meter because they might be getting too warm. It’s these kinds of things that collapse thenness and nowness and keep the guy from running an engram. You got the idea?

All right. Now, we look at this: There is a fundamental method . . I don’t at this time know of any better method than this. And I’ll give you an old method. It’s a simple method of doing it. Just find out if he ever has been and put him back into it.

Well, if he’s never been in one of these things and he can’t recall any and it’s all just garbage and black and invisible ink, well, there’s something else you can do about it. There’s an old process that does this, rather arduously, but it eventually accomplishes this exact thing, which is, “Recall an ARC break.” Now, that’s an awfully stylized auditing command, almost totally limited to processing Scientologists. But “Recall an ARC break” would be pretty well guaranteed to unstack a track to a point where he would find himself in the incident that was upsetting to him. It’s an interesting one, isn’t it?

Don’t interfere with whether he’s calling these things from motivators, he’s calling motivator ARC breaks, motivator ARC breaks. Well, he’ll get it back to a motivator incident. Don’t try to put him in the overt side of the sequence. Don’t do anything about it at all. Just run recall an ARC break and pay attention to where he’s landing on the track, and he will eventually land at the base of some chain where he is in his own valence and something is happening. That is pretty good.

I suppose you could vary the auditing command so that it’d make it comprehensible to a non-Scientologist, but I’ve never put in any time on that. And I’m giving a lecture now to Scientologists, so let’s skip it.

That one will do it. All right, there’s another one that will do it.

Had a fellow last night, and I noticed that he kept asking me about his eyes. I didn’t tell him it was a Security Check question that cures up eyes and eye difficulties faster than anything, is what . . the exact auditing command I’ve given you in lectures before. It’s something on the order of: “What shouldn’t be seen . . what have you done that shouldn’t be seen?” And that will just ruin more glass prescriptions than anything you ever had in the way of eyesight. Just keep security checking on that basis and clear the meter left and right and in the middle, and so forth. “What have you done that shouldn’t be seen?” And, of course, he’s preventing seeingness like mad of something he’s done, that’s all. People hearing this lecture probably have just now thought of what one of them is, and others have heard a ticking automaticity, because it’ll very often send off an automaticity. Well, it’s restraint of inspection. But I didn’t tell this

fellow about it. And instead of that, he was complaining about a mass that seemed to be resident behind his eyes someplace. So I gave him the easy one. Here is another method of doing this exact thing. And I said, "Get the idea of some action going on way out there in front of you two or three hundred yards away." He did.

I said, "What was it?"

"Uhh!" he said, "Well, oddly enough," he said, "I get my mother and driving in a car."

And I said, "All right. Good. Now, conceive of an action two or three hundred yards behind you." And he got a dog or something

I said, "What's happened to this mass that you're complaining about, back of your eyes?"

"Well, it's shifted. It's moved."

I wasn't processing him and told him so, but obviously, the man was stuck in the picture, wasn't he. But as near as he could look toward the picture he was stuck in was way out, and that is quite common. Action that is that far away is safer than action that is up close so people will see it.

Now, you could just follow this thing through . . which I didn't. I just moved the somatic around and changed it all around and did something with it and explained to him that these things are pictures. He was quite amazed. He had been processed, but he was quite amazed to connect up these odd sensations he had with this, you know, with the idea of pictures, see. He couldn't conceive of himself being stuck in a picture. He obviously was stuck in a picture or he wouldn't have had a mass. That was it.

But he could look at that distance. And you could follow this through and take a process of this type, which is inspection at distance, and you would eventually wind up with the guy in the picture he was stuck in. It would peel it right on down to where he was. Interesting idea, huh?

If you yourself have a somatic, and you're prone to self-auditing, why, you can always inspect something way out. Only make it two or three hundred yards. Of course, your attention at once will start collapsing on two or three hundred micro-millimeters, but uh . . I mean in close, you know. you look out there, oh-uh-thu-thu-du. And the next thing you know, you're floundering around, you don't know what's happening to you, you know. Get your attention out there again, you see. Get your attention way back there and way over to the right and way over to the left and way below you and way above you, and so forth. And you're peeling off some environment of some kind or another that has been a stuck environment.

You can also get in lots of somatics and lots of trouble and have to have auditing, and be able to gasp . . be able to gasp over the telephone to a friend of yours, "For God's sakes, come over and audit me before I die in the middle of the living room." I . . this . . randomness can set up with something like that, but you'd survive it.

Anyhow, there is a method of peeling one down. Now, because you are extremely devoted to repetitive processes and we have to have repetitive processes and they are the thing to do . . . But when you get into handling a case, you have to interrogate and do other things, and a repetitive process is not enough. It has to be punched up. But I'll give you a repetitive process. I'm not running them down.

Pc has a disabled leg. We discover this by interrogation of the pc and observation of the pc, and we are limited in this solely and entirely by this one point. It is obvious to us that he has a bad leg, but the pc never mentions it. He keeps talking about his burning ear.

Well, we'd better not go into bad legs because it's not real to him. But the pc tells us he has a bad leg, we observe that he has a bad leg, and so forth. Or if he tells us he has a burning ear, and we happen to observe this, we could run exactly the same regimen on either of these.

Now, what we're asking for is if he has any odd pressures. Now, these could be his face, his chest, his stomach, his legs, his back, his gluteus maximus, his mea culpa, anything, you see. It doesn't matter what, anatomically. This will be what is called a psychosomatic and will be his chronic psychosomatic illness. And will also be probably his hidden standard and will also be numerous other things that we wrestle with. See.

All right. Here's the way to handle it. This is brutal, by the way. It is quite brutal, and the auditor has to be very good and stay in there pitching with the pc.

All right. Now, it's "Who would have an unknown motion around his leg?" We use this new thing, this valence thing, and it is the valence, you see. And then we could compound the felony by asking what. "What would have an unknown motion around it's leg?" "Who would have an unknown motion around his leg (her leg)?" I wish English was a little more adaptable on genders. English is gender happy. You can usually become colloquial and say "their leg" and this covers the whole thing.

English actually . . . the people do try to put a dual gender pronoun in there. You know, they say "their," making it plural.

All right. This sort of question will knock out infinite numbers of chronic somatics providing you flatten it. And it's flattened on the tone arm just as any other process. Now, you're getting into something you're more familiar with. This is an easy one to do. But it is quite brutal. It is quite brutal.

Pc complains all the time that he's got this sensation in his nose. Well, this would be what you did with his nose, see. Got a sensation on his nose.

All right. Pc complains all the time that there is no . . . absolutely no sensation around the right arm. Same process. No sensation . . . absence of sensation and presence of sensation both respond to the same process.

Now, there's a way to amplify this idea and be a little more positive about it, and that is to shake down on the E-Meter what is the most real to the pc. Motion or confusion or some other thing, some other word, meaning action. Could be the word action, don't you see. It could be lots of things. Anything denoting commotion, action, confusion and so forth. Find the best word.

The Secondary Scale of the Prehav Scale at the level of Motion gives you most of these synonyms. And you would assess out the command, and then you would use the same command form. you would say, "Who and what unknown " whatever word you found, you see, commotion, confusion, action. I suppose you'd find some pcs that have attitude. I'm sure that'd be as close as they could get to anything like motion would be attitude. Because the idea . . . they pull back into ideas. They're down below effort and into think, you see. Don't omit attitude.

I should say in passing, by the way, there's a way of running the whole Prehav Scale without assessment. If you were ever caught out in the middle of the bush, the veldt, or the deserts of New York without a Prehav Scale, there is a way of running it, rather crude. Use action or attitude. Just use the words action or attitude for any level. Got the idea?

"King." All right. You're running . . . the pc's terminal is "king." And you say, "Action . . . what action or attitude would you have toward king?" or something of that sort. "What action or attitude would the king have toward you? What action or attitude would king have towards another? What action or attitude another toward a king? What action or attitude would a king have toward himself?" You get how you could do that?

Actually, it runs the whole Prehav Scale in a very haphazard, impositive but workable fashion. It's probably only five times as long as a proper assessment. But if you ran total out of assessment material, and you couldn't get an assessment, and the pc wasn't going Clear, you see, and the needle was stuck, and the tone arm hadn't moved for ages, and so forth, and you assumed there must be some level that you knew not what of or wasn't on the scale or something of the sort . . . after you made sure the rudiments are in, and after you've made sure you'd handled any hidden standard or anything like this . . . psychosomatic,

present time problem of long duration, all this sort of thing . . after you had all this straight, you still couldn't get anything on the thing, you could still use action or attitude.

What it is, is just doingness pure and simple. It's the idea or doingness. And the whole of the Prehav Scale is devoted to idea or doingness. So action or attitude phrases it up so that it can be run as a sort of a blanket command, and it's an interesting thing for you to know just in passing. It's a datum you should have. Remember it isn't good, it merely works . . to no great, high level of workability, but it goes on through. Extends the auditing time rather tremendously, but it will work.

Okay. When I find these little bits and pieces of this character, I like to pass them along to you whether they have vast usages or not, because you may sometime or another be, as I say, in the deserts of north Hollywood. I don't think anybody in Hollywood has been able to read for the last hundred years. They deal exclusively in pictures.

All right. Now, let's get a little bit further on this line. This would be then a method of handling the hidden standard, the chronic somatic, the complaint of the pc, the difficulty which he is always bringing up, and so forth. It'd be something on the order of "Unknown (assessed word)" which adds up to motion. What you're heading for in that, I'll point up to you again: You're heading for motion. You want unknown motion; that motion itself may not express itself well to the pc. See, it'd be best . . work much better with "unknown confusion."

For instance, I was dealing with somebody who had no concept of motion. That can be run into. Wouldn't bang on an E-Meter, nothing like that. "Motion? What the hell is motion?"

"Well, motion is a vague idea that people have that something is changing position in space."

"Well, yeah, but what is motion? What is motion? Have you ever seen a motion?"

"Oh, I'm sure that I've seen a motion. How silly. Of course, I must have seen a motion at some time or another. Naturally. Everybody has seen a motion at some time or another."

"Well, name a motion you have seen."

"(sigh) Name a motion I have seen. Well, I don't know but everybody has seen a motion."

Didn't have any concept of the idea of motion at all. Had no concept of motion. I don't know what all these . . this person did a lot of driving That's why I resigned finally from the Road Safety Committee. People never would undertake any program that had anything whatsoever to do with road safety. I'm saving the fact that I resigned in order to send in a scathing statement at some time or another which lays down a program which actually just puts more punch to the program I've had in mind for some time. "Why I resigned as Road Safety Organizer," see, I mean, this is the keynote of the thing Then everybody pays attention to it because this is obviously a complaint, you see, and is a bunch of entheta and.... Somebody's mad, you know, and that's fine.

All right. Now, we look over all of the . . these aspects, of bank and pictures, and so forth, and we find out at once why the pc will not view his bank. He will not view his bank because he has tremendous intolerance of two things. He has a tremendous intolerance of motion and he has tremendous intolerance of unknowns.

Now, his intolerance of motion is best expressed to you on the basis of: motion can become intolerant to somebody . . he can become intolerant about motion . . to somebody who is extremely fixated on the subject of pain.

If this person is fixated on pain, then he believes that all motion adds up to pain. He has no other concept of motion than it is pain. Well, motion, of course, makes pain possible. And pain cannot occur without motion. And you see somebody that you're kicking in the stomach stiffen up and try not to have any motion. Next time you're kicking somebody in the stomach (out of session, of course) notice the fact that

they are trying to stop motion. Well, that's very interesting The reason they're trying to stop motion is incomprehensible unless they love pain. Because that's the only way pain occurs.

If you had a thetan who wasn't trying to stop motion around the body, the body would experience no pain. It's just as simple as that. If he weren't trying to stop motion, he wouldn't suffer from motion. Of course, he's picked out motion as randomness and there he is.

And the next time you have an ache or a pain, why, notice the fact that it seems to occur from two opposing motions. Just get analytical about it and observe it. It's two opposing motions and they sort of grind against each other or something of the sort, and the sensation on that tiny, tiny, tiny motion between those two opposing areas gives the sensation called pain. That is what pain is. Pain isn't anything more than that. And there hasn't been enough of it so thetans don't like it. Well anyhow . . it's true of all things . . there haven't been enough of, why, people don't like them. Okay?

Now, in handling a pc who has no bank visible, these factors then must be present: that he has an intolerance of pain, therefore an intolerance of motion, therefore an intolerance of unknowns. Not necessarily therefore . . these two things are different spheres. But doesn't like motion; doesn't like unknowns.

He has a fantastic importance attached to motion. And he has a fantastic importance attached to unknowns. He'll give you a fabulously exaggerated idea of the importance of an unknown. And you'll find him Pattering something like this: Well, if he doesn't know about what all the fish are doing off of Dover just now, why, anything could happen.

And you say, "Well, wait a minute now. He's not in Dover. He's not in the fishing business. He has nothing to do with Dover. He had never been clear . . or near Dover and Dover has nothing to do with him," and so forth. Here he's talking about the fish off Dover, and he's worried about what fish are doing off Dover. And he wants to find out about what the fish are doing off Dover because it is very important and you can't quite make out how it's important. Well, don't assign the fact that the fellow's crazy. Just assign the fact the fellow has one Christ-awful intolerance on the subject of the motion of fish and the unknowns of fish, and that's it. It just sums up to that. He has intolerance of these things. These things he can't confront, and he happens to have picked out for his randomness the vast importance connected with one body of motion, i.e., the fish off Dover.

You finally plumb into it and he learned when he was a little boy that they had soles off Dover or something. He's never quite sure about this, and in church, why, they were telling him all the time he had to save his soul, and it's as close as he could get to the soul are those fish off Dover. You know, it would be some squirrel cage . . I mean it would be as idiotic, you see, as this. But it'll be some superimportance about this particular unknown. We see this all the time and we pass it by. We just sort of not-is it. We see people terribly, terribly worried about the terrible, terrible conditions of the natives in Upper Slobovia. And don't be too surprised sometime to go to Upper Slobovia and find the happiest natives you ever ran into. you got the idea?

And similarly, everybody's very complacent about the natives of southern East Germany. Nobody's worrying about the natives of southern East Germany, and they're in a terrible condition, you see. So it's just a fad. It's what . . it's . . "What natives we are worried about at the time" and "What natives we are not worried about at the time" are regulated totally with how much unknown seems to be connected to these things and how important that unknownness seems to be to the person. And the most unknownness there can be is the unknownness about motion. That is the most important unknownness.

You'll find the fellow is suffering a somatic all out of proportion merely because he didn't even know he was going to be hit. And he was hit. And you find out that he'll stick with this somatic, and the somatic is there. Yet he's been run over by a truck, and that somatic isn't sticking. But somebody has walked up to him suddenly and said, "Hello, Joe," and slapped him in the face hard enough to crack his jaw, see. And this somatic is stuck. But it wasn't actually a very brutal thing, and five minutes later, why, he didn't even realize he'd been hit. you know, I mean he didn't have any physical damage from the thing. And you find in vain trying to evaluate the importance of an engram to the preclear is the most fruitless task you can

possibly engage upon, because he's been run over by trucks since time immemorial, and he just never, never, never, never, never seems to attach any importance whatsoever to this fact.

Oh well, yes, he was run over with a truck when he was a small boy, and they sent him to the hospital, and he had a cast on his arm for a couple of weeks, couple of months, couple of years . . . depending on what doctor he hit. And, yeah, he had another accident. He was run over by a truck when he was seven, and he was run over by a truck when he was ten, and he was run over by a truck when he was eleven. Well, he's become accustomed to it. And you won't find these somatics very rough.

But a switching he got when he was five he has exaggerated into the most familial battle royal that anybody had ever heard of. My God, to hear him tell about this thing, why, there was blood plastered all over the ceiling, and the only reason the neighbors came in is because of the bits of flesh that kept flying out of the woodshed, you see. This kind of thing. To hear him tell it, you know, this was the wildest activity, you know. They imported an executioner from Italy just specially, you see, to whip him. And you boil this thing down and you in vain try to find any real brutality about it. All you do is find a switching that you yourself would not have considered very important. But it's very important to him!

In the first place, somebody blew up at him that he didn't ever expect to blow up, you see. So that's unpredicted, which gives you the unknown. And somebody switched him for something he didn't do, which, of course, is not known too. Unjust. Injustice is just an unknown penalty of some kind. It's a penalty for an unknown crime or a not-existent crime, you see.

So there was injustice connected with it, there was unpredictation connected with it, and in addition to that there was no real familiarity connected with it, and amongst these various points we get the unknownness and the motion all adding up to tremendous importance. He's still trying to figure it out. you can say the importances of anything is as great as the individual is still trying to figure it out. And you'll find those engrams which are most seriously stuck on the track are those engrams which are composed of incomprehensibles.

The fellow went . . . kept calling on this girl, and he kept calling on the girl, and he'd wave to her from the window, and so forth. It was rather a strict planet on the subject of sex, they didn't have much. See, he keeps calling on this girl, and it seems all right with him, you see. And he thinks he's getting someplace with... He didn't intend anything very gruesome, you know, and he was sort of paying court in the way they were doing on this particular planet or country, and it all seemed very routine and regular. And one day he drives up and runs into an ambushade. A real one. A real ambushade, you see, complete with muskets, you know? And he's slaughtered!

Well, he didn't have any intentions that match this slaughter, and he doesn't know what would cause that family, you see, to be this upset about somebody paying court to their daughter. And he adds up . . . tries to keep adding this up. He keeps adding this up, you see. Keeps adding it up. Keeps adding it up. And it doesn't ever add up, of course. And he'll get some kind of a fixed idea about it, and he'll say, "Well, that's it." But the number of times he tells you that that is the fixed idea about it and that is it, you can start being suspicious about that time because, of course, if he has to have a fixed idea about something, the unknownness of it must have been terrific. He says, "Well, in actuality her father and she practiced incest and they were afraid to find it out. And nobody could quite discover what this was all about. And if I had paid court to her much longer, why, something like that would have happened, and that is the way it was, and that was the thing, I think. I guess. No, no. It's actually a fact. Everybody in the neighborhood knew that she and her father practiced incest and, therefore, her father set her brothers on me, you see, to shoot me down in order to keep me from finding this out, and that is what it is. That's true, it's true. Everybody in the neighborhood knew it. As a matter of fact, it was in all the papers, so forth . . . I think, I guess, or something else. But that was the way it was! I guess."

And you audit a little while. All of a sudden he comes out of a fog and he says, "You know, she'd actually been pledged to marry the local duke. And this was all being kept secret, you see, because the duke's politics were completely contrary to most of the people's politics, and there might have been quite a revolution, you see, and they had me figured out as an agent that was merely trying to reach the duke. I think. I guess."

All the time he's telling you this, why, these musket balls are still lodged in various portions of his anatomy, and he has got somatics from all of them, you see. And every time he gets on this subject, he gets hectic because these musket balls were hot at the time, and he's never quite dared to feel that littleness of the motion of the heat, you see. And these musket balls start warming up every time he gets onto the mystery of this. So therefore he solves the mystery, but he never solves the mystery right.

So he's just been floundering around in this engram . . . I can see him now. He's on some other planet, and he is a member of the space guard of this particular planet in its polar caps. And he has an igloo in which he's supposed to stand by, you see, as a warning, and he's sitting in this igloo. And life has been going on fairly well while they were building the igloo in the station. He's sitting there, and about two months later, all of a sudden he starts to wonder, "Well, now, I guess it was that she was going to marry the... No, it was father's incest with uh . . . the uh . . . uh . . . situation. I wonder what that was. Now, let's see, it must have been..." you get the idea?

And eventually he gets an illness of some kind or another and has to be carted out of the polar caps and hospitalized for a long time. And the medicos issue very learned papers on the subject of "Polar caps cause illnesses which are hot, burning spots in somebody's chest." And they, of course, become very learned on the subject, and they have very, very vast conferences, and so forth, and they bring this up at their meetings, and they read papers on it. And you've got this piece of pretended knowingness borne as an effort not to face the unknownness of it, you see. And this goes on and on and on. And the primary recipient, of course, would be the medical profession. I think there's probably a fact or two in their books, but most of them are based on some wild effort to solve what: A psychosomatic with a physiological explanation. And what could there be a wilder lie than that?

The fellow has got hot musket balls in his chest, so they say, "Well, there's a new illness called 'polarolosis,'" and here it is.

It's very amusing to read medical records when you know a great deal about the mind and so on. They present you with everything but the facts. They sure give you a lot of learned names to back it up too. And if you want to know a real piece of pretended knowingness, look at the heading on it and see how many authorities had to be called on to vouch for it. And then if you get four or five authorities or hospitals which have vouched for all of this, you can just be sure at that time it should have been garbage cans at the beginning, and somebody should have audited the patient. You see how this thing goes?

It is the idea of the importance of the unknownness, and the idea of the importance of the motion. And these things drop back to the degree of threat to survival. And then this, therefore, goes back to the idea that one must survive. And you start taking this apart from all lines, and you get down to the basic idiocy. A thetan who can't help but survive . . . he just couldn't help himself. He may be surviving kind of deadly and in different forms and out of valence, and so forth, but the one thing he cannot do anything else but, is survive. He always will survive. That's for sure. The one thing he can absolutely count on is the one thing he is always trying to solve, which is, of course, itself is a basic idiocy. And, of course, everything else which follows from that basic idiocy, of course, is idiotic.

But if you want to take this apart, you take it apart along the road of unknown and motion, and these two items give you a very broad four-lane highway right down through the middle. And of course you combine any phraseology that has to do with unknown . . . which is not-know, forget, forgotten; any of the odd numbered postulates . . . and you combine this with any word which sums up to a motion or transplantation in space, and you will get a process, which is a wild one.

Now, if you put that against valences, you will get pc in pictures, and it gives you your basic magic formula for getting the pc into the track and onto the track and in the bank and moving on the track and out of detached views and all these other ills that we are . . . have been discussing. Make any sense to you?

When you see one of these things wheeling off, it's a lot of fun. This gag of telling somebody to look out there two or three hundred yards in front of him and two or three hundred yards behind him is not very new. But let me warn you against having him look ten or twelve feet in front of him or ten or twelve feet behind him. That's too close. He'll jump like he's shot. Usually in space opera when they are conditioning thetans . . . or when thetans are conditioning others . . . they . . . sometimes there's a tumbler

incident, that nearly everybody has some cognizance of or is stuck in or something like this. It's quite common.

And they throw somebody in a body down a shaft, and of course he's spinning, so the bottom of the shaft is lighted and the top of the shaft is lighted, and he is falling in the shaft. And therefore, the image of the top of the shaft and the image of the bottom of the shaft leave an awful lot of bright spots because he's trying to stop himself from falling all the way down. So he gets a vast number of bright spots stuck around him at varying distances, and he doesn't quite know what these are afterwards. And that is the way the picture looks.

Well, these are not very far from him, and some of them are quite close to him, naturally, because he fell only a short distance to get the closest ones, and he fell further to get the further ones, and I haven't made any estimate of how far one of these bright spots would be, but probably something on the order of about . . well, I don't know . . a hundred feet, something like that.

And you tell anybody to look in closer than a hundred feet just on casual inspection, he's liable to run into these things, and they will really hit him. Very casually, you could be riding on a bus and tell some dear old lady, if you felt particularly diabolical, you say, "Close your eyes. Do you have any bright spots around you ten or twelve feet away from you?" And she'll get it right there. Splank! She'll see one of these things. She'll get the sensation of motion, you see, and she'll stop herself suddenly. And it'll be a jolt. That's an interesting phenomena. That's an old, old space opera installation of an engram. And practically everybody's got that one.

There's whole long . . oh, there's long, long lists of these. Any possible way you could get somebody, what? Dislocated.

Now, I told you the other day about dreams. Dreams. An effort to locate oneself Then what is a delusory bank? Let's carry it just one step further. Instead of dreaming it asleep, how about having it in the bank awake? Effort to locate oneself.

Out of this you get the workability and magic of 8-C, TR 10, other things. They have some workability because, of course, they're locating somebody and they feel better.

But how about locating somebody in the bank. Well, nearly every picture he's got is an effort to locate himself in an area where he felt dislocated. So unknown locations could play a considerable role and unknown times could play a considerable role in other processes. I don't particularly mean to cover those now, but I should mention to you that you can have unknown locations, and you can do weird things with pictures. Have the pc spot unknown locations. Of course, he shakes up every delusory effort to locate himself by pictures. And you'll get pictures flying by in all directions.

"Are there any locations you don't know about?" You see, that type of interrogation. Bing-bang, and all of a sudden you get a bank shift. It's quite amusing . . then the fact that an individual is sitting in a bank which locates him so he'll be in the wrong place.

Now, if you went further than that, *reductio ad absurdum*, you could get down to this interesting supposition that a universe is an effort to locate one-self And you'd possibly get the basic consent of why a thetan is willing to be in a universe.

It's an effort to locate himself Therefore, because a thetan doesn't have to be located, and it's totally idiotic . . I point out in the 1954 HPA tapes when this is mentioned . . it's totally idiotic to have to be located. There's no good reason why anybody would have to be located. It must be a dirty trick then to locate a thetan, and it is. It is. Give him the idea that he has to have a location.

But that is such the fundamental idea and goes back of every universe, and is back of every bank, and is so wrapped around and hedged around with reasons, explanations, valences and all the rest of it, that we must assume that it is practically unreachable as a concept in processing. And there are many such very senior concepts in processing, that if you could just think them and realize them, flash! you see . . not on

any gradient but just suddenly say, “Well, there’s no reason I should have to be located, you know,” and bang! you’re Clear, just like that, you see.

These are the thoughts that you think you should be able to think. But of course, you set all these other things in motion every time you think those, but then you stop them if you have an allergy to motion. See, so you think, “Well, I ought to be . . . why, I could be cleared, very easy, all I have to do is get the idea that I don’t have to be located.” Diiiiing you see, and things go bzzuuup and bzzuuup, and you don’t like all that motion, so you say, “Stop.” And also you stop it because you don’t know what was moving. So there’s again the unknown and the motion which blocks the road out to the release of a concept.

Now, you go a little bit further than this, and it must have been some kind of overt to locate thetans. And all of you must have been busily locating thetans madly, viciously, and so on, in order to pile up enough overts that the thing would stick with you to this degree, you see. Well, that’s all very fine, but this must be prior to the overt act-motivator phenomena. So you think the thought and you run into the overt act-motivator phenomena just up the track a ways, you see, bang! And you try to think the thought again or the concept of “Well, I don’t have to be located,” and bang! you get into the overt-motivator phenomena. And that is another blocker which is a cousin to what I have been talking about.

Now, you could run somebody: “Think of locating somebody. Thank you. Think of locating somebody. Thank you. Think of locating somebody. Thank you.” For a little while, why, the thetan says, “Gee,” you know, “that was good of me, you know? This old lady. she couldn’t cross the street. She didn’t know where she was, and I told her where she was, and, ah, that’s nice of me, you know.” And he gets all these “nice of hims,” you know, and these “nice of hims” and these “nice of hims” and then he finally gets nailing this fellow down, you see, to this plank, you see. And “What’s this? Well, I . . . I don’t know why this fellow’s being nailed down to the plank. I didn’t have anything to do with it. Actually, my men wanted me to do it, and I didn’t have any choice. No, I didn’t have anything to do with it. It’s torturing him for some reason or another,” and all of a sudden it dawns on him, “I’m locating him. But they . . . they wanted me to locate him. I . . . I didn’t have anything to do with it myself, you see. I’m just an innocent bystander. I was an officer on this ship, and the crew had mutinied, I think. I guess. And that was why we were nailing this fellow down, I suppose.” So you get this and then you get another one.

“Well, as a matter of fact, that . . . that . . . that’s locating somebody. Yeah, I can get the idea of locating somebody, pretty vicious, you know. Get the idea of locating somebody. That’s pretty mean, you know. Get the idea of lo . . . Gee, that’s mean, you know.”

Then the fellow goes into a total dispersal on the whole thing, and he himself can’t feel he’s located anywhere, and he becomes very difficult to audit. In other words, it’s not a very good track for auditing, but it’s just a potential road.

It’s one of these potential roads that is very nice, that you could drive from . . . straight from here to Italy with no difficulty whatsoever on a straight line. you wouldn’t have to mind falling off many precipices, or running head-on into any mountains, you see, or drowning in any rivers. If you didn’t mind that, why, the best way to get to Italy, you see, is just to drive straight to Italy. You take somebody who has a tremendous allergy to unknowns and tremendous allergy to motions, combine these things and then ask him to run one of these senior concepts, you see . . . and of course, he’ll run into the other one all the time and bang-bang.

Now, the reverse works: If you’ve got the unknownness and the motion allergy is cleaned up pretty well . . . which of course cleans up valences and gets him in his pictures and all that sort of thing . . . why, then, of course he starts reaching back and changing his mind concerning these various things. And we get back to Change of Mind Processing.

And the route we’re looking for is the route to just change of mind. The thetan can change his mind, and that is it. He just gets another idea about it, you see. He just as-ises the idea he’s got and gets another idea about it and he feels fine about it.

Well, what booby-traps this? In the first place, he must have escaped from innumerable pictures and he’s off-track in numerous places, and he doesn’t have a concept of where he’s been or what he’s done, and

the unknownness of that must be very important because actually he does have the . . he has set the example to himself of having escaped from these things, so therefore they must have been dangerous.

You get how he proves it to himself? He proves it to himself reversewise. "I ran away so it must have been rough." See, it proves the point, see. If he ran away, it must have been rough. Not, it was rough, so he ran away. you get the idea? But, it must have been rough because he ran away. And he's also always proving these things to him. you say, "My God! That must be a terrible engram. The reason it must be a terrible engram? Prima facie evidence: It must be a terrible engram is because I can't get in it. See, I'm outside the thing. I'm not in my own valence in the engram, and it's way over there, and it just must have been bitch kitty. This must have been a rough-rough. There must have been nothing there but big jagged rocks being pounded on somebody every three seconds, you see. Shame, blame, regret and degradation are being poured into that area with coal shovels. That's obvious. Proof of the thing is I'm not in it."

Now he gets in it and he finds out that nothing happened. Yeah, there wasn't very much in it. He just struck it at a time of life or a frame of mind when he thought unknowns and motion were terrible. And so therefore he didn't want anything to do with it, and he didn't want to be in it.

People do not escape to the degree that things were dangerous. These are not proportionate statements. You know, the more dangerous a thing is, the more escape you will have from it. you get that? That doesn't work that way at all. The most dangerous thing there is, is war on this planet, for sure, in terms of human activities, and yet you never have any difficulty getting people to sign up to fight a war. That's interesting, isn't it? And you never have any difficulty getting contractors to build things for war. So what does this mean?

Well, the most dangerous activity man engages upon has the most recruits. Well, this is kind of backwards, isn't it? It's . . then it's not true that man escapes to the degree that things are dangerous. He escapes to the degree that he conceives they are motion-ful, that he doesn't like . . motion-that-he-doesn't-like-ful . . and the degree that they are unknown.

Now, actually a war may be very dangerous, but it's fairly well known. Man, you've got sergeants and captains and generals and general staffs and governments and presidents and kings, and so forth, and their whole effort is to locate you.

And the whole effort of the enemy is to dislocate you. So you've got an effort to dislocate being resisted and an effort to locate being obeyed. And, of course, danger hasn't anything to do with it at all. It's just the degree of location involved with it. And of course, you get all kinds of recruits for a war. you could probably dream up and synthesize another activity that would be just as attractive as war if you put your mind to it.

It would have to be something where you were supremely well located. Marvelously located. You'd just have to fix it up so the guy was . . could locate and was being located. Known whereabouts, you see. Known whereabouts. Known whereabouts. Known whereabouts. You just have to play that one off the middle with efforts to make the whereabouts different. In other words, to fix and unfix. The whole idea of power . . this is an old one from way back, Phoenix . . the whole idea of power stems from the ability to hold a position. All power derives from the ability to hold a location. When I say position, of course, that gives you a double entendre. It's location. The base is what derives power to the electric motor. It is the base. It is not the spinning amature . . armature. It's what keeps positive and negative separated that is deriving the power.

Now, you can conceive an electric motor with a positive and negative terminal in the thing that would have enough rotation through magnetic fields applied to it that it would collapse its base. Now, you've got two little things, and they're sort of pinned up there on little weak pot metal. There are two heavy magnets pinned on weak pot metal pins, you see. And you get positive and negative going between these two magnets at a hell of a rate of speed, you know. you turn your armature through the field and those two poles will collapse on each other.

You take a powerful magnet, and the reason things come to a powerful magnet is to the degree that it can stay still. Otherwise, your magnet will race forward toward the thing. These are various laws in the fields

of mechanics which actually derive from the ideas of thetans. All mechanics derive from the ideas of thetans. All matter derives from concept of thetans, and the behavior of matter is based entirely upon how a thetan thinks it ought to behave.

Chemistry is very interesting. There isn't a single product that doesn't have a set of postulates connected with it. There isn't a single chemical compound or a single chemical element that you cannot take apart into the number of postulates that the thetan put in it. And you can find out what the postulates of it were. It's quite interesting. An interesting study.

No more of that. That's rather dry.

The idea of holding a base or holding a situation. All right. There's these . . . a body of troops is holding a hill and they cannot be dislodged. Well, the degree they cannot be dislodged does not have anything whatsoever to do with the number of troops on the hill. It may be influenced by that, come to think about it, but that isn't actually it. It's whether or not they believe they can be dislodged. That is the first requisite and whether or not they have enough weapons of one character or another to resist dislodgment. It only takes one man to fire an electronic cannon.

Now, you need lots of men to the degree that the hilltop can be approached. So the power generated by a body of troops on a hilltop is totally dependent on their ability to make the enemy hold his position, and their own ability to hold their position. And that body of troops actually has to take responsibility for holding the enemy where they are. And bodies of troops almost never take this responsibility very wholeheartedly. They think they will shoot at the enemy if he approaches. It never occurs to them too much . . . although this is part of tactics, strategy . . . to pin the enemy down where he is.

Now, of course, they have won the war to the degree that the enemy cannot advance and that they can continue to hold their position. Wars are won on the basis of held positions and dislodgments from positions.

Now, countries look very weak after wars because one of the countries has dislodged the other terminal, and there's no power resulting.

The whole subject of electricity, flying saucers, the electric motor that turns over your fridge, whatever is running your automobile is merely based on the ability to hold a location and to resist an encroachment upon the location. You look at an internal-combustion engine in this wise, and you learn a great deal. Of course, the pistons are trying to blow the crankcase down, you see, and the crankcase, however, is held up with bolts, and the crankshaft goes zzzzzz, you see. It doesn't go psst down, so this must be the thrust bearings and the main bearings, and so forth, of the crankshaft that are holding a position, and the piston isn't holding the position, but it's being dislodged, but there must be something that keeps it from coming up all the way, you see, and something that keeps it from going down all the way.

You'd normally conceive that the power of an engine is based upon the thrust of the piston. And this is the way they normally calculate the power of engines, and that isn't why the engine is powerful at all. It's the degree the base can be held and the amount of effort that can be applied to dislodge something from base, and then the amount of effort that this base has to resist being dislodged, and it's an interplay of held positions.

And if a mechanical engineer were to look over motors from this exact way, he would arrive with very advanced power plants of one character or another. It's the ability to hold things apart and the ability to thrust them at each other while holding them apart, and so on.

You always get generated energy by thrusting something at something that will not move. If you don't believe it, start an argument with somebody. The power of the argument is totally proportional to the degree that they won't relent, you see. Well, you'll see actual power being generated. It can get pretty sparky, pretty sparky.

All you want to do, if you want to keep generating sparks, why, just keep pressing against the held position. And of course, you know how to settle any argument: in the final analysis you could always run

away. Can't dislodge the position so you could always move off, and of course that . . . there's no more power being generated. You see how that would be?

No more power being generated at all. There's no more argument. Nobody's shouting. Nothing happening, and so forth. You're just gone. you were one of the terminals, you see, and you were holding a position there, too. So you abandon the position, and you don't have all of this upset. All you have after that is detached pictures.

Now, a thetan's friction with life and his crush against life, and life's crush against him does generate energy. You know, he himself has got masses of energy, and he is holding a position, and so forth, and that's where the energy basically comes from. But you want to know where a picture comes from, the characteristics of pictures and masses and all that sort of thing, well, they're to the degree that he is resisting a position. Therefore, if you want to get a three dimensional picture in some pc, which is 3-D in solid, man, solid, well, get a time when he was . . . Well, I'll give you an example. I had a good subjective reality on this.

A company of men lined up in company front firing at a company of men lined up in company front. Neither one of them giving way. They just stood there for hours and fired at each other. And boy, the fronts of those uniforms were just absolutely solid, all standing-wave electricity, of course. They thought it was guns that was generating the power in the battle, but it wasn't at all. It was these two bodies of troops confronting each other, neither one of which would give away, both of which were trying to drive the other away, you see. And neither one of them was driving away. And it was pretty combustible. And of course, when you run into a picture like that and you start to run the picture like that, the thing actually develops a considerable amount of zing.

See, there'll be all kinds of electricity running around, and you'll see it register on your E-Meter. The effort to hold a position.

All right. If you want to see an E-Meter go bing-bang, take somebody that is real to the pc in this lifetime. And then find an argument between the two. And you'll get the same phenomena and you'll get a discharge of energy, and that discharge of energy will be registered on your E-Meter. The study of the mind goes in, unfortunately, without . . . and you don't have to feel bad about this and think that you should learn more about this. Girls are very . . . mostly upset by this.

I start talking about electric flows and so forth. And I'm inferring ohms and ergs and all that sort of thing, and girls get rather distressed. They think that, "While I was in physics class I got A on all those things, but I didn't understand any part of it. And I don't have much to do with mechanics." And they start thinking, "Well," rather sadly, "well, I can't really grasp this because I don't know much about electricity," and so forth. They back down on this particular point, and they think that in order to understand Scientology, they have to know something about electricity, physics and mechanics. Well, I'll let you in on something. I'll let you in on something.

In order to understand something about electricity, and mechanics, and ohms and ergs, electrical engineers would have to understand Scientology. See, it is a completely reversed idea. But a girl in this particular lifetime is not too much or too averagely dedicated to knocking guys' blocks off and knocking positions out and holding the wont line trench, and so forth. They haven't been doing it for a few centuries and are out of practice. And so they think that the subject of power or force is something that they shouldn't have too much acquaintance with. And that's about all there is to it, is they're just out of the habit. And this is why they say, "Well, I really ought to know something about this but he's now talking about something very technical that I really shouldn't know anything about," and that isn't the case at all.

I think that girls in this particular society probably generate more power and more sparks than anything else. Kipling's comment upon "The female of the species is more deadly than the male." I would amend this to reading "The female of the species generates more sparks than the male." There's nothing like a girl who just can't seem to get a different idea in her head and insists on hanging on to that one particular timeworn idea. you can explain to her inevitably and at long length how that idea is moldy and went out of style and it hasn't been worn in Paris for generations, and so on. And you can go on, and you can get

quite elucidative on the subject. You can flower it up and use rhetoric and threat and so forth. And she finally succumbs, and that's too bad, and it's all set now and we've now agreed, you see, until the following morning when she brings up this idea again, you see.

Yeah, there's an awful lot of energy hanging around one of those things. So don't think that a girl won't hold a position or try to drive somebody else from there.

No, a thetan will do it, male or female. And banks have energy in them and are charged. And a person has masses in his bank and is being bothered with masses to the degree that he has experienced this interplay of energy motions and has tried to hold positions and knock people off positions, and so forth. And you will get resultant bank. I mean, that's all there is to that. A bank is a sort of a mold of what you were trying to hold a position against or a mold of what you were trying to dislodge from position.

Well, of course, when one is dislodged from position, in actuality, even conceptually, the person then dramatizes this to the degree of having a picture from another position. Now do you understand where I've been going here?

So you'll have an out-of-valence view of the situation. And you'll see these energy masses all right, but they're parked over in some safe place, and they don't have too much to do with anything. And it's better just to have a picture of those energy masses, don't you see, rather than to confront the energy masses. And you start to move anybody in toward this place where he was dislodged or where he failed to dislodge somebody else from a position, you try to move him in that with duress and command and hammer and pound and argue with him and that sort of thing; well, that's what the substance was of the engram. So of course, it doesn't work. See, the more hammer and pound and duress that you put in to getting him to hold this position again, from which he can view the engram, the more you restimulate the resistance of the engram, the more you blow him out. It's very . . . see, it's very comprehensible. It's just a one, two, Q and A, direct.

But if you can take him on a gradient of what led up to this solid state, he'll find himself in it again. And when he finds himself in again, he'll find that these are masses of confrontingness, and the reality connected with it will be high, and so forth. And then he finds out that he did confront it, and then it properly gets into the thenness where it belongs and doesn't influence the nowness in which he is living, and the engram discharges. You see what this is all about?

It's actually a very elementary subject. And it just boils down to the fact that universes may be universes, I guess, but in actual fact thetans are thetans. And that is far more true, you see, than universes are universes because universes are simply the creation of thetans.

And if you can subscribe to the idea that you had nothing to do with the creation of the universe but it was done by a big thetan, why, that's all right, but processing will catch that up, too.

Well now, in handling pcs, let me warn you against handling them with no idea of how a bank works. Two auditors, neither one of whom have any idea on how the bank works but both of them trying to find out how the bank works can probably audit each other rather successfully amidst the various ridges which build up, because one is trying to hold the position and the other is trying to blow him out of it. So they would probably get there nevertheless. But good skilled auditing toward clearing would have as a requisite some reality on all these points I'm making.

Now, the only realities you have to get on these points is just what is a bank, what's it look like, and what is out of valenceness . . . because anybody has out of valence spots on the track, that's for sure . . . and how does a picture look, and where would a pc be when he is down the track, you see. And do pictures run consecutively from one part of the track to the other, and is there a thenness as well as the nowness? And do energy masses exist? And what are these strange masses and feelings and sensations which the pc has around his body?

You have reality on those various things, and boy, you'll be able to audit.

You don't have to go into the esoterics of why they're there. You just have to get the subjective reality of the fact that they exist. And as soon as you see that they exist quite plainly, of course you are able to handle them, not only yourself, but you are able to handle them in somebody else.

Now, the oddity is that you can handle them in somebody else much more easily than you can handle them in yourself because you are not being affected by the various byproducts that the pc is being affected by. you see, it was the pc that was having the argument, and you were the . . . you're not even a party to the argument. So therefore, you can direct attention and see the reasons that the pc cannot see. The pc cannot redirect his attention because if he was totally regressed into the incident, his attention would be totally fixed in the incident, wouldn't it? But you didn't happen to be in the incident, so therefore it is very, very easy for you to direct his attention in the incident because your attention with regard to that incident in which he is in, is free. And oddly enough, the bank will always obey you much better than it will obey the pc.

And these are the fundamentals of why auditing works. And this is how auditing works. And if you don't know what you're directing his attention toward, or away from, and so forth, you will occasionally make flubs, get into all kinds of tangled skeins of auditing, and have to run ARC breaks; 99.44 percent of the auditing session will be devoted to present time problems and ARC breaks. See, the pc actually will have as many present time problems and ARC breaks as . . . to the degree that the auditor cannot direct his attention. The auditor has no idea of where he is directing his attention or how he's directing the pc's attention or if the pc's attention is being directed, why, of course, he has a great deal of trouble handling the pc.

Now, you have an idea of "Controlling the pc is very necessary to the conduct of the session," don't you? Well, you just redefine what is controlling a pc beyond keeping his body in a chair and keeping him from getting up. There is no other control of the body that you're trying to accomplish or attempt.

It must be, the control of the pc is simply the direction of the pc's attention by the auditor. And that would be the whole statement of how do you control a pc. Well, you control a pc by knowing where his attention is and doing things with his attention, and of course that controls the pc. And that's all there is to controlling pcs. you can go endlessly into the subject and you won't thrash up any more data than that.

Well now, if you don't know where his attention is, can you control the pc? See, it can't be done. So of course, then the pc is left to flounder on the track and flounder with this and flounder with that, and his attention is not under any kind of control, and as a result, what do we wind up with? We run . . . wind up with endless auditing. And auditing takes as long as the auditor doesn't control the pc.

Well, when we say this, then it must follow that the auditing takes as long as the auditor does not control the attention of the pc. To control an automobile on the road it is rather, well, and you really should, know where the automobile is. Works much better that way. And "in driving a pc," you might say it's much better to know where he is and where he's going and what he's doing. And a repetitive command will do a great deal. We shouldn't undermine these things. It does a great deal. It is directing the attention of the pc left, right and center. But also, the attention of the pc may be doing some other things which are rather fantastic. And we have to find out about this.

And we're only trying to get the auditing command executed. But in order to get it executed, we have to find out where the pc's attention is, and where the pc's attention is going, and keep track of this.

Otherwise, he has the idea of running under a dryer that doesn't know where the road is, much less where the automobile is. Both are missing. And he sort of goes around, and he goes through it, and he doesn't quite know. It almost might be enough simply to create the illusion that you know where the pc is, and so forth. This might be all right, but there is actually no substitute for a subjective reality on what a picture is, what a real picture looks like, what an energy mass is, what a track looks like, the sensation of thencess, and these little odds and ends of phenomena go along with subjective reality. Once you improve that, your auditing will go up in a steep climb like one of these new aircraft they're building over here. They don't take them off on runways anymore. They set them up on their tail and they light a match, and they go off into the sky.

Okay? All right. Well, I wish you good luck tomorrow and this weekend. And you're overdue for clearing somebody, and I will have to have a Clear Tuesday morning. Okay?

Thank you.